We must recognize the price we pay for things. But with so many families having two incomes in order to achieve what we call the American standard of living, it is almost impossible for a woman on aid to dependent children ever to earn enough to make working worthwhile to her or her children if she is untrained, uneducated and unmotivated. So it is no wonder she may be content—if that is the word—to continue to drift where she is.

For such women and for all so-called "disadvantaged" Americans, to the extent that we can reach them—and many of us can reach many of them—we should knock ourselves out trying to get the word across: the word that there is opportunity today for those who would make themselves receptive to it. There are free classes to learn how to speak in preparation for numerous job vacancies in which good voice and diction are essential; there are free courses in every skill in demand; there is even financial maintenance while learning; there is a crying need for people with warmth and human kindness in all of the disciplines related to health care; there is reward, too. But when the family's standard of living must inevitably fall in its most essential feature—in housing—once the income should go up just a bit, well, we aren't going to accomplish this objective of upgrading very easily. Public housing tenant incomes must have limits and ceilings; but then comes this gap. May I ask a question: Are you "selling" the concept of rent supplements and other ideas of that nature with enough zeal in your communities?

As passed by Congress, rent supplements now may go only to those who are already in the public housing income brackets. So the gap persists. My bill for 3 percent direct loans to nonprofit organizations to enable them to rehabilitate older housing for sale to low-income families covers the same income range as the rent supplement programs. At present, only the below market interest rate FHA loans take things several steps further for the inbetween public and private housing tenants. My next question is this: Are public housing authorities sharing their expertise with, and encouraging, private groups in the community to get into this field to serve families just above the public housing income level but too low for full-cost private housing?

The more I learn about housing, after 12 years on the subcommittee, the more impressed I am on the need for more generalists as well as specialists in the field; for people who when faced with a problem involving a family needing help, will get on the telephone and call around to as many different agencies as can contribute anything at all toward the solution of the problem or problems; people who will come to the conclusion, if no satisfactory solution is found, that new laws or new programs must be enacted to meet unsolved problems; and who will then make sure that those of us who have responsibility for passing the laws—Federal, State, and local—are made aware of the needs and are pressured into doing something about them, if new laws can be of any use in a particular situation.

A lot of you here fit into the category of the kind of good-doers I described. I would like to see the day when everyone who deals with the public in any capacity, as public official or private businessman or worker, would do more than just shrug at a problem he didn't know how to solve for some despairing human being standing before him. If everyone meeting the public and dealing with the public would only recognize that there are people who would be willing to tackle the problem and help solve it—and would intelligently direct the poor soul to someone who would try, at least, to invent a solution if none existed—I think our cities would be far less of a jungle, and far more of a community. Thank you.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 22, 1966

(Legislative day of Monday, March 21, 1966)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. John R. Claypool, D.C., minister, Crescent Hill Baptist Church, Louisville, Ky., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whom we live and move and have our being, we come into Thy presence now to acknowledge Thy priority in all things and to give thanks for every shape of goodness that comes to us from Thy hand.

Open our eyes, O God, to what Thou art doing in our world, and enable us to join Thee as colaborers in the task of humanizing humanity and bringing every man to the fullness of his personhood.

Guide now the deliberations of Thy servants in this place, and grant to them wisdom and courage and insight as they lead our Nation in the living of these days.

We pray through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. PROXMIRE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 21, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 7423. An act to permit certain transfers of Post Office Department appropriations;

H.R. 10284. An act to provide that the Federal office building under construction in Fort Worth, Tex., shall be named the "Fritz Garland Lanham Federal Office Building" in memory of the late Fritz Garland Lanham, a Representative from the State of Texas from 1919 to 1947; and

H.R. 13448. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 7423. An act to permit certain transfers of Post Office Department appropriations;

H.R. 13448. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; and

H.R. 10284. An act to provide that the Federal office building under construction in Fort Worth, Tex., shall be named the "Fritz Garland Lanham Federal Office Building" in memory of the late Fritz Garland Lanham, a Representative from the State of Texas from 1919 to 1947; to the Committee on Public Works.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on today, March 22, 1966, he signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 969. An act to authorize redetermination under the Civil Service Retirement Act of annuities of certain reemployed annuitants;

H.R. 7526. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Antonio; and

H.R. 10722. An act to authorize the payment of an allowance of not to exceed $10 per day to employees assigned to duty at the Nevada Test Site of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, and for other purposes.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to announce the appointment of Senators NELSON and FANNIN to the 50th session of the International Labor Conference, to be held at Geneva, Switzerland, June 1 through June 23, 1966.

The Chair also announces the appointment of Senator BYRD, of West Virginia, to attend the dedication of the Honolulu Memorial on May 1, 1966.

The Chair further wishes to announce the appointment of Senators WILLIAMS of New Jersey and JAVITS to the 19th Assembly of the World Health Organization, to be held at Geneva, Switzerland, May 3 through 21, 1966.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. PROXMIRE, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the unanimous-consent agreement to recognize the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Delaware may address the Senate briefly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

NEWSWEEK SUGGESTS THE CURTAILMENT OF GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the March 28 issue of Newsweek there appears an article by Henry Hazlitt entitled "Slash the Spending." This article points up one of the major causes of inflation—namely, Government extravagance and deficit spending—and makes the constructive suggestion that instead of planning a tax increase the first step should be to curtail expenditures.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

SLASH THE SPENDING

(By Henry Hazlitt)

For the last 5 years the new economists have denied that their policies led to more inflation. Now that they are at last forced to recognize this, they are proposing one of two cures, or both. The first is price and wage controls; the second is another tax increase. The first is not a cure at all but merely an additional disease. The second is harmful and unnecessary.

The simple cure for inflation is to stop inflating. The direct cause of inflation is the increase in the quantity of money and bank credit; the direct cure is to stop this increase. In order to make this possible we must stop the budget deficits. There are two ways to do this. One is to increase taxes; the other to cut expenditures.

But a further tax increase, on top of the $5 billion annual increase in social security taxes that went into effect January 1, and on top of the $6 billion increase just enacted, i.e., on top of the unparalleled tax burden of $145 billion that the American people already carry for 1967, would discourage production and constrict the economy. No one has been more insistent on this result in the last few years than the new economists themselves. They supported a tax reduction when we could not afford it. As we already had an inflationary deficit, the tax cut simply made it greater. It was therefore a sham tax cut. It merely substituted inflation, which President Johnson has called "the most unjust and capricious form of taxation," for other taxes.

HUGE NONDEFENSE COST

And it was the wrong kind of tax cut, both politically and economically. If everyone's taxes had simply been cut by an equal percentage, it would now be politically easy to restore them by a corresponding percentage. But proportionately the tax cuts were greatest on the low-bracket incomes, making income-tax rates even more steeply progressive than they already were. The administration and Congress would therefore not dare now to restore personal income tax rates to their previous levels because they would be accused of making the increase greatest on the lower incomes.

Yet with the clear threat of further inflation, it is imperative that we reduce or eliminate the inflationary gap, i.e., the excess of expenditures over revenues. The best way to do that is to reduce expenditures.

We are being told that this cannot be done, because the present huge spending is necessary to pay for the war in Vietnam. But this is not so. In the cash budget for the fiscal year 1967 total national defense expenditures are estimated at $60.5 billion. Nondefense spending comes to $83.6 billion. If we compare the 1967 budget with 1956, we find that defense costs in this 11-year period have risen only $20.5 billion while nondefense spending has increased by $52 billion. The way to prevent further inflation is to start slashing this enormous nondefense total.

SAVING $10 BILLION

How many billions need to be slashed off? Technically, the 1967 cash budget is already estimated to be in balance. But if (allowing for the dubious accounting gimmicks and the probable underestimate of expenditures) we assume that the real deficit will be at least $5 to $10 billion, then this is the amount that expenditures should be cut.

Anyone who thinks there is anything unreasonable or impossible about a cut of these dimensions need merely look at the increase in nondefense spending in the last few years. For 1967 it is $12 billion more than in 1965, $23 billion more than in 1963, and $32 billion more than in 1961. All we have to do to cut out even $10 billion is to cut out the new spending programs added since 1965 alone. If we don't want to do it that way, we might do it by slashing one or two of the more dubious categories of spending such as the $4 billion for foreign aid, the $3 billion for farm subsidies, the $4 billion for the most expensive roadbuilding program in history, the $4 billion for putting a man on the moon, or part of the $46 billion of welfare spending.

But don't let anyone tell you that we need to levy $5 billion or so of increased taxes (on top of $145 billion already there) to "prevent inflation" or to pay for the Vietnam war. The money is "needed" only to pay for the extravagant Great Society programs of the last few years.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S REPORT INDICATING MISMANAGEMENT IN AID AGENCY SHOULD BE RECLASSIFIED

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, during his recent testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee Mr. David Bell, the Administrator of the AID program, was asked why so many of the Comptroller General's reports pointing up mismanagement in his agency were given the "secret" classification. I quote the question and Mr. Bell's answer:

Senator AIKEN. I have just one more question which does affect your territory. That is, Why is it that when the General Accounting Office makes a report on mismanagement of an AID program, that all the vital parts of that report are stamped secret?

Mr. BELL. I am delighted to answer that, sir, because that is not so about the economic assistance program. All of the economic assistance program reports, every one without exception so far as I am aware, is an open report and can be published.

Notwithstanding this clear statement by Mr. Bell another Comptroller General's report was sent to the Foreign Relations Committee with a confidential or secret classification. This report was a devastating document outlining a glaring waste and mishandling in the distribution of food in a South American country under Public Law 480 programs. To prevent its release to the public the State Department has classified this document as secret and confidential.

The Foreign Relations Committee noting Mr. Bell's clear promise that such documents would not be classified, unanimously adopted a motion asking Mr. Bell, Director of the AID program, to remove the classification of this document in order that it could be released to the Congress and the public. In his reply on March 4 Mr. Bell refused to declassify this report. With specific reference to the Comptroller General's report in question Mr. Bell stated that it "makes disclosures of such a sensitive political nature that not only was its classification deemed necessary by the GAO and the concerned agencies, but also its distribution was severely limited to minimize the possibility that its existence might become public knowledge. The reasons which indicated classification continue to prevail; publication at this or any time in the foreseeable future of this information would be strongly adverse to the interests of the United States."

Mr. President, I have read this report, and there is nothing contained therein which would in any way jeopardize the security of the United States of America. There is much in the report, however, that would jeopardize the security of some public officials who have abused their office and condoned and approved the improper, if not actually illegal, distribution of these food products which were intended to be distributed as aid to the people in that country.

It should be noted also that the GAO classifies these reports only upon the request of the agency or department affected.

Once again I suggest that the State Department consider removing the cloak of secrecy from this report, and if such action is not taken this question will again be brought up for consideration when the foreign aid authorization bill for 1966 is before the Congress.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, notwithstanding the unanimous-consent agreement of the Senate to recognize the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 2 minutes.

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

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM TEACHES GOOD NUTRITION HABITS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, perhaps the most important feature of the special milk program for schoolchildren is the good nutritional habits it teaches the children when they are at the most impressionable ages. It teaches children to drink and enjoy milk—nature's perfect food—rather than soda pop. It inculcates good nutritional habits that will last virtually a lifetime.

The administration's plans to cut the school milk program by 80 percent will have just the opposite effect. Millions of children will stop drinking milk when the program is cut by 80 percent. Freed from the obligation of spending their money to buy a milk ticket which enables them to receive federally supported half pints, they will either not be able to purchase any beverage or will spend their nickels and dimes on soft drinks and pizza.

I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to an address given by Dr.

Elizabeth Todhunter, dean of the University of Alabama's School of Home Economics. She states:

Nutrition education is needed to guide families in wise selection of foods, and this education needs to be in terms of foods rather than specific functions and requirements of each nutriment.

What better way to educate children in good nutritional values than to accustom them to drinking milk, with its outstanding nutritional values?

This point is reiterated by Dr. Morris Fishbein, editor emeritus of the American Medical Association, when he states:

The answer X—to unsound nutritional practices—must lie in education, in expanded nutritional education of children.

Mr. President, I hope and believe that Congress will continue to teach children the value and healthfulness of a balanced diet by continuing the school milk program at its present level as a minimum. To do otherwise would be to encourage the type of bad nutritional practices that the school milk program was devised to combat.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is recognized for not to exceed 1 hour, for debate on the bill H.R. 13546.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, without losing his right to the floor, for an insertion in the RECORD and to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CLARK. I would be happy to do that, but I do not personally require the calling of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, but I think that should be done.

HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE CRISIS IN ASIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT], at the 21st Annual Conference on Higher Education in Chicago, Ill., on March 14, 1966.

The title of the speech is "Higher Education and the Crisis in Asia," and I think it is well worth the time of all Senators to read and study most carefully.

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

HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE CRISIS IN ASIA

(Statement by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman, U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, before the 21st National Conference on Higher Education, Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Ill., Mar. 14, 1966)

A society has the right to ask two great services of its educational institutions: the cultivation of those qualities of the mind which will help the society to avoid misfortune and the cultivation of those intellectual qualities which will advance the public happiness. What the community expects of higher education at any given time is determined by the extent to which it feels itself endangered or secure. There is a kind of Gresham's law of public policy: fear drives out hope, security precedes welfare, and it is only to the extent that a country is successful in the prevention of bad things that its institutions of learning are set free to concentrate on those pursuits which bring happiness and beauty and fulfillment into the lives of the people.

For a whole generation our country was greatly preoccupied with external dangers and, accordingly, neglectful of those aspects of the public happiness which require organized public programs and sizable public expenditures. The reason for this, of course, was the exacting demands of two World Wars and an intractable cold war, which required the massive diversion of resources from community life to national security. We felt ourselves compelled to turn away from our hopes in order to concentrate on our fears and the public happiness became a luxury to be postponed to some distant day when the dangers besetting us would have disappeared.

In 1961, a trend and an event coincided which seemed to promise a new era in our national affairs. The trend was one toward relative stability in international relations, based on a fragile, tacit agreement between the great powers to live together in peaceful, or competitive, coexistence. The event was the coming to office in the United States of a creative new administration, eager to strengthen the developing detente with the Russians and eager as well to use a respite from international crisis to devise imaginative new programs for the betterment of American life. During the 3 years of his administration, President Kennedy put forward imaginative and well-conceived plans for the improvement of health and education, for the conquest of poverty, pollution and blight, and for the spiritual enrichment of American life.

President Johnson embraced and expanded upon these innovations. Elected in 1964 by a great popular majority and supported by a great congressional majority, President Johnson was able to utilize his own extraordinary political talents to make the 1st session of the 89th Congress the most productive in a generation. Vigorously executed and adequately funded, the legislation adopted in 1965 can open the way to an era of abundance and opportunity for all of our citizens. It seemed, a year ago, that at long last our fears could give way to our hopes, that we had indeed crossed a new frontier and were in sight of the Great Society.

Then came Vietnam. The war had been going on for many years but before 1965 it had been a small and distant war and, as our leaders repeatedly assured us, a war which would be won or lost by the Vietnamese themselves. Then about a year ago it became clear that the Saigon government was about to lose the war and we radically changed our policy. Intervening with a large army of our own, we changed our role from adviser to principal belligerent and expanded what was essentially a civil war into a contest between the United States and Asian communism.

As a result of this radical change in American policy in southeast Asia, we must now, after so brief an interlude, turn back once again from our hopes to our fears, from the advancement of the public happiness to the avoidance of international disaster. The President has been compelled to divert his principal energies from implementing the Great Society to the supervision of bombing missions over North Vietnam; the Congress has been diverted from debating future needs in education and urban renewal to debating the American involvement in a land war in Asia and how we can control it; the American people have been diverted from community and family life to preoccupation once again with foreign dangers, casualty lists, and the fear of a wider war.

What does all this mean for higher education? I most emphatically do not think that the university must act like a recruit called to the colors. I do not think that the humanities must now give way to military science, that civil engineering must give way to military engineering, or that history and philosophy must give way to computerized "war games."

Unless it conceives itself as nothing more than the servant of the party in power, the university has a higher function to perform. The university, it is true, cannot separate itself from the society of which it is a part. Like the rest of us, it must now divert some part of its energies from the enrichment of the life of the individual to the preservation of the life of the Nation. But the community of scholars must do more than accept misfortune and consider how it can be overcome. It must ask how we came to misfortune and whether we need have. It must ask what has been done wisely and what has been done foolishly and what the answers to these questions imply for the future. It must ask how it came about that we have had for so long to devote so great a part of our resources to war and its prevention and it must ask whether we are condemned by forces beyond our control to continue to do so. It can, like the Secretary of State, ask what is wrong with the "other side," but it must not fail to ask as well what is wrong with our side, remembering always that the highest devotion we can give is not to our country as it is but to a concept of what we would like it to be.

Whatever the circumstances of the moment, whatever the demands of government and industry on the universities—and whatever the rewards for meeting these demands—the highest purpose of higher education is the enrichment of the life of the individual and the advancement of the eternal effort to bring reason and justice and humanity into the relations of men and nations. It is the further task of higher education to analyze existing public policies with a view to determining whether they advance or retard the realization of basic human objectives and whether and how they should be changed.

Applying these principles to the war in Vietnam, it would seem to me that the major service the university can perform for the community is to seek answers to some elemental question about means and ends.

The politician is usually preoccupied with technique rather than purpose and with immediate pressures rather than long-term needs. His concern is largely focused on the tactical questions of the war: What are the probable effects of bombing or of not bombing North Vietnam? What degree of escalation is likely to bring the Chinese into the war? What concessions, if any, are likely to induce the enemy to negotiate?

The scholar, on the other hand, must provide the historical and philosophical foundations on which wise political decisions can be based. His proper concern is with questions of means and ends, of motive and purpose: To what extent is the war in Vietnam a civil war, to what extent a war of international aggression, to what extent a conflict of ideologies? Does the American military intervention in Vietnam strengthen our alliances throughout the world, as the administration believes, or does it weaken them, as General de Gaulle's recent statement would seem to indicate?[1] And perhaps the

[1] Press conference of Feb. 21, 1966, in which he expressed fear that America would drag her European allies into non-European conflicts.

most important questions of all: does this war advance the freedom of southeast Asia or make a mockery of it by subjecting the region to great power domination? Does it increase the security of the United States by proving our resolve or reduce it by draining our material and moral resources?

The universities have a critical responsibility to meet in the crisis of our country's relations with Asia. I believe that students and professors all over the country have acknowledged that responsibility and are responding to it. I think that the student protest movement, despite certain excesses, has had a healthy effect in stimulating informed discussion and awakening the national conscience. But the more significant contribution of the university is made in the library and the classroom, by teachers who teach and students who study, by the raising and answering of elemental questions about means and ends.

Our prospects for a decent and lasting settlement in eastern Asia depend in great part on our ability to apply the kinds of insight and understanding that only broadly based liberal education can provide. We must bring to our efforts for peace in Vietnam and to our long-term relations with China some of the perspectives of history and philosophy and psychology. We must apply the experience of the past with intelligence and discrimination, separating those experiences which seem to have general application from those which are unique or accidental. We must recognize that history can be misleading as well as instructive, and we must avoid the pitfall of simple and literal analogy—such as the eternally repeated example of Munich, which is so often cited as an object lesson for cases which it resembles only slightly or superficially. We must utilize our knowledge of man and his past in the only way it can be utilized, not as a source of detailed prescriptions for specific maladies but as a source of general insight into the kinds of efforts that are likely to succeed and the kinds that are likely to fail, the kinds of policies that are likely to advance peace and human welfare and the kinds that are likely not to.

We must be prepared to examine each situation and each problem on its merits and we must be prepared, as only educated men can be, to discard old myths in the light of new realities. More important than any single policy decision that we might make is the strengthening of our capacity to reconsider established policies in the light of changing facts and circumstances.

It is not so much change itself that the universities can usefully encourage as the capacity for change. Even in the case of those of our present policies which are perfectly sound, it is not at all certain that we would be prepared to alter these policies quickly in response to a wholly new situation or an unforeseen opportunity. One of the basic problems of our policy is thus intellectual rather than political. It is the problem of freeing our minds from the dead weight of habit and prejudice and stereotype and of bringing to bear on foreign policy the rich and diverse resources of liberally educated men.

A related problem—and one for which the solution, if there is one, can only come from higher education—is the retention of the capacity for honest individual judgment in a large organization in which the surest route to advancement is conformity with a barren and oppressive orthodoxy. There are many intelligent, courageous, and independent-minded individuals in our Foreign Service, but I have had occasion to notice that there are also sycophants and conformists, individuals in whose minds the distinction between official policy and personal opinion has disappeared. The universities—and especially those schools and departments whose graduates tend to enter public service—have a special obligation to train potential public servants in rigorously independent thinking and to acquaint them as well with the need for reconciling loyalty to an organization with personal integrity. It is an extremely important service for the universities to perform because the most valuable public servant, like the true patriot, is one who gives a higher loyalty to his country's ideals than to its current policy and who therefore is willing to criticize as well as to comply.

In recent weeks the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has engaged in an experiment in public education. With results thus far that seem to me highly satisfactory, the committee has made itself available as a forum for the meeting of politicians and professors and, more broadly, as a forum through which recognized experts and scholars can help increase congressional and public understanding of the problems associated with our involvement in Vietnam and our relations with Communist China.

I believe that the public hearings on Vietnam, by bringing before the American people a variety of opinions and disagreements pertaining to the war, have done far more to strengthen our country's position than to weaken it. The hearings have been criticized on the ground that they conveyed an image of the United States as divided over the war. Since the country obviously is divided, what was conveyed was a fact rather than an image. The question arises whether those who believe the hearings should not have been held would have preferred to maintain the image of unity even though it were a false image, maintained at the cost of suppressing the normal procedures of democracy and at the cost of denying both our people and our Government the advantages of a full, free, enlightened, and responsible discussion of a national issue of the greatest importance.

No one challenges the value and importance of national consensus, but consensus can be understood in two ways. If it is interpreted to mean unquestioning support of existing policies, its effects can only be pernicious and undemocratic, serving to suppress differences rather than to reconcile them. If, on the other hand, consensus is understood to mean a general agreement on goals and values but not necessarily on the best means of realizing them, then and only then does it become a lasting basis of national strength. It is consensus in this sense which has made America strong in the past. Indeed, much of our national success in combining change with continuity can be attributed to the vigorous competition of men and ideas within a context of shared values and generally accepted institutions. It is only through this kind of vigorous competition of ideas that a consensus of values can sometimes be translated into a true consensus of policy.

The hearings on Vietnam were undertaken by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the hope of helping to shape a true consensus, even at the cost of destroying the image of a false one. They were undertaken in the belief that both the American people and their Government would profit from an airing of views by forceful advocates from both within and outside the Government. They were undertaken in the belief that the best way to assure the prevalence of truth over falsehood is by exposing all tendencies of opinion to free competition in the marketplace of ideas. They were undertaken in something of the spirit of Thomas Jefferson's words: "I know no safe depository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion." [2]

Many times in the past the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has served as the forum for a national debate and in some instances its proceedings have had the effect of translating a consensus of values into a consensus of policy as well. One notable instance was the debate on the nuclear test ban treaty in the summer of 1963. For 3 weeks the Foreign Relations Committee, with members of the Committee on Armed Services and Atomic Energy also attending, met in open session to hear vigorous arguments for and against the treaty by witnesses from the Government, from the universities, and from other areas of private life. My only feeling at the time was that the non-Government scientists and professors of politics, as disinterested individuals, were more influential than the Government witnesses, who of course were committed to the administration's policy. Each day's discussion was transmitted to the American people through the press. The result was that the Foreign Relations Committee was able to serve simultaneously as both an organ of Senate deliberation and a form of public education. In the course of those 3 weeks and the Senate floor debate that followed, support for the treaty steadily grew and the treaty was finally ratified by a vote of 81 to 19. Through the medium of open discussion and debate an existing consensus for peace as an objective was translated into a policy consensus for the test ban treaty as a means of advancing it.

The committee is now once again drawing on the resources of both Government and the community of scholars, this time in the hope of increasing public knowledge of China and of helping to lay the foundations for a true consensus about our relations with China. It is our expectation that these discussions will generate controversy, possibly a great deal of controversy, and no doubt the committee will be criticized for fostering it. It is perfectly true that we are fostering controversy and, for my own part, I do so without apology, because there is nothing wrong with the honest and responsible airing of differences and, more important, because controversy is the condition of intelligent decisionmaking and the crucible in which a consensus as to objectives may be translated into a consensus of policy as well.

It is of great importance that we try to learn something more about the strange and fascinating Chinese nation, about its past and its present, about the aims of its leaders and the aspirations of its people. Before we can make wise political—and perhaps military—decisions pertaining to China, there are many questions to be asked and, hopefully, answered: What kind of people are the Chinese? To what extent are they motivated by national feeling? To what extent by ideology? Why are the Chinese Communist leaders so hostile to the United States and why do they advocate violent revolution against most of the world's governments? To what extent is their view of the world distorted by isolation and the memory of ancient grievances? And to what extent, and with what effect on their government, do the Chinese people share with us and with all other peoples what Aldous Huxley has called the "simple human preference for life and peace"?

We need to ask these questions because China and America may be heading toward war with each other and it is essential that we do all that can be done to prevent that calamity, starting with a concerted effort to understand the Chinese people and their leaders.

---

[2] Thomas Jefferson, letter to William Charles Jarvis, Sept. 28, 1820.

Higher education has a vital role to play in this inquiry into our relations with China and Asia. The testimony of a necessarily few experts before congressional committees is obviously a limited channel for the resources of our community of scholars, although it is an exceedingly valuable one for politicians like myself who do not have nearly the time we wish we had to study those matters of history and national character and aspiration which are so pertinent to the decisions we must make. But beyond their direct communications with politicians and policymakers the universities have the higher responsibility of the classroom.

The ultimate source of wisdom in public policy is, I feel certain, education at every level. To a certain degree a U.S. Senator can point the way toward intelligent and creative policies as he sees them; to a much greater degree the President of the United States can do so; but the ultimate answer to the challenge of excellence lies with public school teachers and university professors, with writers and scholars and all those who in one way or another help to shape the minds, or fail to shape the minds, of young Americans. "A teacher affects eternity," wrote Henry Adams; "he can never tell where his influence stops." [3]

The highest duty of higher education toward the community is to keep faith with its own essential purposes, which are the disinterested pursuit of knowledge and the cultivation of the free and discriminating mind. None of us—professor, politician, or private citizen—truly serves the interest of the community by uncritical support of the policies of the moment. All of us have the responsibility to act upon a higher patriotism, which is to love our country not as it is but as we would have it be. And, in the words of Albert Camus, "if at times we seemed to prefer justice to our country, this is because we simply wanted to love our country in justice, as we wanted to love her in truth and in hope." [4]

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION, 1966

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13546) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, despite the agreement entered into yesterday, which entitles me to the floor for 1 hour when the Senate comes in today, that I may yield for 3 minutes to the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and that the time not be charged to me.

[3] "The Education of Henry Adams," ch. 17.

[4] Albert Camus, "Letters to a German Friend, in Resistance, Rebellion, and Death" (New York: Random House, Inc., 1960), p. 10.

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

SCHOOLS FACE CUTBACK IN SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a recent proposal by the administration to cut back school milk rations by $82 million has received considerable attention in the newspapers.

An article published in the Dallas Morning News treats this subject and points out the difficulties the school lunch program will face if this proposal is implemented.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Dallas (Tex.) News, Mar. 13, 1966]

SCHOOLS FACE POSSIBLE CUTBACK—PLAN WOULD HURT LUNCH PROGRAM

(By Dorothy Lillard)

AUSTIN, TEX.—Many Texas school officials may be crying over spilled milk and empty platters if the Federal Government decides to withdraw from their lunchrooms next year.

The basis for concern is President Johnson's proposal to cut back school milk rations by $82 million and emphasize the needy youngster in the school lunch program.

The Dallas independent school district, which long has spurned the so-called Government platters and milk doles, would have reason to be smug if the revised Federal plan places other districts in a bind. Some observers say, however, that many Dallas civic leaders recently have exerted more and more pressure for participation in the Federal aid program.

If the Children Nutrition Act of 1966, the President's plan, passes, Dallas school officials could feel even greater pressure to seek aid for low-income youngsters.

Meanwhile Charles Hicks, school lunch coordinator for the Texas education agency, foresees serious curtailment of Texas programs in the near future.

Instead of a nickel reimbursement per lunch, Uncle Sam might have to offer an average 3 cents to the participating school districts.

Milk reductions could force schools to charge students 7 cents instead of 3 to 4 cents per half pint.

Last year, Texas schools served 128 million hot lunches in about 1,300 school districts. In addition to the milk served with the lunches, 94.5 million extra half pints were served.

Currently Dallas, Highland Park, Richardson and Garland schools are joined by San Antonio, Houston, and Fort Worth schools in rejecting the national lunch program. Unlike Dallas, the other three big schools do participate in the milk programs. Fort Worth and San Antonio schools also receive surplus Government food.

The President's program, said to face serious opposition in Congress, calls for milk subsidies to go to 3 million youngsters from the neediest families rather than all the 18 million children who received it last year.

School lunch programs aided by low-cost surplus food in Federal stock (a decreasing supply) are expected to continue unchanged. Free breakfasts are to be served in poverty area schools, which are also scheduled to receive money to equip kitchens and cafeterias.

Some have termed the "unchanged" description of the lunch program deceptive. While the President has asked for $50 million more in special assistance, his proposals cut the actual cash and commodities by $19 million. The special grants are intended for use in needy districts mainly.

"The cash provided in the lunch appropriation and proposed Child Nutrition Act will not be enough to meet these demands," explained Hicks.

"The proposals do not provide for growth and expansion of the local program."

"And I am very apprehensive of the situation which would develop if Houston, San Antonio, Fort Worth, and Dallas should decide to participate in the lunch programs," he added.

These areas represent more than 650 schools and administrators would be hard pressed to redistribute decreased funds to an increased number of schools. Districts already dependent upon the Federal lunch program will face a fund reduction without the addition of the four most populous cities in the State.

Hicks noted that Texas always refused to administer on a variable cost basis—5 cents on a lunch in district A areas and 2 cents on the same lunch in district B areas.

"We will cut uniformly when necessary," Hicks said. "We now are experimenting with the special assistance programs for the most needy schools as one solution."

Annual funds for the special assistance, which help pay up to 15 cents on a lunch, will amount to $72,900 this year in Texas. If the State receives proportionately the same amount with the proposed $50 million increase, Hicks can count on about 12 times as much or $875,900.

With this amount, administrators could avoid elimination of the program in the better off school districts, and just reduce the reimbursement fee. The special assistance funds would handle the bulk of the extra emphasis on the needy.

The milk slashes will affect more schools than the main lunch program. Under the act, the cheap half pints are intended strictly for the needy.

The milk program, which was started in 1954 because of heavy dairy surpluses, had $103 million allocated to it last year. President Johnson has called for only $21 million in his budget. Federal officials contend that most schools should be able to pay the extra cost and not the children. Districts usually receive 1 cent for handling, which the Government says is usually more than needed. Children pay 3 to 4 cents for half pints costing 6 to 8 cents.

Hicks said some districts take 1½ cents extra for handling, but often use the extra to pay for free half pints given to needy children.

"Cuts in the milk program will eliminate it for most school districts in Texas or limit it to schools within a district with a large number of low-income children," said Hicks.

Actually the milk program could end up operating only in south Texas and those schools attended predominantly by Negroes in low-income areas.

Ironically some Congressmen point out that if the program is limited to low-income areas, poor children in wealthy school districts would have to do without milk, unless provided from some other source.

Also, poorer Negro students, transferred into formerly all-white districts by Federal civil rights campaigns, might lose out on free lunch and milk programs or be embarrassed by accepting Government handouts where other students do not.

One educator cited an example in south Texas where students who paid their own way ate chicken while the free lunch students ate inexpensive meat loaf the same day.

Hicks said the State is experimenting with providing breakfast free to children in some Austin schools and elsewhere.

"It is my understanding that most schools serving free breakfasts use milk as the mainstay," he said. "If the milk supply is cur-

tailed seriously, it will have an adverse effect."

Hicks said the President's proposal to extend the feeding service to nonschool activities (camps, nurseries) might be longer coming to Texas.

"I am happy to see that funds are being made available for equipping lunchrooms and also to assist the State in administering the programs," he commented.

The State pays only costs of administering the national lunch and milk programs. Some States appropriate additional funds to help the local districts pay for the actual lunches.

One of the most vocal congressional critics of the bill offered by the administration is Representative J. J. PICKLE, of Austin, a former member of the Texas Employment Commission.

PICKLE testified before the Ways and Means Committee last year and urged changes that would protect the rights of State governments in this field. He plans to give his views anew to the committee and to the House when the bill reaches the floor.

The Federal lunch program, begun in 1946 under the National School Lunch Act, reimburses public and nonprofit schools about 5 cents a lunch. The children are charged from 25 to 35 cents for the lunch. The remainder of the cost is absorbed by the district, with the addition of surplus Government foods from the Department of Agriculture. Hicks estimated that these supplies contribute 10 cents to the average meal cost.

Many children receive a free daily meal. Local school authorities determine the needy children and shoulder the extra expense.

Hicks said 6 to 7 percent of the daily hot lunches are provided free in Texas. In addition, more free lunches are financed through title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Districts qualify for money on the basis of the number of low-income families in their area.

Noting a current shortage of agricultural supplies, Hicks said he recently was notified that butter may not be available for school consumption. The U.S. Department of Agriculture said it had been unable since February to purchase supplies on the open market in enough quantity to provide for the schools.

"At this point, we don't know what to do about the schools," wrote the Agriculture officials.

EXPORTS TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a penetrating editorial was published in the Austin American on March 14, 1966, which concerns our exports to Communist countries.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD, so that I may share this perceptive observation with my colleagues.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for yielding to me at this time.

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

[From the Austin (Tex.) American, Mar. 14, 1966]

A STRATEGIC QUESTION

State Secretary Dean Rusk in February submitted to Congress the Department's 1964 report on operations under the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 also known as the Battle Act, the U.S. law barring shipment of strategic goods to Communist countries.

The report shows that exports to Communist countries in 1964 more than doubled over the 1963 level, rising from $167 million to almost $340 million. (U.S. trade with Communist China, Cuba, North Korea, and North Vietnam is, with minor exceptions, prohibited.)

This expansion resulted primarily from increased shipments of wheat but included also other agricultural products. The report showed that total free world exports to Communist countries rose sharply from $5.6 billion in 1963 to $6.7 billion in 1964.

General U.S. imports from Communist nations, according to the report, rose from $85 million to $102.5 million in 1964, while total free world imports from these countries rose slightly from $6.2 billion to $6.8 billion.

The report said the rise of more than a billion dollars in Communist purchases from the free world in 1964 was the largest increase in any year since World War II. The report said the balance of foreign trade between the free world and the Soviet Union shifted favorably in the direction of the free world. It added that the largest single gains were in exports and imports from Communist China. Chinese exports for the first time exceeded $1 billion.

It would be interesting to learn precisely what goods are exported to Communist nations.

The law says that no goods of a strategic nature can be exported to Communist countries. But practically all goods have some strategic value.

SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION, 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13546) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I continue with my speech, which was interrupted last night by the recess of the Senate around 7 o'clock.

At that time, I had made two principal points. First, that I found myself compelled to vote for the pending defense appropriation bill, on the ground that I could not conscientiously vote to deny money needed for the safety of American troops overseas. Second, that, in my opinion, we should never have been in Vietnam in the first place, committing large numbers of American troops to a land war on the ground mass of Asia.

I should now like to make my third point: that, as of today, our military, economic, and social posture in South Vietnam is far from favorable. We have eliminated the danger of losing the war, but we have not—at least, on the surface—started to win it.

I quote from page 266 of the hearings before the Armed Services Committee, in response to a question from the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], as to whether we had improved our position in South Vietnam during the past year, had slipped back, or are today about the same as we were a year ago, and General Johnson, Chief of Staff of the Army, replied:

I would say that we are about the same as we were a year ago with regard to control.

His answer contains a couple of deletions, but at a later point he stated—and I paraphrase him—that by reason of our improved firepower we show some improvement on total balance, but not on provable results.

The status in South Vietnam at the moment involves the vexing question of how much terrain we and our allies control. In this regard, it has been extremely difficult to get any categorical answer out of either the Secretary of Defense or the AID Administrator, to whom this question was addressed at the time of the hearings on the supplemental foreign aid bill. There has been great complaint as to whether an effective map could be produced. Nothing really effective in the way of such a map was produced before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

However, on page 145 of the hearings of the Armed Services Committee, a map was produced before the committee which, of course, is not copied in the testimony.

Secretary McNamara made this point with respect to who controlled the terrain: The important points to note, he said, are that the population is concentration in Saigon and the areas south of Saigon, the rice bowl, the delta area, and along the coast in these areas. He made the further point that the area fully controlled by the Vietcong was, to some extent, sparsely populated.

Nevertheless, it is perfectly clear that the Mekong Delta, where a substantial part of the wealth of the country is located, has not been pacified. It is equally clear that the area adjacent to a number of American bases has not been pacified.

We find that in many of the areas where, as a result of our search and destroy tactics, we occupy the land as a result of a successful assault, we are compelled shortly thereafter to vacate the terrain we have taken, and in many instances the Vietcong have moved back in short order.

Thus, I would raise the question, with some confidence, that there is more than a majority of the land mass in South Vietnam and, possibly, even a majority of the densely populated land mass which is not really secure for either ourselves or our South Vietnamese allies.

An additional important question is, Who controls the population?

This is a rather deceptive matter because of the huge number of refugees who have left the land and moved into the more densely populated areas, particularly Saigon, and have no visible means of support and, generally speaking, are on the South Vietnamese equivalent of relief.

Nevertheless, I read from page 146 of the hearings where the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] ask the question of Secretary McNamara:

How much of the population does the Vietcong control?

Secretary McNamara answered:

Well, the figures we have received from South Vietnam say 23 percent of the population.

Then he continued:

However, this morning, earlier, I gave an estimate of Prime Minister Ky to the effect

that his government controls only 25 percent of the population. Now, these figures are not necessarily contradictory because of the difference in the definition of "control." Prime Minister Ky, when he gave the figure 25 percent as being controlled by the Government, was thinking of the population that could participate freely and without coercion.

Then he continued:

I think if you applied the definition of control that our field representatives do, both the political and military representatives in South Vietnam, they would say that the Government controls today 53 percent of the population of the country, the Vietcong control about 23 percent. That makes a total of around 76 percent, and the remaining 24 percent is in the disputed areas.

Then he added this significant statement:

I think that Ky's estimate is a much more realistic appraisal of Government control than is the 53 percent.

The importance of the discussion of the terrain and population is clear when we recall that we have recently approved a substantial appropriation for economic aid to South Vietnam, $175 million, which will be used largely, although not entirely, to bolster the South Vietnamese economy, which is showing signs of sagging, and the other $100 million is to be used largely, though, again, not entirely, to go ahead with the economic and social programs which President Johnson stressed so much at the Honolulu meeting and thereafter.

It will be recalled that in the follow-up on the economic and social development program, on which the administration, correctly, in my judgment, lays great stress, the President sent the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. John Gardner, to Vietnam to do everything possible to expedite the aid program. The aim of this program is not only the pacification of the countryside, but to use a cliche which has been used so much in connection with Vietnam, the job of winning, or winning back, the hearts and minds of the people of South Vietnam, who were so badly alienated by the activities of dictator Diem and those who followed him in the government of South Vietnam.

I would make the point, on the basis of the hearings of the Armed Services Committee, that there is precious little terrain where the pacification and economic and social justice program can take effect, because there is so little of the land we really control, and that as to the population where the program can be carried out we are dealing, to a large extent, with homeless refugees and people in cities who, in many ways, are far more in need of economic aid than the peasants in the hamlets and villages.

So I would say, in summary, that because of our lack of control over the terrain and the population, and because of the sagging condition of the South Vietnamese economy, there is not much prospect that, in the immediate foreseeable future, we will be able to make much progress in our economic and social aid program to South Vietnam.

I turn now to the military situation. There was developed at the hearings before the Armed Services Committee the fact that the total number of effectives of those who were enlisted under the banner of the Saigon government was 630,000. This quite large number includes the local police. It includes the militia. It includes several hundred thousand military personnel who are not of the highest caliber in terms of their effectiveness, or, indeed, of their fighting capacity.

South Vietnam put on a serious drive last year to increase this total of military personnel which would be available to fight the Vietcong, and it had modest success. So the figure I have given is up by several tens of thousands over what it was a year ago.

It was said yesterday by the able chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. RUSSELL] that, in his judgment, perhaps two or three more divisions of South Vietnamese could be drafted or recruited and trained and put into the military services. Most of these would come from cities.

Without questioning the judgment of the Senator from Georgia, I would have grave doubts as to whether a substantial additional number of South Vietnamese who are not already in the armed services could be made into effective fighting forces.

I think we would be wise to realize that the present effective strength of the South Vietnamese is about as high as it can become in the foreseeable future.

It must be pointed out that the desertions of South Vietnamese have been extraordinarily high. While the rate stated in the hearings was deleted for security reasons, the figure has been published by the press, and there was no denial by the administration. It was stated the gross number was 113,000 South Vietnamese who had deserted. It should be pointed out that these are not defections, in that they did not go to the Vietcong. They merely sneaked away from their units, went back home or to the farm, or merely disappeared. Nevertheless, 113,000 desertions out of a total of 630,000 must, by any standard, be rated high.

The fact is that not long ago the South Vietnamese Army was very much demoralized. As the chairman of the committee [Mr. RUSSELL] said yesterday, if we had not gone in with a massive commitment of some 200,000-plus American soldiers, in his judgment, the South Vietnamese would not have been able to fight off the Vietcong for more than another month.

Whether this is true, I have no way of knowing, but I have a great respect for the judgment of the Senator from Georgia.

So the South Vietnamese forces are still struggling under the impact of an almost catastrophic defeat.

While I hope that their effectiveness will improve in the months and years ahead, I for one will not be too confident that they could fight by themselves with effectiveness. I read recently in the papers of an incident involving the camp at Ashau, which was overrun, and helicopters were being used to take them out. There were wounded there who should have been removed, but they had to resort to shooting at their own men in order to carry out an evacuation in an orderly manner. That may be only an incident, but I think it illustrates that we cannot rely too strongly on the South Vietnamese being able to reconquer that part of their country which they have lost and to subdue the Vietcong.

As I said earlier, there are 300,000 American personnel committed to the war in South Vietnam. This includes Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Air Force personnel.

When this bill is passed there will be authority and there will be money to increase the overall size of our Armed Forces by 452,000 men.

I endeavored to find out yesterday from Senators on the Armed Services Committee what portion of those 452,000 men it was contemplated would be committed to Vietnam. They said they had been entirely unable to get any sort of figure from the Secretary or the Joint Chiefs.

I can understand this because the policy is to give General Westmoreland what he wants, and General Westmoreland has not indicated and perhaps cannot indicate how many more troops he will require.

It is true that of this new 452,000, probably none of them would go to Vietnam. The existing well-trained divisions in this country, possibly Germany, and possibly elsewhere would be shifted to South Vietnam either in cadres or units, and the newly recruited men would be used as fillers for those units which are presently outside South Vietnam.

I, therefore, note that almost a million men are now committed to South Vietnam, if we add our allies and the South Vietnamese to our own forces; there is a possibility, which this bill would allow, of sending several hundred thousand additional American troops to South Vietnam; and there is not much chance that the South Vietnamese troops will be increased.

There is also the possibility that some of our allies will be less reluctant than they were in the past to increase their forces. We know that Australia is sending a few more men, Korea another division, and the Philippines may send a unit or two. But I do not believe that we can look forward with much confidence to augmentation of forces of our allies in South Vietnam.

I turn now to the military situation with respect to the Vietcong. I note that on page 62 of the hearings the Secretary of Defense indicated that the Vietcong army was in the neighborhood of 235,000 strong. The same testimony appears at page 144, where it is reiterated. To this should be added some 15,000 PAVN or regular North Vietnamese troops, making the total effective force about 250,000.

To me, the interesting thing about this figure of 235,000 for the Vietcong is that it is more than twice the effective strength of the Vietcong forces a little over a year ago. At that time our estimate of the total Vietcong effectives was 103,000. It has now gone up to 235,000.

It is not much of an exercise in primitive mathematics to take that 103,000 of a year ago, deduct casualties, deduct defections, of which there are some, add

the infiltration from the north, which is reported by the Secretary of Defense at about 20,000 last year, and conclude at the end of that exercise that they did not have as many Vietcong as they had at the end of the year. So where have all of these other people—more than 100,000—come from?

It is very clear to me that they come from South Vietnam. In fact, the Secretary of Defense testified that 80 percent of the Vietcong force are South Vietnamese, either individuals who were born in South Vietnam or who have moved down there.

I can see no other logical explanation for this huge increase in the Vietcong force over last year except that this is a civil war. If it is not a civil war why should individuals from South Vietnam take up arms against their legitimate government?

To me, this, in and of itself establishes the fact that the Secretary of Defense is not entirely correct when he keeps reiterating that this is not a civil war. In my judgment this is clearly a civil war.

How about Hanoi? That is a good question. There is not a shadow of a doubt that Hanoi is strongly supporting the Vietcong, not only with technical assistance, not only with platoon and company commanders, but with military supplies, and with at least 15,000 of their own crack troops.

But we, on the other hand, are helping our South Vietnamese allies with 300,000 troops, so that it occurs to me to say that regardless of the assistance given by Hanoi, which is countervailed to a much larger extent by us, one cannot say this is anything but a civil war.

I recall that the able Senator from Georgia, whom I see on the floor of the Senate, stated in colloquy yesterday that in his judgment in many respects this was a civil war. I think I quote the Senator correctly.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I think I said it has many aspects of a civil war.

Mr. CLARK. Yes. It has many aspects of civil war. Substitute the word "aspects" for the word "respects."

If this is a civil war I suggest we should analyze, as best we can, how we can bring it to an end. I shall do that in a moment or two.

First, I would like to move to my fourth point with respect to what our immediate objective is in South Vietnam. That objective has been stated many times by the Secretary of State and also by the President, but I found no better statement of it than the statement by General Wheeler which appears at page 116 of the hearings, and by Secretary McNamara at page 120.

General Wheeler said:

> We have been proceeding, as Secretary McNamara outlined earlier, on the basis of a limited political objective laid down by President Johnson; namely, that the object is to cause the Vietcong and primarily Hanoi to cease and desist their aggression in South Vietnam.

Then Secretary McNamara said, as appears on page 120 of the hearings:

> Or to put it another way, it is our policy to achieve our limited objective that I referred to a few minutes ago with the fewest personnel losses possible.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I wonder if the Senator would agree that the best way to achieve our objective, if at all possible, would be at the negotiating table?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, indeed.

Mr. CHURCH. Is not this also the stated purpose of the President, as the Senator from Pennsylvania understands it?

Mr. CLARK. It is, indeed. It is also the objective of the Secretary of State, although I do not think he has exhausted every possibility to get to the negotiating table.

Mr. CHURCH. It is this aspect of the situation that puzzles me. As the Senator from Pennsylvania well knows, the position of the Secretary of State seems to be that, although we would welcome Hanoi to the negotiating table, we are prepared to deal with the Vietcong only if their representatives come as a part of the Hanoi delegation—that is to say, as agents of Hanoi. This means, does it not, that we impose a condition upon the Hanoi government; for if the Vietcong were to come as members of the Hanoi delegation, then, in effect, Hanoi would be conceding that the Vietcong have no independence whatever, a status we assign to them, but one which Hanoi has consistently denied?

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator from Idaho will permit an interjection, I do not believe it is the case. I think his position is very unwise if his objective is—and I have no reason to question his sincerity—that we would like to end this war by negotiation. I think there is a grave doubt that Hanoi completely dominates the Vietcong; but this is the position that the Secretary of State has taken for some time. I hope that some day in the near future he will be willing, because he is a splendid, mature gentleman, to revise his estimate in light of the figures I have given in this speech.

Mr. CHURCH. Let us assume, for the purpose of the discussion, that the Secretary of State is correct in his assessment of the situation. Does not this still leave the question of whether it serves the American interest to demand that Hanoi concede it, as an admission price for coming to the negotiating table?

Mr. CLARK. I entirely agree.

Mr. CHURCH. I, for one, have never received a satisfactory answer to this question, even though every highly placed spokesmen in the administration have acknowledged that, in effect, our position does require Hanoi to admit precisely that which Ho Chi Minh has thus far been determined not to admit; namely, that the Vietcong are agents of Hanoi. If our requirement served some American purpose, I would not hesitate to endorse it; but I fail to see—and no one has yet supplied me with a satisfactory answer—what possible purpose it serves.

Mr. CLARK. In my opinion, the position of the Secretary of State in this regard—of not being willing to talk to the group which is fighting Americans—is as unsound in its concept as is the countervailing position of Ho Chi Minh, which is that the National Liberation Front must be recognized as the sole government of South Vietnam, an obviously incredible position to ask us to accept.

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, with that I fully agree. But, again, I emphasize that the record simply furnishes no answers to the question I have raised. Sometimes to be sure, spokesmen for the administration have emphasized that the Vietcong are assassins——

Mr. CLARK. So were the North Koreans.

Mr. CHURCH. And that their terrorism has been reprehensible. This is plainly true; but then, certainly, the Hanoi government is subject to the same indictment. They, too, have been assassins, and their tactics have been equally reprehensible. Yet we hold to the position that we will deal with Hanoi, but with the Vietcong only if they come as a part of the Hanoi delegation, as confessed agents of the Hanoi government.

I should think that, since our purpose is to reach the bargaining table, we ought to remove from our path those obstacles that clearly constitute impediments.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree with the Senator. Yesterday in the debate a point was made that we do not know who the Vietcong leaders are. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], in an excellent speech that he made toward the close of the day, and in response to a question from me, pointed out, as appears on pages 6415 and 6416 of the RECORD, that we know very well who the leaders of the Vietcong are. We know that they have so-called diplomatic missions established in a half dozen European and African capitals.

We have had advice right inside the Committee on Foreign Relations, in an informal way, to be sure—I did not attend the session and was not aware of this until the Senator from Arkansas brought it up yesterday—that the names of the Vietcong leaders are well known all over South Vietnam. So I completely agree with the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I have in my hand an interview of Prof. Bernard B. Fall, which was published in the Christian Science Monitor of March 14, 1966. Professor Fall is one of leading authorities on Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator from Idaho will permit an interjection, Professor Fall is also the same gentleman who told the Committee on Foreign Relations the names of the Vietcong leaders.

Mr. CHURCH. I noticed a comment by Professor Fall on the question that we have been discussing. It reads as follows:

> On the other hand, to go on saying that the Vietcong doesn't exist and to force Hanoi in advance to speak for it in one form or another, is begging the question. In 1954, the United States did not object to the presence at first of some pretty phantom-like "Pathet-Lao" and "Free Khmer" (Cambodian) delegations. As the conference settled down to some serious bargaining, those

delegations dropped out by mutual consent and the Laotian and Cambodian cease-fire accords were signed, for the Communist side, by North Vietnam.

As long as those various "unconditional" offers to talk peace contain the advance condition to drop one of the participants under the table—and the Vietcong has 200,000-southerners under its control and not 3,000 to 4,000 troops, like the Pathet-Lao—there is very little chance of getting anywhere at all, except into a bigger war.

I wonder if the Senator from Pennsylvania would be good enough to give me his own appraisal of this statement by Professor Fall.

Mr. CLARK. I am completely in accord with it. As the Senator knows, it is pretty close to the position taken before the Committee on Foreign Relations by General Gavin, and former Ambassador Kennan; and now I note another distinguished American soldier, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, has taken pretty much the same position in an article appearing in Look magazine, entitled "Pull Out, All Out, or Stand Fast in Vietnam."

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this 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:

PULL OUT, ALL OUT, OR STAND FAST IN VIETNAM?

One of our most deeply embedded traditions asserts the supremacy of the civilian authority over the military. It follows that the only justification for a military policy is to support and execute the policies decided by our civilian authorities. Military effort must always be so closely tied to the political objective that at no time do we risk a mushrooming, unlimited war, while the political goal remains definitely restricted.

What troubles many good citizens, people who support the President as I do, is exactly where the balance lies between our military and our political objectives in Vietnam, and whether, in fact, the military effort may soon be dominant, if, indeed, it is not already so.

The cry of "Why are we in Vietnam?" echoes two of the questions I heard from soldiers and civilians in December 1950, when I took command of a defeated and dispirited army. "Why are we in Korea?" and "What are we fighting for?" were the queries then. As the new commander intent on rebuilding confidence and the offensive spirit, I had to answer.

I told our troops that we were in Korea because we had been ordered there by properly constituted authorities. The loyalty that we gave and expected barred any questioning of those decisions. As to what we were fighting for, my answer was essentially this: "The real issues are whether Western civilization shall defy and defeat communism. This has long ceased to be a fight for freedom of our Korean allies alone. It has become a fight for our own survival in an honorable, independent national existence."

Today, in Vietnam, I think questions like these are rarely asked. Our combat forces seem to have a better understanding of why they are fighting than do many people at home. The soldiers draw no parallel with the Korean war, for many of them hardly recall that conflict. They know that we are using armed force to repel an armed aggression that seeks to impose Communist control over people who reject that tyranny. In Korea, our obligation was a moral one. In Vietnam, we have a treaty obligation: The Southeast Asia Treaty of 1954 and its protocol commit us to help with armed force when a nation in the treaty area asks for our aid, as South Vietnam has done.

It should be perfectly clear, then, that the President has but one basic course to pursue. He must honor our treaty commitment while concurrently making an intensive effort to find some honorable and acceptable solution. He must also enlist the greatest possible support—diplomatic, economic and military—from the greatest possible number of nations, to bring the fighting to an end and to lessen the danger of drift into a catastrophe of unimaginable proportions.

Currently, a great deal of loose talk in the United States tends to increase the probability that our military effort will become divorced from the political objective and we will stray toward nuclear disaster. When presumably responsible citizens urge upon the Nation, "Let's get it over with now. Let's plaster Vietnam and China too," or "Let's bomb North Vietnam back into the stone age," the danger of our losing all sight of our political objective becomes very real. These hardy folk, who, like Omar Khayyam, are ready to "take the cash and let the credit go, nor heed the rumble of a distant drum," would be talking sense only if our political objective were unlimited—the imposition of a Pax Americana upon the entire world—and if we confessed no national morality whatever.

We cannot ignore this moral question. Otherwise, we retreat overnight to the jungle from which the human race took millennia to crawl. The civilian authorities themselves bear much responsibility for the widespread confusion among well-meaning people over the military situation and our political objectives. Within the past 2 years, pronouncements on our military efforts by highly placed authorities have ranged from rosy euphoria to grim forboding. As for our political aims, we have been chided for not grasping "the simplicity of our basic objectives" in Vietnam. Yet we have been given numerous definitions of those objectives: to contain communism; to halt aggression; to prove to Communist leaders that aggression cannot be made to pay off; to support "the right of a people to choose their own government"; to help the South Vietnamese realize their desire to "live in the way they prefer"; and to assist a helpless people "to advance toward economic prosperity and social improvement." As recently as December 7, 1965, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT called for the negotiation of "an honorable compromise." On the same day, Secretary of State Dean Rusk was quoted: "There is no room for compromise" on Vietnam.

Our military objective has been frequently and beguilingly described as "victory." This word always rings gladly on American ears. What American does not want to win any fight he gets into? It is a deeply ingrained national trait to go all out for victory, using whatever force we possess. There is, we are told, and we foolishly agree, "no substitute for victory." But we are not dealing with a lawsuit, a prize fight or a football game. We live in a world very unlike the one we were raised in. We have a potential for wholesale destruction so indescribably vast that many words, including "victory" lose their meaning. It would hardly be counted a "victory" if one football team were to defeat another through the use of knives; neither would we savor triumph in "victory" that would reduce three-fourths of the civilized world to rubble.

With no clear-cut limit upon our immediate military objective, we commit ourselves to an upward-spiraling course that may approach annihilation. If we decide to employ whatever force is needed (and no one is wise enough to estimate now how much that will be) to achieve victory in Vietnam, do we double, then triple, then quadruple our ground forces? And if victory even then eludes us, do we extend the war to wider and wider arenas? And if we still fail to eliminate all resistance, do we then use nuclear weapons?

We cannot thus engage to achieve victory at whatever cost unless we have already announced an unlimited political objective: i.e., the complete subjection of the outside world to American domination. And I cannot see in the current situation anything to justify the setting up of so rash a goal as that. But if, in the light of their greater knowledge of the situation, our highest civilian authorities believe that something like this should be our goal, then the public should be told immediately. If our policymakers do not believe in aiming for such a goal, and there is certainly no indication that they do, then a halt should be called soon to control our military buildup.

In my opinion, it is the immediate duty of our civilian authorities to define more precisely and pragmatically just what is our political goal—assuming it is something less than global defeat of all resisting forces. At the very least, we should have what Senator KARL MUNDT called for recently in a TV debate moderated by Eric Sevareid: "A declaration of policy from the White House to the Senate, where that policy can then be debated." With that objective precisely fixed, the size of the military effort needed to attain it could be clearly determined. With our aims loosely described only as "freedom for the people to choose their way of life" or as "standing up to communism," we have drifted from a point where we were told, a scant 2 years ago, that our military task would be largely accomplished and our troops withdrawn by December 1965, to a point where the faint outline of a half-million troop commitment becomes a distinct possibility. And even that commitment is not offered as a final limit. The situation remains, to use Senator MIKE MANSFIELD'S apt phrase, "open ended," and we have made, to date, I believe, an unconvincing argument to our people that our goals lie within the zone of vital national interest that cannot be compromised. The falling-domino theory—if Vietnam falls, then Laos, Thailand, and all south Asia will collapse—is a theory I have never accepted. Like many other premises upon which people tend to rest their position, it is deserving of more searching analysis than it generally gets.

I am fully aware that I am speaking in generalities. Whatever course I propose or whatever action I oppose, I still cannot deal in specifics. The plain truth is that no individual, outside of the top levels of Government has, or should have, access to enough inside information to do otherwise. I have no private sources of top-level intelligence and no access to top-level military plans. Yet the proper functioning of a democracy demands that the conscientious citizen speak his carefully considered views. Only then can patriotic and competent officials, civilian and military, who bear the ultimate responsibility for decisions, find the guidance they must have. The recent hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee served an admirable purpose in stimulating public thought and discussion of one of the most difficult problems this country has had to face.

Many of those who have thoughtfully endorsed a widening or an intensifying of the war have spoken, I believe, from the conviction that they have been applying the lessons learned in Korea. Lessons can be learned from Korea. But there are far more dissimilarities between the two actions than there are parallels. In South Korea, we had a workable government, led by a fiercely patriotic and powerful civilian leader whose opposition to communism was widely known and who held the allegiance of the majority

of his people. We acted in concert with many nations and had been deputized by the United Nations to repel the aggressor in its name.

Relatively little terrorist activity occurred in South Korea. United Nations personnel rode in open jeeps throughout our zones without ever drawing an assassin's fire. Our power easily contained guerrilla activity, even though our forces were neither as well-equipped nor as mobile as they are in Vietnam. A unified military command kept both United States and ROK Armies under the direct control of the U.S. commander. In short, our line of battle was well-defined, the enemy clearly identifiable, and the political divisions were sharp.

None of these conditions holds for Vietnam today. Yet we do have a "right" to be there, for our treaty obligation is clear and specific. I think we should take care, however, not to misread history in an effort to justify unlimited military effort. Most people will agree that we face confused, complex, and unpredictable situations. Most people will agree that each contains potential perils of great and undetermined extent.

Confronted with such circumstances, would we not be wise to avoid further dispersion of our already overextended resources? Would it not be sound judgment to husband our strength and to refuse further far-flung commitments in an "open-ended situation" until we can discern more clearly the shape of things to come?

Again, we hear talk of "sanctuaries." Yet the bombing of sanctuaries never turns out to be a simple matter. During the Korean war, the Manchurian bases, the so-called sanctuary, were indeed wide open to attack from the air. We deliberately refrained from bombing them, as we refrained from taking out the vulnerable Yalu bridges. The advisability of carrying this war over the border into Manchuria in this manner was considered in the highest councils of our Nation. The decision not to bomb the sanctuary was made for reasons that seemed then, and still seem, wise to me. Had we attacked mainland China through air raids we would have unleased a war of unknowable dimensions. Not one of our major allies would have approved this adventure, and the coalition formed to stop Communist agression would have dissolved. Furthermore, our "shoestring" air force (this was Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg's own description) would have dwindled, through combat losses and natural attrition, to a shadow. We would have been left without power to honor the many IOU's we had extended on a worldwide basis. The time then required to rebuild sufficient strength to honor our obligations would have been 2 years.

Nor should it be forgotten that the United Nations forces had their own sanctuary during the Korean conflict, just as we have one now in South Vietnam. Both China and the United States operated under self-imposed limitations as to the bombing of hostile bases. The Chinese air force in Manchuria and other nearby bases was strong enough to have done us major damage, not only in South Korea, but in Japan. Similarly, Red China now may possess the power to destroy Saigon and inflict heavy damage on our South Vietnam port facilities in one swift strike should we carry our air attack close to her own vitals.

China has the strength, too, to reopen the Korean front. Should we, in that instance, oppose her there, or should we withdraw to more defensible positions to the south and east, an unthinkable abandonment of our Korean allies? An attack upon mainland China might well bring Soviet Russia into the fray, with Western Europe open to immediate invasion. Where do we draw our line of defense then, and what weapons do we use? And where do we concentrate our strength?

These questions suggest the immensity of the problem the President and his advisers now wrestle with. Those men in public life who urge prompt and unlimited escalation of the war are neither diminishing the problem nor strengthening the President's arm. They only make it even more difficult for the President to steer the Nation on that careful course between duty and disaster.

And those who call for immediate disengagement from Vietnam, as if it had all been a mistake, likewise make the President's path more difficult. We cannot escape now from the obligations we took upon ourselves when we first pledged out word to the South Vietnamese. One lesson to be drawn from Korea is that we cannot pull out of a sticky situation without regard for those who have fought at our side.

During the Korean war, soon after the Chinese launched their New Year's offensive in January 1951, serious thought was given in Washington to our abandoning the peninsula and pulling our forces back to Japan. (I opposed this strongly.) It quickly became clear that such a withdrawal would require the evacuation of a least a million South Koreans, those who had been our battlefield allies or had worked with us since the invasion. To have left them to the vengeance of the Communists would have been an infamous betrayal.

We are under similar obligation in Vietnam not to abandon the hundreds of thousands who have been our allies there. We cannot pick up and run home without making extensive and permanent provision for all the Vietnamese who have supported our arms. A concept like the one discussed by Gen. James Gavin, for holding fast to our defensive enclaves, would enable us to fulfill our obligation to our Vietnamese allies, before committing ourselves to unlimited military effort, while we continue to seek an honorable solution.

Korea also taught that it is impossible to interdict the supply routes of an Asian army by airpower alone. We had complete air mastery over North Korea, and we clobbered Chinese supply columns unmercifully. Unquestionably, we inflicted serious damage upon the Chinese and greatly complicated their problems of reinforcement and supply. But we did not halt their offensive nor materially diminish its strength. The Chinese, like the Vietnamese, traveled light, with each man carrying his ammunition, his food, and his weapon on his back. They moved at night or on hidden footpaths and goat tracks, immune from air attack. And where we did find their concentrations and strike them, we still could not force them off the disputed ground. In Korea, I saw whole sections of railroad bombed into scrap iron by aircraft, and yet the enemy rebuilt the tracks in a single night, and the trains ran the next day. After the Chinese repulsed the ill-fated advances to the Yalu, Gen. Douglas MacArthur himself expressed disillusionment with the value of tactical airpower. It could not isolate the battlefield, he said, and its effectiveness had been greatly overrated. It is easy for the civilian mind to be seduced with talk of "easy" conquest through airpower. But the crucial battles are still won by foot soldiers.

There is yet another lesson etched by our experience in Korea: It is folly to base military strategy upon our interpretation of enemy intentions. As our forces pushed toward the Yalu in the Home by Christmas offensive of November-December 1950, the high command assured all doubters that the Chinese had no intention of intervening in force because the psychological moment for this had passed, because "no commander in his right mind" would send his forces across the Yalu at this season and because of various other reasons understood only by those who had made a study of the Oriental mind. We knew, however, that the Chinese were capable of dealing us a mighty blow along the Manchurian border, where our forces would be strung out almost haphazardly, without mutual support between commands and without supplies enough to sustain more than a light engagement. We knew that close to a hundred thousand well-disciplined and well-armed Chinese troops were mobilized on the other side of the river. We knew that Chinese volunteers had already appeared in force south of the Yalu, for we had suffered severe attacks from them and had taken prisoners from units known to be in the Chinese order of battle.

Yet, despite this intelligence, we hurried forward in pursuit style, our forces thoroughly dispersed and improperly clothed for fighting in subzero temperature. We knew the Chinese were bluffing, and we knew they would never commit more than a token force of volunteers. We abandoned elemental prudence. Instead of being guided by enemy capability, we divined the enemy intentions. The mistake cost us very dearly in American lives and took us close to disaster. It might be pointed out, too, that MacArthur's earlier brilliant coup at Inchon, where he cut the enemy's lifeline in one spectacular and surprising strike, succeeded in large part because of his stated reliance on the enemy's assumption that no commander would risk the monstrous tides, the tortuous channel and the 2-mile mud flats outside Inchon harbor. Custer likewise knew that the Indians would not attack at Little Bighorn. And the French knew that Wolfe would never be fool enough to try to scale that precipice guarding Quebec.

We should be wary of experts who feel they can correctly interpret Chinese intentions and can predict how they will react to any move of ours. We know what the Chinese are capable of in southeast Asia. This is the knowledge that should guide us in appraising our strategy.

The one final important lesson we can draw from what happened in Korea is that we cannot enter into agreements with the Communists unless we have iron-clad sanctions, underwritten by the world's major powers, including, if possible, the Soviet Union. Vietnam, as Senator JOSEPH CLARK pointed out in that TV debate I referred to previously, is only an incident. The major threat to our security and our way of life still comes from Red China and the Soviet Union. It is with our eye upon them that we must plan our global strategy. To do that calls for the best minds we can assemble in far-sighted statesmanship and creative thinking.

Finally, I want to put proper emphasis on one aspect of the whole military and political problem that tends too often to be either minimized or ignored—that is the moral factor. In June, 1955, when I was chief of staff of the Army, I had occasion to address a letter to the Secretary of Defense regarding the military defense of the United States. My conviction, pressed in that letter, remains unaltered:

"Just as the ultimate and most deadly threat of communism is the destruction of the religious and moral principles which * * * have guided man to new heights of dignity and self-respect * * * so also do we find the same threat in the increasingly significant ignoring by our planners of the consequences of omitting the moral factor in considering the use of the immense destructive capability which now exists in the world."

It is my firm belief that there is nothing in the present situation or in our code that requires us to bomb a small Asian nation "back into the stone age." While we should be prepared to pay any price in order to live

up to our obligations, there must be some moral limit to the means we use to achieve victory. A victory that would require the wholesale devastation of a country by nuclear arms because it would not yield to conventional force would be the ultimate in immorality.

GENERAL RIDGWAY'S NINE POINTS FOR VIETNAM

1. We should emphatically reject the two extreme courses—"Pullout" or "All-out war"—that have been advocated by certain groups.

2. We should give our full support to the President's determined efforts to fulfill our treaty obligations and to honor our pledges, while at the same time seeking an honorable solution of the basically political problem in Vietnam.

3. With due regard for diplomatic secrecy, our Government should spell out, more specifically and pragmatically, our immediate and long-range political objectives, firmly rejecting any unlimited political objective that might entail unlimited military effort.

4. We should also reject any political involvement that might gradually commit us to military efforts that would jeopardize our basic security and those vital American interests that cannot be compromised.

5. Once having announced our political objectives within the framework stated above, we should then employ whatever force is needed to attain them.

6. We should categorically reject "preventive" war, employing nuclear weapons, the use of which would be, in my opinion, a deliberate move down the road of international immorality past the point of no return.

7. We should enter into formal agreements with the Communist leaders of southeast Asia only after establishment of enforcible sanctions to guarantee the permanent protection of the South Vietnamese people.

8. We should sign no instrument with those leaders without prior agreement in good faith among a group of nations, including, if possible, the Soviet Union, to join in fairly sharing the task of applying proper sanctions.

9. We should repose complete confidence in the capability of our military leaders in southeast Asia to accomplish any mission they may be assigned, for these men are among the best that our Nation has produced.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, with regard to including the Vietcong at the bargaining table, I associate myself with the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. In demanding that they come only as agents of Hanoi, it seems to me that we interject a needless impediment to whatever prospect there may be for negotiations.

It is realistic to recognize that the Vietcong are the principal fighting force with which we contend in South Vietnam, and therefore to continue an attempt to exclude them from the negotiating table appears to be an unnecessary and unwise policy.

Mr. CLARK. I wonder if the Senator from Idaho would agree with me that talking to the Vietcong is our best chance at the moment of getting to the negotiating table and achieving peace. And the reason I say that, before my friend answers, is that, as I analyze the situation, Peiping is not going to want to talk about negotiations. They are only too content to have us fight to the last American and to the last Vietnamese. Hanoi appears to be quite intransigent at the moment. At least one belligerent statement follows another.

We had hoped for a while that the Russians would help us, but they will not.

The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] thought that the United Nations would be a place to settle this dispute. However, the United Nations seems to be to a large extent immobilized because of peculiar conditions within the United Nations with which the Senator from Idaho is familiar.

The International Control Commission, consisting of Poland, India, and Canada, seems to be unable to enter into the picture with any hope of success.

Russia has steadfastly refused to join with Great Britain as cochairman of the Geneva Conference for the purpose of calling that Conference back into being.

The only hope I see of getting negotiations started is for us to reverse our policy of not being willing to talk to the Vietcong and at the same time to single them out and impose upon them our greatest possible military strength in an effort to persuade them that never, never, never are we going to be thrown out, and that never, never, never will we get out unless and until we achieve a peaceful South Vietnam, which does not necessarily mean keeping the Ky government in charge of the future of that country.

Mr. CHURCH. I agree. And it is for the latter reasons that I shall vote for the pending measure.

I think, given the existing circumstances, that Congress must not only support the American fighting men who are now in the field, but we must also make it plain to Hanoi that we will not permit ourselves to be forced from South Vietnam under the military pressure of the Vietcong.

However, I agree with the Senator that we should at least experiment with the possibility of reaching the negotiating table through the process of initial dealings among the Vietnamese themselves. If, for example, preliminary talks between representatives from Saigon and representatives of the Vietcong were to get under way, then it is quite possible that Hanoi would feel free to come in and strongly support the Vietcong spokesmen in the bargaining position they take, while we would be free to come in and give equally strong support to the Saigon representatives in the position that they take. This approach might prove to have a catalytic effect, opening the way to a general international conference of the kind that will doubtless be necessary if satisfactory political settlement is to be reached.

Mr. CLARK. The position of the Senator is completely logical, and I am in accord with it. However, I point out to him the grave difficulty of getting the present Saigon government into the frame of mind in which it would be willing to negotiate or even participate in negotiations with the Vietcong.

The belligerent statements coming out of Saigon are equaled only by the belligerent statements coming out of Hanoi. I would be fearful that, unless we can get in South Vietnam some civilian government composed of more mature and farsighted individuals representing the Saigon government, we would have little luck along the lines advocated by the Senator.

I point out to the Senator that in the end we have the power, because that government could not last a month if we were to withdraw. This might be power that we would be reluctant to use, but I think that, through Ambassador Lodge, Secretary Rusk, and our own diplomatic establishment, this is an end for which we should press.

Mr. CHURCH. I agree. I concede that there are great difficulties in the way of progress in this direction. However, I reiterate that I do not think our own policy should preclude this course of action to the United States, but that, on the contrary, our own position should be such as to encourage this development in every way that we possibly can.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his very helpful interjection.

I find myself completely in accord with his views. As a result of my colloquy with the Senator from Idaho, I have pretty well covered my fourth point, which was our immediate objective in South Vietnam, and my fifth point, which was to discuss our ultimate objective, which, I take it, is to settle the war in South Vietnam as quickly as we can with honor, and to leave a country which will have some chance of developing its own future through free elections.

The people of South Vietnam, who have been at war for well over 25 years now, from the time of the Japanese invasion, would be enabled to start up the long, hard road which confronts them in turning their country, or at least that area—whether it is a country or not is somewhat dubious—into a peaceful place in which men, women, and children would have some chance of leading the good life.

My sixth point, which is closely akin to my fifth one, concerning our ultimate objective, is that we should get back to the island barrier which, in my opinion, we should never have left.

The island barrier, of course, starts at Japan, and runs through Okinawa, Taiwan, the Philippines, and now, thank goodness, Indonesia, Borneo, Malaysia, Australia, and New Zealand. I add Malaysia, because although it is a peninsula, it is in many ways an island, certainly around Singapore.

Before World War II, who would have thought that the United States of America would have a permanent foreign policy of maintaining troops on the land mass of southeast Asia? Who would have thought that we would have had an island barrier? The limit of our ambition was to operate diplomatically across the Pacific, from Honolulu, to the island of Guam. It was almost a phobia with us. But we now suggest that we are an Asiatic power. That seems to me to be entirely unwise. The two most unwise things about it are, first, that we seem to believe that white men, fighting on the land mass of Asia, can change the hearts and minds of the people of

that area to the direction in which we would like to see them go.

The second fallacy, as I see it, is that the inevitable result is a constantly increasing escalation of American casualties, in a war whose result is far from sure, and which in my opinion will in all likelihood end in a stalemate; whereas, if we base our forces on the island barrier, we have not only our diplomatic potential, but we also have our airpower and our seapower. In my opinion, the combination of diplomacy, airpower, and seapower gives us as much overall power as is needed to assure, to the extent that our national security requires it—and that, in my opinion, is not much of an extent—that American interests in that part of the world are adequately protected.

I turn now to my seventh point, which is that if we can get into communication with the Vietcong, who then can bring to the conference table the other interested parties to a settlement, it should be possible to achieve a reasonable settlement in South Vietnam, which will enable us to depart with honor in due course.

Yesterday the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and I had a discussion on the floor as to what if anything was the difference between honor and saving face. Senator FULBRIGHT thought there was very little. I happen to think there is quite a good deal, because a mere effort to save the face of our military leaders or of our State Department, to me, is not an adequate reason for continuing the slaughter of American boys.

On the other hand, it is clear to me that we cannot scuttle and run and leave the people of South Vietnam to be taken over by Communist Hanoi and Peiping, but we do have an obligation to see that the shooting stops, the country is pacified, and a reasonable chance is given for those people, as I said earlier, to live out their lives as they wish.

That will, of course, call for an interim government, from which I do not believe we can foreclose other interested parties. It should call for free elections—although I point out that free elections are hardly a normal part of the institutional history of the South Vietnamese. It will raise the question as to whether there shall be two Vietnams, or only one. It will raise a host of other questions, including to what extent international forces should be brought in to supervise the pacification of the country.

But in my opinion, it is premature to discuss all of those subjects now. We do not wish to tip our hand before we go to the negotiating table. There is a wide range for flexibility in determining, once we start to talk, just what sort of a settlement, satisfactory to us, can be worked out. We certainly do not want to give our case away before the negotiations begin.

My eighth point, which I shall not dwell upon at length—because it must be obvious to everybody—is the domestic cost of this war. It is sufficient to serve on the Banking and Currency Committee, as does the present occupant of the chair, on the Interior Committee, as does the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], or on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, with its Education Subcommittee and its Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment, as I do, to know full well what is happening to the Great Society program because of the war in Vietnam.

We also know the substantial likelihood, that a substantial tax increase will be required. We are aware of the threat of inflation, as the distinguished occupant of the chair knows so well as a member of the Joint Economic Committee of the House and the Senate. And regardless of what the budget says—and I agree that the present budget does provide a significant amount of money to continue the Great Society programs—we all know education is being cut back, the program of training manpower is being cut back, the program of rebuilding our cities is being almost abandoned, the water and air pollution programs we passed with such gusto last year are being cut back. There is a huge dam in Huntingdon County, Pa., the Raystown Dam, which is put on the shelf because of the economy drive. We are in desperate need for an appropriation to acquire land for the Tocks Island-Delaware Water Gap Recreational Area. That money is not available largely because of the war in Vietnam. Meanwhile, the price of the real estate the Government will have to acquire is mounting and mounting, until in the end, the price will be two or three times what it would have been if we could have moved ahead this year or last year.

But I shall not dwell on the domestic cost, because it must be obvious to everybody.

I come now to my conclusion and my ninth point.

Everything I have said thus far I think may be summarized as follows: It befits a great nation, headed by a great President, to be wise enough and mature enough to acknowledge when a mistake has been made, to cut our losses, to achieve as many of our immediate and ultimate objectives as possible, and to return to a southeast Asia policy which is practical and pragmatic, which will not result in the unnecessary death and wounding of thousands of young Americans and will enable us to move full speed ahead on the Great Society program which has been interrupted, and if not killed at least scotched by the war in South Vietnam.

Mr. President, may I address an inquiry to the distinguished Senator from Georgia?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I shall be happy to undertake to answer any question the Senator wishes to ask.

Mr. CLARK. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered last night, I am obligated, in a few minutes, to yield the floor. I wonder if the Senator from Georgia would be willing to take the floor, and allow me to address one or two inquiries to him, unless there is somebody else who wishes to speak.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I have assured the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] that he would be permitted to have at least 10 minutes on this issue, and I would have to check such an arrangement with him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have, for over 2 years, voiced my opposition to our military intervention in southeast Asia.

When I first voiced my opposition and my plea that the United States cease and desist from its unilateral intrusion into a situation which in nowise menaced our security, it was, in the oft-quoted phrase, "a cloud no bigger than a man's hand."

It would have been relatively easy to achieve an honorable settlement at that time, over 2 years ago. Instead, by move after move, the administration has steadily escalated a minor presence into a major war. Step by step we are getting in deeper and deeper, steadily widening our commitment and modifying our justification with each such step, for each of which its advocates promise results which are not fulfilled.

The premises alleged for our presence have been false from the beginning. We were not asked by a friendly government to come in and help it repel aggression. We asked ourselves in. We are the invaders, the intruders in a civil war.

The Eisenhower administration offered only economic aid and that with conditions that were never fulfilled.

The Kennedy administration, following the bad advice of Secretary McNamara, increased our participation by sending in advisers, to the number of 15,000. But, not until this administration, were our men sent into combat and aggressive warfare waged by American troops.

So we are engaged in a ground war on the continent of Asia which not only President Kennedy, but such outstanding military leaders as Gen. Douglas MacArthur and Gen. Matthew Ridgway warned us against.

When the myth of our having a solemn commitment made by three Presidents was shown to be a myth, the SEATO Treaty was then invoked to justify our armed intervention, but the SEATO Treaty gives us no such right. In the first place, it specifies that only peaceful means shall be used. In the second place, under article 4, which is pointed to for justification, consultation by all the signatories is required before joint action, and then only by the constitutionals means prescribed for each country.

There never was any consultation. There never was any joint agreement. The constitutional means required by us, had these other conditions been fulfilled, would have required a declaration of war by Congress.

In further alleged justification that we are fighting for the freedom and democracy of the South Vietnamese people, we are supporting unworthy puppets who impose themselves by means of coups on the South Vietnamese people. There have been nine of these administrations since Diem's tyrannical performance rendered him useless as our instrument and led to his disposal.

The idea that we will achieve freedom and democracy through these self-imposed characters is farcical. Last year, there were 96,000 desertions from the South Vietnamese Army. Thus, we have to send our boys to die for those who will not fight for their cause. Nor can we blame the South Vietnamese wholly for not fighting for the self-imposed corrupt exploiters of their own people.

Much more can be said to demonstrate the folly and lack of justification for our intervention in that Asiatic area. While we are expending lives and billions of dollars our domestic programs are being drastically curtailed. It will be said that a vote against this mammoth appropriation will be a denial of aid to our boys at the front. On the contrary, it will be a vote of protest against an undeclared Executive war and a vote to end the needless and ever-increasing slaughter of our young boys and of the Vietnamese people.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement with respect to some of the arguments which have been made on the floor of the Senate on the pending bill.

First, a great deal of this discussion has gone rather far afield. We have gone into the areas of philosophies of governments, systems of governments, and matters not really within the purview of the proposed legislation.

I have no particular complaint to make as to that, because I have never thought we should have a rule of relevancy in Senate debate. But, I do observe that there has been practically no discussion of the pending bill; namely, whether the Senate should appropriate the sum of $12,700 million for the support of combat operations of U.S. forces in southeast Asia, and $415 million for economic aid for South Vietnam and other countries.

I wish to clarify the statement made by the Senator from Pennsylvania that I have stated this war has some of the aspects of a civil war.

That is true. Every revolution has some aspects of a civil war, whether directed from outside or inside the country. Indeed, the war between South Vietnam and North Vietnam would, in a certain sense, be a civil war, because both those countries have the same stock of people, they are all related, have the same backgrounds, the same history, the same traditions, and the same religions. But this is not a strictly civil war, despite the fact that General Ky, the head of the South Vietnam Government, was born in North Vietnam. We hear from one source that the head of the Vietcong is a man who calls himself Tran Nam, but many of the captured Vietcong insist that the leader of the Vietcong is actually Lt. Gen. Tran Van Ira, a Deputy Chief of Staff of the North Vietnamese Army and a member of the central committee in the Hanoi party.

I cite this to the Senate to show the absolute impossibility of consummating any proposal that we negotiate directly with the Vietcong in an effort to bring the war to a conclusion. Here, the only man we know of in this faceless group of leaders is a member of the staff of the North Vietnamese army, and directly under the command of Ho Chi Minh.

It is manifestly impossible for the President, however much he might desire to negotiate with anyone, anywhere, at anytime, to undertake to bring this war to a conclusion by negotiating with the Vietcong. Their eyes are fastened on Hanoi. Their ears are attuned to orders from Hanoi. They are directed from Hanoi. They are supplied from Hanoi.

Until Hanoi is willing to participate in peace negotiations, any efforts this country might make would be completely vain, foolish, and unworthy of the dignity of a great power.

We are asked: What are our objectives? Our objectives in South Vietnam have been stated time and again by the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense.

We wish to carry out the commitment of three American Presidents, that the people of South Vietnam will have an opportunity to decide their own destiny.

I assume that that means they are entitled to a free and untrammeled election in the selection of their officials, and in determining the form of government they will have.

That is our objective.

We are all hoping and praying that we will have peace, and that we can bring our men home.

I have been interested in the statement, which has been reiterated here, that we have no business in South Vietnam.

There was a time when I expressed that opinion vigorously. I believed it at that time. But after we got into South Vietnam, I stopped debating the wisdom of whether we should be there or not because, at this time, I can see no point in lengthy discussions of this point.

Mr. President, I do not believe it helps anyone except our enemies. I do not believe that it contributes to the cause of peace. I also do not believe that it contributes to the restoration of order in South Vietnam and the opportunity for those people to select the form of government under which they and their children will live.

We are now in South Vietnam. If it were based on no other premise, I would support the proposed legislation as an obligation which I owe to the more than 300,000 youths of this land who are in South Vietnam, or in the areas and waters contiguous thereto.

To me, Mr. President, it is incomprehensible that anyone would say he was going to bring this war to a conclusion by starving 300,000 Americans to death, or by leaving them naked and unarmed in the face of their enemies who would kill them, and when we know that the enemy is equipped with the latest and most lethal weapons.

I told many Senators about the exhibit of weapons which was on display in the Appropriations Committee during the hearings on the Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1967, weapons which were captured by the 1st Cavalry Division in the battle in the central highlands. The enemy had .50-caliber machineguns, .30-caliber machineguns, and what we call a short burpgun, which, in some respects, are superior to those which our forces are using. They have had every weapon necessary for the kind of war they are waging there.

The only advantage that we have is in control of the air, but with the system of tunnels the enemy has, and the heavy foliage covering thousands of miles of jungle, that air advantage is greatly minimized.

Mr. President, as I see it, we have no alternative but to continue the war with increasing force and power until Hanoi is willing to treat with us, and the other nations who are interested, with the signatories to the Geneva Convention—which, incidentally, we did not sign but later said was acceptable to us—and bring this tragic situation to a conclusion.

Mr. President, there is no question that Hanoi is directing this entire effort.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks an article by Mr. Chalmers M. Roberts, which appeared in the Washington Post of Friday, March 18, discussing an article by George A. Carver, Jr., printed in Foreign Affairs magazine, which is the publication of the Council on Foreign Relations.

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

ARTICLE DETAILS HANOI'S CONTROL OF NATIONAL LIBERATION FRONT

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

The National Liberation Front in South Vietnam is described in an article published today as a contrived political mechanism with no indigenous roots and subject to the ultimate control of the North Vietnamese Communist Party in Hanoi.

The article, by George A. Carver, Jr., appears in the prestigious quarterly, Foreign Affairs, the publication of the Council on Foreign Relations. Carver is described as a "student of political theory and Asian affairs" with degrees from Yale and Oxford. He is currently an officer of the Central Intelligence Agency.

His article details and documents, in effect, the Johnson administration's contention that the National Liberation Front is simply a tool of the Hanoi regime. Carver agrees that while the Vietcong organization is unquestionably a major factor in the South Vietnamese political scene, it has no serious claim to recognition as the sole legitimate voice of the South Vietnamese.

The article concedes that there are unquestionably many non-Communists heroically serving in various components of the National Liberation Front out of a desire to redress genuine grievances or in the honest belief that they are thereby helping to build a better political structure.

Carver traces the history of Ho Chi Minh's Indochinese Communist Party since 1930, the creation of the Vietminh to harass the Japanese and later to seize power in Hanoi and to fight the French.

The National Liberation Front was created in December 1960, with the People's Revolutionary Party (PRP) as its controlling element. On behalf of Hanoi, says Carver, it acts as the southern branch of Ho's Communist Party.

Field control over the Vietcong military units, writes Carver, is held by faceless men of whom few have been identified. The overall commander is almost certainly a man who uses the name Tran Nam, but several

captured Vietcong cadre members insist he is really Lt. Gen. Tran Van Tra, a Deputy Chief of Staff of the North Vietnamese Army and a member of the central committee in the Hanoi Party.

"There is no such thing," the article states, "as a Vietcong military unit of any size independent of the (PRP's) political apparatus or free from tight political control. Probably no more than a third of the Vietcong forces are party members, but by virtue of its organizational mechanism the PRP controls the liberation army in the same way that it controls the National Liberation Front."

The key elements in this control are the more than 50,000 persons infiltrated into the south since the Hanoi Party's 1959 decision "to pursue its objective of political conquest by waging insurgent war." Until late 1963 these infiltrators were mostly southerners who had been regrouped in the north after the 1954 Geneva agreements split the country.

The image-building campaign to win for the National Liberation Front acceptance as an indigenous South Vietnamese political coalition has been aided by missions in numerous non-Communist capitals as well as in Communist nations.

One of the most effective of these representatives has been Huynh Van Tam in Algiers where, says Carver, "he devotes considerable time to cultivating Western newsmen, deceiving some of them about his own political background and the true nature of the organization he represents in a manner reminiscent of [Red China's] Chou En-lai's similar success during the mid-1940's" in China.

Carver's article, because of its detail, is likely to add new weight to the administration's attack on those who suggest that the National Liberation Front should be given an independent place at any negotiating table. In 1955 Carver wrote, also in foreign affairs, a highly regarded article on "The Real Revolution in South Vietnam," a study of that nation's search for "a real national entity."

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I hope we may be able to vote on the bill. There is no doubt in my mind that the Senate will vote overwhelmingly for it, because we are in a situation where Senators must support their own flesh and blood, those who are in the war zone.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may go into executive session to consider a nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Farris Bryant, of Florida, to be Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

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

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION, 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13546) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Georgia would be willing to respond to a series of questions.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, if I am able to give any information that will shed any light on this subject, I shall be pleased to do so.

Mr. CLARK. I refer to page 26 of the hearings. In the report which was submitted to the committee, it is stated that there was no deep-seated resentment or hatred of either the South Vietnamese or Americans because of the bombings. This is a part of the research report that was placed in the record by the Secretary of Defense.

I wonder if the Senator from Georgia knows whether it was an independent research organization that produced this report and who it was.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. It is my understanding that it was the Rand Corp.

Mr. CLARK. Therefore, it is not a CIA report?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. No, it is not a CIA report. It was a report prepared by a researcher for a private corporation.

Mr. CLARK. My understanding is it resulted from interrogation of PAVN and Vietcong prisoners.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That is true. They interrogated a large number of prisoners.

Mr. CLARK. I have been concerned that these bombing attacks and artillery barrages, which of necessity we use in connection with our search and destroy and clearing operations, might have caused some adverse reaction to the Americans among the people of South Vietnam who would come under the bombing attacks or artillery fire, and also, whether this would result in adverse propaganda reaction abroad because of the almost inevitable killing of civilians in the course of these attacks.

I wonder if the Senator or the committee has any information as to the number of civilians killed during any particular period as a result of the bombing and artillery fire of our troops?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. No, I do not believe any witness gave us any number. Unquestionably some civilians were in the villages and have been killed both by air attacks, not only by B–52's but other airplanes, and artillery fire.

However, let me add that our commanding officers in South Vietnam have taken steps so that no village will be bombed or fired upon until the people are notified by loudspeaker from the air of our purpose and intent in order to give all noncombatants an opportunity to leave the village. Even under those circumstances probably some of them have been killed.

As I stated yesterday, any that we killed have been killed accidentally, whereas we know thousands of these people have been killed with premeditated brutality by the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese.

Mr. CLARK. I have no doubt about that.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I think our people have taken almost every precaution possible in the effort to minimize the deaths of civilians. War is a cruel thing. You cannot fight a war without everybody suffering, and the people in the area where the war is being fought will, of course, suffer the most.

I think we have taken about every precaution possible to minimize deaths of the civilians and the innocent. It is undoubtedly having some effect because for the first time now the civilians are showing a willingness to tell us the location of Vietcong units, and to help us avoid the many ambushes into which our forces have stumbled, which is one of the principal causes of battle losses we have suffered.

Mr. CLARK. This would seem to indicate that there has been no permanent alienation of the local people as a result of the bombing or artillery fire.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I would not make that categorical statement. If I were in a village that was bombed, I would be outraged at the moment. I am sure that most human beings would react in the same way.

I think we have tremendously changed the attitude of the civilian population by the extreme measures we use to minimize the suffering of the civilian population.

Mr. CLARK. Which is in striking contrast to that used by the North Vietnamese.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Absolutely.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will turn to page 128 of the hearings, in view of the fact that chemical defoliants have only limited capability against so-called double canopied jungle vegetation and growth, is it fairly clear that we are using these chemical defoliants largely for crop destruction, as we see in the newspapers?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I think it has been used for both purposes, as I recall the testimony. But as I recall it,

we have used them in an effort to locate the many different prongs of the Ho Chi Minh Trail, which is a series of connecting roads. We have on occasion used defoliants to prevent the Vietcong from gathering rice crops that were about to ripen.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator have any idea of the extent to which we used the chemicals in destroying rice or other food supplies?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. No, I am afraid I cannot answer that question. I do not know how many acres are affected. I do not think it is a considerable amount when measured against the total rice production capabilities of South Vietnam.

The Senator knows prior to the war they were a great exporter of rice to the Asiatic world. But now we are exporting rice from Louisiana and Arkansas to help feed them.

Mr. CLARK. What does the Senator think is the principal cause for the decline in rice production; the fact that the fields have been constantly fought over?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I think the fact that the man that planted his crop saw that the odds were 4 out of 5 that he would never be able to gather it for his own use is the major cause. I understand on occasion Government troops have made levies on the rice.

It is difficult to force a man to plant and gather a crop that he is not going to be able to eat or sell himself. That, in the simplest terms, is the condition that exists in vast areas of Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator completely. It occurs to me that using chemicals to destroy crops might well be counter productive on our part on the ground that it would clearly alienate the peasants whose crops are being defoliated, and I wonder whether the denial of the crops destroyed to the Vietcong is worth the psychological impact of alienating the farmers.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am not sure that I recall this from the testimony or conversations I had with members of the staff of General Westmoreland, but it is my recollection that no defoliants have been used on any rice fields where there was any hope whatever that the rice could be harvested by the South Vietnamese. It was used only on areas where there was no possibility of anyone except the Vietcong benefiting from the harvesting of the rice.

I yield to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] who has spent some time in South Vietnam.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Much of this information with respect to defoliation has been classified, but I would say to my friend from Pennsylvania that the primary interest in this particular defoliation is for clearing the jungles, in order that our people know what they are attacking when they attack such targets as the Ho Chi Minh Trail to prevent ammunition, troops, and food from coming down said trail to help the Vietcong in their attacks against us.

Based on testimony received, the control of the use of these defoliants is very tight. I believe the Senator would be satisfied if he obtained the classified testimony, that there has been relatively little of it used for destroying any crops.

The testimony supplied me at this moment by a member of the staff is interesting, but I observe there have been too many deletions to make it useful.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am happy to have the Senator from Missouri confirm what I have said. I said that a small proportion of defoliation had been on crops, and only in instances where we knew that the harvesting of crops would rebound to the benefit of the Vietcong by supplying them with essential food.

It is very true that our position in the war and the mistakes we have made have been magnified all over the world. The news photographers of television networks have been permitted to accompany our people. The tragic pictures of little children who have been wounded, of mothers weeping over their dead, and of those who are binding up their wounds have been transmitted all over the world.

For every one of those instances there have been a dozen instances in which the Vietcong have deliberately done what we have done accidentally, but we have not had the means to present that to the world. That is one of the disadvantages of living in an open society.

Frankly, I think that in some cases the disseminators of news should have been more judicious in the showing of some of these films and in the statements that accompanied the films that indicated that our soldiers were careless and were deliberately killing the civilian population.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree completely with the distinguished Senator from Georgia. One of the tricks the Vietcong has been using is to wait until crops were ready for harvesting, then to go into the fields and cut the men, women, and children to pieces as they were working to bring in the grain.

One of the chief reasons why it has been necessary for the United States to export grain to South Vietnam are the clever ways in which the Vietcong have combined to destroy both the people and the grain when the people have attempted to harvest it. I associate myself with the statement of the Senator from Georgia concerning how little of this story has been told in various films and other media when they have been shown to the American people.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not true that in many instances the Vietcong prefer to extort a tax from the people as a condition to letting them eat or market their grain, as opposed to destroying it?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield, to permit me to reply?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In many places the Vietcong do impose a tax. The tax apparently has been custom. It was one of Ho Chi Minh's customs, when he started his building of communism in Vietnam long ago. It was part of the effect to destroy all the people above a certain economic level by imposing a confiscatory tax in North Vietnam and South Vietnam. In many places, if anybody argued against the tax, he would, in typical Vietcong fashion, be destroyed.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I recall that in many areas the farmers were compelled to abandon their crops to avoid being forced to harvest it, and were thus unable to take it with them. The Vietcong collected the tax and left the civilian population there without any means of support, even though they had harvested the crop. That has had a terrific effect on the production of rice in South Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. To return briefly to the question of chemical warfare, the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Missouri are aware, I know—the Senators have said so—that war is a nasty business. It is not always possible to fight a war according to the Marquis of Queensberry rules. The use of gas by our troops in South Vietnam enabled the Russians to mount a propaganda offensive at the Disarmament Conference in Geneva last week. They spent the better part of a day, together with one or two of their Communist allies, castigating the United States for violating the Geneva Convention in connection with the use of gas and chemical weapons.

It may well be that the use of gas is reasonably humane—at least as humane as shooting the enemy with artillery or dropping bombs on them. It may also be necessary. But I do point out the adverse propaganda effect.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator from Pennsylvania well knows that the Russians are masters of propaganda. They can seize a little, isolated incident, take it out of context, and make it appear to be a terrible crime against humanity. That was what I had in mind when I was discussing the news releases and matters of that kind.

The fact is that there is not a country on earth that is not using this type of gas against its own people. The type of gas we have used against the Vietcong is what is referred to as "tear gas." This type of gas is used by the police forces of every country to restore order when matters get out of hand.

When it was announced that we were using tear gas, naturally the Russians seized on that and said that the United States was using lethal gases in this war. I have inquired into this matter and have been told that we have used only tear gas. We possess lethal gases, and we have them in large quantities. They have destruction powers almost beyond description. But we have not sent one container of lethal gas out of this country, much less used it against the Vietcong in South Vietnam. The gas we have used is the same kind of gas that the police force in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, or here in the city of Washington has available to enable it to maintain order.

Mr. CLARK. What is the view of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Missouri with respect to the effect on personnel of the chemical defoliants which we are using? Do they have an adverse or lethal effect on the personnel?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I doubt whether it has any serious effect on personnel. If we happen to be fortunate

enough to expose a vehicle on a road or to pick up a few trucks coming down and can knock them out, the defoliant has an adverse effect on that immediate contingent of troops or truck drivers. But I doubt whether the defoliant itself has had any lethal effect on the Vietcong personnel. As a matter of fact, I think we have done a great many things in Vietnam that have been said to have a tremendous effect, but that have been magnified out of reasonable proportion.

Mr. CLARK. I invite the Senator's attention now to the question of our bombing and the contemplated bombing of North Vietnam. I am glad the Senator from Missouri is in the Chamber, because this is a subject in which he has interested himself deeply.

Referring to page 42 of the hearings, do the Senators accept the statement of Secretary McNamara?

The quantities of men and the quantities of materiel involved in the infiltration into South Vietnam are small.

I recall some statements in the newspapers that the rate of infiltration of men from the north was about 4,500 a month. On the other hand, the Secretary testified that throughout all of last year only about 20,000 men infiltrated from the north, with the exception of the regular army battalions. The Secretary said, as shown at page 42 of the hearings, that he thought the infiltration from the north was small.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. It all depends on what figure one regards as being small.

Mr. CLARK. Would the Senator from Georgia agree that 4,500 a month would be about the correct figure?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I should think that that is a fair estimate of troops coming down from North Vietnam at the present time.

Mr. CLARK. The 4,500 has reference to personnel.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I understand, of course, that they carry supplies at least sufficient to support the personnel.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Not only for the 4,500, but also to supply the 250,000 Vietcong and North Vietnamese regulars who are engaged in the war.

Mr. CLARK. I have heard it said that the amount of tonnage coming down the Ho Chi Minh trail this year is quite insignificant. As I recall, the committee had testimony to that effect. Perhaps the Senator from Missouri will recall that testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations. Much of the tonnage came on bicycles.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I do not agree that the amount is small or insignificant. That is not my own estimate of the situation. I have read everything that has been written on the war between Vietminh and the French, and the amount of materiel of war that those people were able to move around on their heads and backs, on bicycles, and in baskets is absolutely staggering to the human imagination.

An occidental army could not begin to exist if it were forced to supply itself in the manner in which the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong are compelled to do today. I think that they move a considerable quantity of supplies. I believe that we have slowed them down somewhat by this bombing. But we have not interdicted them completely, and we never will. That is why I have advocated closing the Haiphong Harbor in addition to knocking out the two railroads from China.

Mr. President, I yield to my friend, the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, this discussion is interesting. I happen to have a very high regard for the fighting characteristics of the American military. They have been sent to South Vietnam to defend the United States. They cannot ever expect success on a man-to-man basis because there are so many millions of people out there able to fight in this war. Therefore, they see quality as their only hope, quality of munitions, quality of supplies.

It is interesting to watch the development of these curious discussions in the newspapers and on the radio and television in the United States, concerning what we should or should not supply in the way of quality in our supplies, so as to help these young men to be successful in what they have been sent out there to do.

I am in complete agreement with my colleague from Georgia on the importance of destroying the docks at Haiphong. Nobody knows what and how much is coming through that harbor.

It is little more than some 150 miles at the most to Haiphong from Red China. It is a relatively simple trip, one which can be taken, and is being taken by many ships, ships owned by countries not friendly to the United States, as well as ships by countries that are friendly to the United States. But what worries me most is this slow but steady effort to denigrate the qualitative advances which, as a highly industrialized nation, we can offer our forces.

Nobody has considered the use of nuclear weapons. Nor should they. But many people apparently are worried about the amount of bombing we are doing in Vietnam. They are also worried about this limited defoliation. They ask about the use of gas, as the Senator from Georgia pointed out, a gas that does not permanently hurt people, one used all over the United States by policemen, in carrying out their duties in our cities.

People are worried about the type and caliber of our airplanes. They wonder whether these airplanes are too big, or too fast. Perhaps the words airplane, bomb, chemical defoliators and other words expressing our quality will be established soon as dirty words. What will the result be?

I have seen many rifles that were manufactured in China and Russia. These rifles are placed in the hands of the Vietcong and people from the north who live on a small amount of rice, have never had a good life and never expect much change.

We take a college graduate from the United States and put him in the jungle. He has a rifle. The Vietcong referred to has a rifle which is just as good as the rifle manufactured in the United States.

If the situation continues to develop as it is developing, soon the only way in which we will be willing to defend freedom will be by putting our men out with rifles to fight with their men with a rifle. It would then become a numbers game, a game which, in my opinion, our position would be hopeless from the standpoint of success; and it would also involve heavy additional casualties.

Mr. President, I have a statement I would make if the Senator from Georgia would yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Pennsylvania had the floor for an hour, that he had asked for an hour.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the Senator would yield, I thought the Senator from Georgia had the floor, was so told by a member of the staff.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall yield to the Senator from Missouri, but I should like to have the RECORD show that, having completed my comments in something less than an hour, I yielded the floor. Several other Senators took the floor.

I came back and asked if the Senator from Georgia would be willing to answer a few remaining questions which I had not had the opportunity to ask him yesterday. He very graciously said that he would.

We were in the middle of that colloquy when the Senator from Missouri came in.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I do appreciate the Senator yielding to me. There are only 20 minutes remaining before the vote.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Missouri so that he may make a short statement without my losing my right to the floor.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the able and distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, during recent weeks and months, there has been much discussion on this floor of the various Communist units, political and military, in North Vietnam and South Vietnam, primarily the Vietcong and the National Liberation Front; also others.

Many different statements and interpretations of the structure and functioning of these units have been made a part of the RECORD—to the point where, frankly, I have been somewhat unclear about the history and the actions of these various components.

Now, and perhaps for the first time in summarized fashion, a clear and concise presentation has been made by a scholar of political theory and Asian affairs, who also has served in Vietnam.

Anyone who wants better understanding of what has been and is going on in the relationship between the Ho Chi

Minh government of North Vietnam and the Communists of South Vietnam will be intensely interested in this article. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that an article "The Faceless Vietcong" by George A. Carver, Jr., be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From Foreign Affairs, April 1966]

THE FACELESS VIETCONG

(By George A. Carver, Jr.)

"We [the Lao Dong (Communist) Party] are building socialism in Vietnam. We are building it, however, only in half of the country, while in the other half, we must still bring to a conclusion the democratic-bourgeois and anti-imperialist revolution. Actually, our party must now accomplish, contemporaneously, two different revolutions, in the north and in the south. This is one of the most characteristic traits of our struggle."

—HO CHI MINH, June 1959.[1]

The present struggle in South Vietnam is in essence the third act of a continuous political drama whose prologue spanned the 1930's, whose first act was played in the years between 1941 and 1945, and whose second encompassed the 1946–54 Franco-Viet Minh war. The scene of major action in this drama has shifted several times, as have the identities of the auxiliary players (e.g. the Chinese Nationalists, the British, the French, the Chinese Communists and now the Americans) and the political guises of some of the principals. Throughout its course, however, the unifying theme of this drama has been the unrelenting struggle of the Vietnamese Communist Party to acquire political control over all of Vietnam. Its chief protagonists, furthermore, have always been and are today the small, dedicated and doctrinaire group who, under Ho Chi Minh's guidance and direction, organized and nurtured Vietnam's Communist Party during the 1930's, usurped the nationalist revolution after World War II and subverted it to their ends. They are the same men who run the Communist state already established in North Vietnam and who are now directing the insurgency designed to bring the southern part of the country under their domination.

The term "Vietcong" came into circulation around 1956 as a means of distinguishing some of the players in the current act of this ongoing political drama from the players in act II. "Vietcong" is a contraction of the phrase "Vietnam Cong-San," which means, simply, "Vietnamese Communist(s)." It is a descriptive term, not necessarily pejorative except, perhaps, in the sense of "If the shoe fits. . . ." It is a useful, precise and, as we shall see, accurate generic label for the individuals leading the present insurgent movement, at all levels, and for the organizational structure through which that insurgency is controlled and directed.

Not surprisingly, the reactions of many whose concern with Vietnam is of recent origin are analogous to those of theatergoers who walk into the middle of the third act of an extremely complex drama ignorant of what has gone before. To understand the Vietcong insurgency, its relationship to the North Vietnamese regime in Hanoi (the D.R.V.) and to the National Liberation Front and the People's Revolutionary Party in South Vietnam (and "their" respective interrelationships), it is essential to appreciate the historical setting within which the Vietcong movement developed and the ends it was created to serve.

Throughout their almost four decades of unremitting struggle for political power, the Vietnamese Communists have demonstrated great skill in coping with new problems and great tactical flexibility in pursuing unwavering strategic objectives. Yet, though skillful in learning from past failures, they have often become the victims of previous successes. For the past quarter-century the Vietnamese Communists have been doctrinally addicted to the political device of a broad front organization, dominated and controlled from behind the scenes by disciplined Communist cadres, but espousing general sentiments to which persons of all political inclinations can subscribe (though the formulation of these sentiments has invariably involved a special lexicon of key terms to which Communists and non-Communists attach radically different meanings). They have always rigidly subordinated military activity to political ends, and employed it not to inflict strategic defeat on enemy forces in the conventional sense, but as an abrasive to wear down their adversaries' will to fight and force their enemies to accept interim political settlements favorable to the continued pursuit of Communist political objectives.

Because of this Vietnamese Communist penchant for repeating political and military stratagems, a knowledge of recent Vietnamese history is particularly helpful in understanding the present insurgency. Although westerners may be largely ignorant of the scenario and detailed plot development of the previous acts of Vietnam's continuing political drama, the Vietnamese most decidedly are not. Virtually all politically minded Vietnamese have spent at least their adulthood, if not their whole lives, during the Communist struggle for power. Few indeed have not had their lives altered, conditioned or shaped thereby. Without appreciating what the Vietnamese have lived through and without recognizing some of the things they know intimately—often from all-too-first-hand experience—Westerners cannot hope to understand the attitude of Vietnamese now living south of the 17th parallel toward the insurgency, the Vietcong, the National Liberation Front and the Communist regime in Hanoi.

II

Under the direction of the man who now calls himself Ho Chi Minh, the Indochinese Communist Party was organized in January 1930. For the next decade the Vietnamese Communists concentrated on perfecting their organization, jockeying for position within the rising anti-French nationalist movement and attempting to undercut nationalist leaders or groups whom they could not subvert or bring under Communist control, using any means available, including betrayal to the French.

In 1941, the Vietnamese Communists joined a nationalist organization called the League for Vietnamese Independence (Vietnam Doc Lap Dong Minh Hoi—or Vietminh) which was sponsored by the Chinese Nationalists as a vehicle for harassing Japanese forces in Indochina but swiftly subverted by the Vietnamese Communists to further their own political objectives. By 1945 the Vietminh movement was under complete Communist control, despite the continued presence and subordinate participation therein of non-Communist nationalist elements whose names and talents the Communists were more than willing to exploit. In the chaotic aftermath of Japan's precipitate surrender, the Communists used the Vietminh as a device for seizing power in Hanoi and (on September 2, 1945) proclaiming the existence of the "Democratic Republic of Vietnam" under the presidency of Ho Chi Minh.

On November 11, 1945, in an effort to make the Vietminh government more palatable to non-Communist Vietnamese and to the Chinese Nationalist forces then occupying Vietnam down to the 16th parallel, Ho formally "dissolved" the Indochinese Communist Party, though the impact of this gesture on the discerning was considerably attenuated when the same day witnessed the formation of a new "Association for Marxist Studies." Complete control over the Vietminh and the subsequent resistance struggle, however, remained unchanged in essentially the same hands as those which control North Vietnam and the insurgency below the 17th parallel today.[2]

By the late spring of 1946, the fact of Communist control over the Vietminh (despite the "nonexistence" of the party) was becoming increasingly apparent, as was the fact that Ho's political maneuvering and stalling negotiations with the returning French were not going to work. In preparation for the inevitable struggle, Ho endeavored to broaden the Communists' base of nationalist support. In May 1946 he announced the creation of a new "popular national front" (Lien-Hiep Quoc Dan Vietnam), known as the Lien Viet, whose announced objective was the achievement of "independence and democracy." The Vietminh was merged with, and eventually absorbed by, the Lien Viet, though its name remained to serve as a generic label for those who participated in the subsequent armed struggle against the French. The Communists also brought into the Lien Viet two other small splinter parties which by then were under complete Communist control: the "Democratic Party," designed to appeal to "bourgeois elements" (i.e. urban trade, business, and professional circles), and the "Radical Socialist Party," designed to enlist the sympathies of students and intellectuals.

The war with the French broke out on December 19, 1946, and its general course is sufficiently well known to require no rehearsal here. The northern part of Vietnam constituted the principal theater of military operations; the struggle in the south, though intense, was primarily a terrorist and harassing action designed to keep the French off balance and prevent them from concentrating either their attention or their forces on the war in the north. Though the Vietminh achieved these objectives, their efforts in South Vietnam were beset with a continuing series of problems. French control of the sea, air, and major overland routes left the Vietminh in the south dependent for supplies, reinforcements, cadres, and communications on a tortuous set of jungle tracks running through Laos (along the western slopes of the Annamite Chain) which came to be known, collectively, as the "Ho Chi Minh trail." Saigon politics were considerably more complex than those of Hanoi, and non-Communist Vietnamese political groups were both more numerous and more powerful in the south than they were in the north. Furthermore, the Communist leaders of the Vietminh had a series of command and control problems with their southern organization which took several years to resolve.

In 1945, the senior Vietminh representative in southern Vietnam was a Moscow-educated disciple of Ho Chi Minh and the Third International named Tran Van Giau, whose blatant ruthlessness and indiscriminate ter-

[1] From a Hanoi interview by two correspondents of the Italian Communist Party journal Unita, published in Unita on July 1, 1959, and in the Belgian Communist paper Le Drapeau Rouge on July 10, 1959.

[2] Despite the Vietnamese Communists' claim that their party did not "exist" under any name from 1945 until 1951, on Aug. 31, 1953, the Cominform journal noted that Vietnamese Communist Party membership increased from 20,000 in 1946 to 500,000 in 1950.

rorist tactics alienated key groups that the Vietminh were anxious to bring into their fold, such as the Hoa Hao, Cao Dai and Binh Xuyen. Giau was accordingly recalled to Hanoi in January 1946 and his duties as Vietminh commander in the south were assumed by Nguyen Binh. Although eminently successful in harassing the French and furthering the cause of the nationalist revolution, Binh—a former member of the Communists' most militant nationalist rivals, the VNQDD—was never fully trusted by the Communist high command in the north and came to be considered excessively independent. In 1951 he was replaced by Le Duan, a charter member of the Indochinese Communist Party who is now first secretary of the Communist Party in North Vietnam and one of the most powerful figures in the Hanoi regime. Until 1954, and perhaps even later, Le Duan continued to play a major role in developing and directing the Vietminh organization in the south and in ensuring that it remainded under firm Communist control. However, in late 1952 or early 1953 he was apparently compelled to share his authority with Le Duc Tho, the present head of the North Vietnamese Communist Party's Organization Bureau and also a member of its Politburo.[3]

The 1949 Communist victory in China had a profound influence on the course of events in Vietnam, particularly after the Vietminh offensive in the fall of 1950 cleared the French out of the frontier area and gave the Vietminh a common border with their new Communist neighbor. The military consequences of ensuring Chinese Communist support to the Vietminh cause are fairly well known. The political consequences, less well known in the West, were of at least equal significance. With an increasingly powerful fraternal ally in immediate proximity, the Communist leadership of the Vietminh became progressively less dependent on the good will and support of non-Communist Vietnamese nationalists. The mask could now be slipped. The fact of Communist direction of the Vietminh no longer had to be concealed, the instruments of Communists control could be made more effective, the nature of that control more rigid and its extent more pervasive.

The first major step in this direction was taken on March 3, 1951, when the Indochinese Communist Party reappeared as the Dang Lao Dong Vietnam, or Vietnamese Workers' Party. The Lao Dong swiftly assumed a position of absolute political primacy within the Lien Viet front, though for appearances' sake the "Democratic" and "Socialist" Parties mentioned above were kept in existence. The overt reconstitution of the Communist Party was doubtless prompted by a variety of considerations, of which the most important was probably the fact that covert domination of the Vietminh movement via a clandestine apparatus whose very existence had to be concealed was an awkward and inefficient process. It necessitated reliance on persuasion as well as coercion and, further, complicated the task of advancing Communist political objectives within those areas under Vietminh control.

The Vietminh was ostensibly a purely national movement dedicated to the twin goals of independence and democracy; its stated objective during the first phase of the armed struggle (1946–51) was simply to throw out the French. The emergence of the "new" party, however, brought forth a new slogan: "The anti-imperialist and the antifeudal fights are of equal importance." What this meant became increasingly apparent during the course of a systematic program which the Communists soon initiated and took 5 years to complete. It was designed to make the party itself more doctrinally orthodox and to restructure the whole society, at least of North Vietnam, along lines consonant with Communist dogma. This program was conducted in five stages, each carefully prepared and each preceded by intensive sessions of "thought reform" for both party and nonparty cadres to insure that they would in fact execute the orders they were about to receive.

The first or "economic leveling" stage, launched in 1951, was designed to ruin the wealthier peasantry and the urban businessmen (to the extent that French control of the towns permitted this) through a complicated system of arbitrary and punitive taxes patterned on Chinese Communist models—as, indeed, were all phases of this Vietnamese Communist program.[4] The second stage was a short, sharp wave of terror launched throughout large parts of North Vietnam one evening in February 1953, a week before Tet, the lunar new year, and sustained for precisely fifteen days.[5] The patent objectives of this terror campaign were to cow the populace, in preparation for what lay ahead, and eliminate all potential centers of effective resistance. When the terror was shut off after accomplishing its purpose, Ho Chi Minh made one of his celebrated weeping apologies.

The next phase of the Communist program, implemented during 1953 and 1954, was euphemistically labelled "Land Rent Reduction." Carefully selected and specially trained teams of hardcore Communist cadres (some of which almost certainly had Chinese "advisers") went quietly to each village, made friends with the poorest therein, organized them into cells and helped them to draw up lists classifying their more prosperous neighbors with respect to wealth, status, political leanings and revolutionary zeal. Once all was in readiness, the "land reform battalions" came out in the open, set up kangaroo courts and administered summary "people's justice" to "exploiters" and "traitors." Each land-reform team had a preassigned quota of death sentences and hard-labor imprisonments to mete out and these quotas were seldom underfulfilled. In addition to calculated and extensive use of terror, the Communists marshalled all the pettiness, jealousy and vindictiveness of village life to serve their political ends. The punishments carried out extended not only to those actually convicted of "crimes" but also to their families, who were stripped of their possessions, turned out of their homes, denied means of obtaining a livelihood and deprived of the documentation (e.g., ration cards) essential to existence in a Communist-controlled society. They became, officially, "nonpersons" whom it was a crime to succor. The fact that many of those convicted and far larger numbers of their immediate relatives who suffered the attendant consequences had taken an active part in the resistance against the French was considered immaterial and irrelevant. No one was safe or immune from the judgments of the "people's courts," not even life-long members of the Communist Party.

Despite its incredible barbarity and violence, the land rent reduction campaign was but a preliminary—and a mild one by comparison—to the land reform campaign proper which followed, and which lasted from 1954 until 1956. Essentially the same methods and techniques were employed but on a much larger scale (e.g. the mandatory quota of death sentences and imprisonments for each village was increased fivefold). No one will ever know the exact human cost of these two campaigns, but the number of people killed was probably on the order of 100,000, and the number who suffered dire personal hardship was probably about half a million. Since North Vietnam has a population of about 18 million, these campaigns had a political impact roughly equivalent to that which would be felt in America if the U.S. Government deliberately engineered the murder of over a million American citizens.

The rationale for this politically motivated slaughter was rooted in the dogmatic fanaticism of the Vietnamese Communist leadership. The fact that only a small percentage of the party membership had genuine proletarian or "poor peasant" origins was doctrinally embarrassing and made a purge doctrinally madatory. Dogma required that the "feudal-landlord" class be eliminated. Though no such class really existed in North Vietnam, it had to be created so that it could be destroyed. The object of the exercise was to purge the party, restructure North Vietnamese society, smash all real or potential opposition, and impose an iron grip of Communist control. The excesses, however unfortunate, were "necessary."

Once the land rent reduction and land reform campaigns had accomplished their objectives, the Lao Dong in 1956 opened the final phase of its five-step program. It was known as the "Rectification of Errors" and designed to restore North Vietnam to the Communist version of "normalcy." The excesses of the recent past were officially admitted and, by implication at least, apologies were tendered. Ho wept (again). Truong Chinh resigned as Secretary-General of the Party (though he remained as member of its Politburo); so too did the DRV's vice minister for land reform. General Giap made a speech to the 10th Congress of the Party Central Committee during the course of which he acknowledged a long list of "errors" and mentioned that 12,000 Party members had been released from jails to which they had been unjustly consigned. (How many were imprisoned in the first place was never stated.) The apologies and explanations, however, provided an overwhelming body of irrefutable evidence regarding what had actually transpired and made it abundantly clear that throughout the whole process the party (as one of its spokesmen admitted) had been guided by the principle that "it is better to kill ten innocent people than to let one enemy escape."[6]

[3] During the Viet Minh era Le Duan and Le Duc Tho apparently had a violent quarrel over tactics which Ho Chi Minh himself had to settle. The details of this dispute are still obscure, but the resultant enmity between these two men has never been completely dissipated.

[4] North Vietnam had virtually no large businesses in the Western sense; Vietnamese termed "capitalists" by the Lao Dong were generally what we would term small businessmen or merchants. Though there were inequities in land ownership in North Vietnam, the Red River Delta had the most extensive pattern of private ownership to be found anywhere in Asia and there were virtually no large "feudal" holdings of the kind that existed in pre-Communist China, or even in the Mekong Delta region of South Vietnam.

[5] Tet is the most important traditional Vietnamese family and religious holiday. Launching a terror wave just before Tet in Vietnam is like launching one a week before Christmas in the United States.

[6] Hoang Van Chi, "From Colonialism to Communism." London: Pall Mall, 1964 (also Praeger, New York), p. 213. This detailed study of the events we have outlined by a Vietnamese scholar and former Vietminh cadre merits the careful attention of anyone interested in Vietnamese affairs.

III

In the midst of the events we have so briefly described, the 1954 Geneva Conference brought the Franco-Vietminh war to a close and ended the second act of Vietnam's present political drama. This conference produced a set of four interrelated documents known collectively as the Geneva accords. Three were cease-fire agreements (one each for Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam) and the fourth an unsigned "Final Declaration," whose juridical status is open to dispute. A variety of external political considerations and pressures (including French domestic politics) had considerably more influence on the language of the accords than the objective realities of the situation in Vietnam. The problem of extricating France from her Indochinese entanglements as gracefully as possible was effectively solved and the shooting was temporarily halted, but more fundamental questions regarding Vietnam's political future were ignored or swept under the rug. At the time, the accords' crucial lacunæ and ambiguities seemed relatively unimportant, since most of the conference's participants considered it virtually inevitable that all of Vietnam would soon be ruled by a Vietminh regime headed by the benign and (so it was thought) universally esteemed "Uncle Ho." Their significance did not become manifest until several years later.

Although the legal predecessor of the present Saigon government attended the conference (as the "Associated State of Vietnam"), none of the documents emanating from Geneva mentioned it by name or assigned it any rights or status. The Vietnam cease-fire agreement was signed by a French general on behalf of the "Commander in Chief of the French Union Forces in Indochina" and by the DRV's Vice Minister for National Defense on behalf of the "Commander in Chief of the People's Army of Vietnam." In discussing "political and administrative measures in the two regrouping zones" (art. 14), it makes a passing reference to "general elections which will bring about the unification of Vietnam," a theme amplified but not clarified in the conference's "final declaration" (which set a July 1956 deadline). Nowhere was it specified what precisely the Vietnamese were supposed to vote on or how the rights of various elements within the Vietnamese body politic were to be protected. Not surprisingly, the Saigon government objected formally and strenuously to these vague and airy dicta concerning Vietnam's future fate, stressing that it was not a party to these agreements and hence could not consider itself bound by them.[7]

Some of Ho's lieutenants felt that the Geneva settlement had cheated them of the full fruits of their victory, but on the whole the Communists had no reason to be dissatisfied with the results. The land-reform program was then in full cry and consolidation of Communist control over the north was the task immediately at hand. The south could wait, particularly since its chances of survival as an independent political entity seemed nil at the time.

The Lao Dong leadership went through the motions of overt compliance with the provisions of the Vietnam cease-fire agreement, though in doing so they took a number of steps to preserve a subversive potential in the south and thus insure themselves against unfavorable political contingencies. In accordance with the agreement, some 50,000 Vietminh troops were regrouped in specified areas below the 17th parallel and taken north, along with 25,000-odd Vietminh adherents and supporters. The Communists were very careful, however, to leave behind a network of cadres, which were instructed to blend into the scenery, deny Communist affiliation and agitate in favor of the scheduled elections. They also left behind a large number of weapons caches (3,561 of which were discovered between September 1954 and June 1959) against the day when their southern apparatus might have to augment political action with armed forces. The composition of the units taken north was also carefully structured with an eye to possible future needs. The Communists made sure that many of the persons involved were young, employing both coercion and impressment to get the kind of people that they wanted. Before they departed, personnel designated for regroupment were strongly encouraged or, in many cases, directly ordered to contract local marriages and family alliances in South Vietnam. These would stand them in good stead if they ever had to return.

In the aftermath of Geneva, the area south of the 17th parallel was in a state of political chaos bordering on anarchy. Ngo Dinh Diem, who became Premier on July 7, 1954, had only the shell of a government, no competent civil service, and a far from trustworthy army. In addition to all its other difficulties, the Diem government was also soon faced with an unexpected problem of major magnitude: refugees from the north. The myth that the Vietminh was a purely nationalist movement to which virtually all Vietnamese freely gave their political allegiance and that "Uncle Ho" was almost universally loved and esteemed by his compatriots was rudely shattered soon after Geneva by what became, proportionately, one of history's most spectacular politically motivated migrations.

Article 14(d) of the Vietnam cease-fire agreement promised that civilians could move freely to whichever "regrouping zone" they preferred. The Communists accepted this provision with a notable lack of enthusiasm, hindered its implementation in a variety of ways and eventually, when its application became altogether too embarrassing, flagrantly violated it. Despite all Communist intimidation, obstruction and harassment, however, some 900,000 people fled from the north to the south uprooting themselves and their families in order to avoid living under Ho Chi Minh's Communist regime. (Given the relative population sizes, this was the political equivalent of 9 million Americans leaving the United States.) As many as 400,000 more wanted to leave, and were entitled to do so under article 14(d), but were not permitted by the Communist authorities to depart.

The 2-year period from 1954 to 1956 was one of political progress and achievement in South Vietnam that would have been considered impossible at the time of Geneva. The situation which prevailed in the summer of 1956 forced Hanoi to take stock of its prospects. The rather pro forma protests made by North Vietnam at the passing of the Geneva election deadline suggest that Hanoi's rulers were not so perturbed by the fact that the elections were not held as they were over the increasing disparity between political life north and south of the 17th parallel, a contrast considerably less than flattering to their regime. The north was just emerging from the throes of the land-reform campaign and was in a state of economic turmoil, while the south presented a picture of increasing political stability and incipient prosperity.

Hanoi accordingly recognized that more decisive action would be required if the south was to be brought under its control. Instructions were transmitted to the Communist network left behind in the south directing these cadres to begin agitation and political organization. The Lao Dong Party set up a department of its central committee called the Central Reunification Department, which was made responsible for all matters concerning individuals who had been regrouped to the north during the post-Geneva exchange of forces. The following year (1957) a PAVN major-general named Nguyen Van Vinh, who had served in various responsible posts in the south during the Franco-Vietminh war, was named chairman of this Reunification Department, an office he still holds.

The 1956–58 period was unusually complex, even for Vietnam. Diem, in effect, reached his political high-water mark sometime around mid-1957. After that, his methods of operation, traits of character and dependence on his family became set with ever increasing rigidity along lines which ultimately led to his downfall. Despite the undeniable progress of its early years, his government was never successful in giving the bulk of the South Vietnamese peasantry positive reasons for identifying their personal fortunes with its political cause. The administrators Diem posted to the countryside were often corrupt and seldom native to the areas to which they were assigned, a fact which caused them to be considered as "foreigners" by the intensely clannish and provincial peasantry. Land policies, often admirable in phraseology, were notably weak in execution and frequently operated to the benefit of absentee landlords rather than those who actually tilled the soil.

Such factors as these, coupled with the still manifest consequences of a decade of war, generated genuine grievances among the peasantry which the Communists were quick to exploit and exacerbate. Communist cadres began their organizational efforts among the disgruntled and the ill-served. They harped on local issues and avoided preaching Marxist doctrine. Cells were formed, village committees established and small military units organized. A pattern of politically motivated terror began to emerge, directed against the representatives of the Saigon government and concentrated on the very bad and the very good. The former were liquidated to win favor with the peasantry; the latter because their effectiveness was a bar to the achievement of Communist objectives. The terror was directed not only against officials but against all whose operations were essential to the functioning of organized political society: schoolteachers, health workers, agricultural officials, etc. The scale and scope of this terrorist and insurrectionary activity mounted slowly but steadily. By the end of 1958 the participants in this incipient insurgency, whom Saigon quite accurately termed the "Vietcong," constituted a serious threat to South Vietnam's political stability.

Despite the increasing trouble that Vietcong bands were causing and despite the Vietcong's initial success in organizational work, Hanoi was far from satisfied with the pace of Vietcong progress and was particularly chagrined at the movement's failure to win a really significant political following.

---

[7] The American position was formally enunciated by President Eisenhower in a July 21, 1954, statement, which said in part: "* * * the United States has not itself been party to or bound by the decisions taken by the conference, but it is our hope that it will lead to the establishment of peace consistent with the rights and needs of the countries concerned. The agreement contains features which we do not like, but a great deal depends on how they work in practice.

"The United States is issuing at Geneva a statement to the effect that it is not prepared to join in the conference declaration, but, as loyal members of the United Nations, we also say that, in compliance with the obligations and principles contained in art. 2 of the United Nations Charter, the United States will not use force to disturb the settlement. We also say that any renewal of Communist aggression would be viewed by us as a matter of grave concern."

Several Vietcong cadre members who were subsequently captured have reported that in late 1958 Le Duan himself was sent on an extensive inspection trip in the south, and that upon his return to Hanoi in early 1959 he presented a list of recommendations subsequently adopted by the Lao Dong Central Committee and referred to in Vietcong cadre training sessions as "Resolution 15." These recommendations laid out the whole future course of the southern insurgency, including the establishment of a National Liberation Front to be controlled by the Central Committee of the South Vietnamese branch of the Lao Dong Party and supported by a South Vietnamese "liberation army." The Front was to be charged with conducting a political struggle, backed by armed force, designed to neutralize the south and pave the way for "reunification," i.e., political domination by Hanoi. We can be certain that some such decisions were made about this time, for in May 1959 the Lao Dong Central Committee declared that "the time has come to struggle heroically and perseveringly to smash [the GVN]."

The consequences of these Hanoi decisions became increasingly apparent during the 18 months which followed the Central Committee's May 1959 meeting. The scale and intensity of Vietcong activity began to increase by quantum jumps. Communist military moves in Laos secured the corridor area along the North Vietnamese border and infiltrators from the north began moving down the "Ho Chi Minh Trail"; a few hundred in 1959, around 3,000 in 1960, and over 10,000 in 1961.

During 1959 and 1960 further evolution of the various stresses within the South Vietnamese body politic occurred. Diem's military establishment had been designed to counter the threat of conventional invasion and proved ill suited to cope with insurrectionary warfare. The quality of government administrators grew worse rather than better as Diem became increasingly inclined, in making key appointments, to put loyalty to himself and his family ahead of ability. His agrarian policies, particularly the disastrous "agroville" program of 1959, provided fresh sources of rural discontent. The Vietcong were quick to take advantage of the government's errors and steadily heightened the intensity of their terrorist activity. To complicate matters further there were rising political pressures within the non-Communist camp and a growing feeling that Diem had to be ousted before his methods of government made a Communist victory inevitable.

During the 1958–60 period, Hanoi's hand in southern troubles was quite imperfectly concealed. In August 1958 Hanoi radio, billing itself as "the voice of the Liberation Front," broadcast instructions to the Vietcong armed forces and village cadres directing them to adapt themselves to the requirements of the South Vietnamese political situation in order to carry out their missions. In October 1958, it openly appealed to the highland tribes to revolt, noting that "the government of our beloved Ho is standing behind you." In September 1959 and again in February 1960, Hanoi commented on recent Vietcong military forays by terming them "our attacks" and praising the "skill of our commander and the good will of our soldiers."

In September 1960 an almost open official seal was affixed to Hanoi's plans for southern insurgency when, at the Third National Congress of the Lao Dong Party, Le Duan made a lengthy speech in which he stated: "The present National Congress * * * will define for the whole party and the whole people the line for carrying out the socialist revolution in the north, for the completion of the national people's democratic revolution throughout the country, for the struggle to achieve national reunification." In this speech Le Duan made a public call for the creation of a "broad national united front" in the south. In effect, he was making public the policy decisions which the Lao Dong Party had made during the preceding months. From the tone and temper of Le Duan's address it was apparent that the Vietcong insurrection was about to move into the stage of open war.

IV

Toward the end of January 1961, Hanoi radio announced that "various forces opposing the fascist Ngo Dinh Diem regime" had formed a "National Front for the Liberation of South Vietnam" (NLF) on December 20, 1960, and that it had issued a manifesto and 10-point political program. The language of both, as broadcast by Hanoi, made the Front's political parentage abundantly clear. The program's fourth point, for example, was "to carry out land rent reduction, guarantee the peasants' right to till their present plots of land, and redistribute communal land in preparation for land reform." To knowledgeable Vietnamese, such words as these made it chillingly obvious who was behind the Front and what lay in store for South Vietnam should it ever come to power.

On February 11, 1961, Hanoi devoted a second broadcast to the NLF's manifesto and program, blandly changing the language of both to tone down the more blatant Communist terminology of the initial version. However, even the milder second version (which became the "official" text) borrowed extensively from Le Duan's September speech and left little doubt about the Front's true sponsors or objectives.

After the Hanoi radio announcements, the Vietcong immediately began consolidating all of its activities—military as well as political—under the NLF banner and conducting intensive organizational activity in its name. A propaganda outlet, the Liberation News Agency, was promptly established and began pouring forth announcements and stories (replayed by Hanoi and by Communist media throughout the world) designed to portray the Front as a spontaneous, indigenous coalition of South Vietnamese nationalists. For the first year of its alleged existence, however, the NLF was a shadowy thing with no definable structure and a faceless, unidentified leadership.

The Front was but one of the two organizational instruments Hanoi had deemed essential to the successful pursuit of its political objectives south of the 17th parallel. The other—designedly less well known in the West but more important within South Vietnam itself—was first brought to light in a Liberation News Agency broadcast on January 13, 1962, which announced that a "conference of Marxist-Leninist delegates" had met in South Vietnam "during the last days of December 1961," and decided that "to fulfill their historic and glorious duty * * * workers, peasants and laborers in South Vietnam need a vanguard group serving as a thoroughly revolutionary party." Accordingly, the conference had established the People's Revolutionary Party (PRP), which came into official existence on January 1, 1962.[8] The founders "warmly supported" the program of the NLF and "volunteered to join its ranks." In point of fact, the PRP immediately took complete control of the Front ("assumed the historic mission of playing the role of vanguard body to the southern revolution") and is currently referred to by Hanoi as "the soul" of the NLF.[9]

Captured Communist documents have since made it abundantly clear that the creation of the PRP involved what would be termed in American business parlance the "spin-off" of a wholly owned subsidiary. The PRP was and is, in fact, simply the southern branch of the Lao Dong. As one pertinent party directive put it: "The People's Revolutionary Party has only the appearance of an independent existence; actually, our party is nothing but the Lao Dong Party of Vietnam (Vietminh Communist Party) unified from north to south under the direction of the central executive committee of the party, the chief of which is President Ho."[10] The PRP serves as the principal vehicle for maintaining Lao Dong—i.e., North Vietnamese—control over the Vietcong insurgency.

As the organizational structure of the Vietcong movement has expanded over the past 4 years, its general outlines have become fairly well known. In the insurgency's initial phase (1954–59), the Communists retained the Vietminh's division of what is now South Vietnam into "interzone V" (French Annam below the 17th parallel) and the "Nambo" (Cochin China), with each area under Hanoi's direct control. In late 1960 or early 1961, this arrangement was scrapped and field control over all aspects of the Vietcong insurgency vested in a still existing, single command headquarters, originally known as the Central Office for South Vietnam (or COSVN)—a term still in circulation) but now usually referred to by captured Vietcong as simply the PRP's Central Committee. This command entity, which also contains the headquarters of the NLF, is a mobile and sometimes peripatetic body, usually located in the extreme northwestern tip of Tay Ninh Province in prudent proximity to the Cambodian border. Under this Central Committee headquarters, the Vietcong divide South Vietnam into five numbered military regions and one special zone for Saigon and its immediate environs. Each of the five regions, in turn, is divided into provinces; each province into districts; and each district into villages.[11] The Vietcong's provinces, districts, and villages are administratively comparable and roughly equivalent in area to those of the South Vietnamese Government. But their boundaries do not coincide, thus complicating Saigon's administrative problems in reacting to insurgent activities.

Though the outlines of the Vietcong's organizational structure are fairly well known, the identities of its leaders are not. They are faceless men, veteran Communist revolutionaries who have made a lifetime practice of masking their identities under various aliases and noms de guerre and who

[8] The only two of these "delegates" who have been subsequently identified are Vo Chi Chong, now a vice chairman of NLF's presidium and member of the PRP's executive committee, and Huynh Van Tam, now the NLF's representative in Algiers, where he devotes considerable time to cultivating Western newsmen, deceiving some of them about his own political background and the true nature of the organization he represents in a manner reminiscent of Chou En-lai's similar successes during the mid-1940's.

[9] These phrases appear in "The Vietnamese People's Revolutionary Party and Its Historic Mission of Liberating the South," an article in the January 1966 issue of the Lao Dong Party's theoretical journal Hoc Tap. The same article notes: "The experiences of the world and our country's revolutions have shown that in order to win the greatest success, the national democratic revolution must be led by a workers' revolutionary party"—i.e. a Communist Party.

[10] This particular document, dated Dec. 7, 1961, was captured in Ba Xuyen Province. Its text may be found, among other places, in the Department of State's white paper, "Aggression From the North."

[11] In Vietnam, a "village" is not a cluster of huts but an administrative entity roughly comparable to an American township.

take particular pains to stay hidden in the background in order to support the political fiction that the insurgency is directed by the NLF and the Front's ostensible officers.

At the 1962 Geneva Conference on Laos, a member of the North Vietnamese delegation inadvertently commented that the published roster of the Lao Dong Party's Central Committee did not include some members whose identities were kept secret because they were "directing military operations in South Vietnam." One of the four examples he cited was "Nguyen Van Cuc," [12] which is one of the aliases used by the chairman of the PRP. This Lao Dong Central Committee member, whose true name we do not known, is probably the overall field director of the Vietcong insurgency in South Vietnam. The overall commander of Vietcong military forces (who would be a subordinate of Cuc's within the Communist command structure) is almost certainly the chairman of the (PRP) Central Committee's Military Committee—a man who uses the name Tran Nam Trung but whom several captured Vietcong cadre members have insisted is actually Lt. Gen. Tran Van Tra, a Deputy Chief of Staff of the North Vietnamese Army and an alternate member of the Lao Dong Central Committee. The director of all Vietcong activity in Vietcong Military Region 5 (the northernmost third of South Vietnam) is Nguyen Don, a major general in the North Vietnamese Army and another alternate member of the Lao Dong Central Committee, who in 1961 was commander of the North Vietnamese 305th Division but came south late that year or early in 1962. In short, not only does the PRP control all aspects of the Vietcong movement, including the NLF, and not only is it a subordinate echelon of the North Vietnamese Lao Dong Party, but the PRP's own leaders appear to be individuals who themselves occupy ranking positions within the Lao Dong Party hierarchy.

As indicated above, for the first year of its existence the NLF was as shadowy and faceless an organization as the PRP is today. It was allegedly created "after a conference of representatives of various forces opposing the fascist régime in South Vietnam," but the identities of these representatives or the "forces" they represented were never specified. The myth of the Front was not fleshed out with public organizational substance or overt leadership until after the PRP was presented as its vanguard element. The NLF now claims to be a coalition of over 40 "associated organizations" which, collectively, purport to represent virtually all shades and strata of South Vietnamese political and social life. This coalition includes three "political parties": the PRP, the "Democratic Party" and the "Radical Socialist Party." (The latter two bear almost exactly the same names as the two minor parties allowed to exist in North Vietnam and are obviously intended to play similar roles.) In their present name or form, virtually none of its affiliated organizations antedates the founding of the NLF itself, many almost certainly exist only on paper, and a careful analysis of the NLF's own propaganda makes it clear that a goodly number have identical officers, directorates, and staffs. Some of these organizations, however, have acquired substance after the fact, as it were, and now play important roles in the NLF's efforts to organize and control the rural populace.

It is fairly easy to devise an organizational structure capable of lending verisimilitude to a political fiction, doubly so if one is trying to deceive a foreign audience unversed in local political affairs. Fleshing this structure out with live, known individuals to occupy posts of public prominence is considerably more difficult. The Vietcong obviously hoped to attract to the NLF South Vietnamese of personal stature and renown, preferably individuals not immediately identifiable as Communists or Communist sympathizers, who could enhance the Front's prestige and political attractiveness and provide a more or less innocent facade behind which the NLF's Communist masters could operate in secure obscurity. To date the Vietcong have been notably unsuccessful in this regard, though the full measure of their failure is far better appreciated within South Vietnam itself than it is abroad. No Vietnamese of what could accurately be described as significant personal prestige or professional standing—not even one of known leftist persuasion—has ever been willing to associate himself publicly with the NLF or lend it the use of his name.

The NLF's first Central Committee was not announced until March 1962, well over a year after the Front's supposedly spontaneous creation. Though the committee purportedly had 52 members, the NLF was able to come up with only 31 names, most of which were virtually unknown even within South Vietnam. The 41-member second (and current) Central Committee, announced in January 1964, is equally lacking in distinction.

The Chairman of the NLF's Presidium and Central Committee is Nguyen Huu Tho, a former provincial lawyer with a long record of activity in Communist-sponsored causes but of little political repute or professional standing among his former colleagues at the South Vietnamese bar, who generally categorize him as having been an "avocat sans brefs." The NLF's present Secretary General (also the Secretary General of the "Democratic Party" and the Chairman of the NLF's Saigon Zone Committee) is Huynh Tan Phat, usually described in NLF propaganda as an "architect," though one would be hard pressed to point to any edifices he has designed. From 1945 until 1948 he apparently served as a member of the Vietminh/Vietcong Executive Committee in Nambo and as the Communists' propaganda chief for their Saigon Special Zone. The NLF's First Secretary General (also the Secretary General of the "Radical Socialist Party") was Nguyen Van Hieu, now its principal traveling representative abroad. A former journalist and teacher (some say of biology, some of mathematics), Hieu has been a Communist propagandist since the late 1940's. The Chairman of the NLF's External Relations (i.e. foreign affairs and propaganda) Committee is Tran Buu Kiem, a Central Committee member who served briefly as Secretary General after Hieu and before Phat. Described in official NLF biographies as an "intellectual and ardent patriot," Kiem has spent most of the past two decades as a leader in various Communist-front youth groups. Such figures as these are the best the Front has been able to come up with to staff its most prominent public offices. Their organizational and revolutionary talents may be impressive, but their personal stature and prestige among the South Vietnamese people are not.

V

Over the past 4 years the Vietcong have labored mightily to improve their image beyond South Vietnam's borders and to enlist a broad spectrum of international support for their cause; to develop their organizational structure within South Vietnam, thus strengthening their internal political position; and to expand their military effort, to facilitate achievement of their political goals and if possible to generate an aura of invincibility capable of breaking their adversaries' will to continue the struggle.

The image-building campaign abroad has been designed to publicize the NLF and inflate its prestige and reputation. Its goal has been to get the NLF generally accepted as an indigenous South Vietnamese political coalition (admittedly with some Communist members) which sprang up spontaneously to combat the harsh excesses of the U.S.-supported Diem regime, and which seeks only peace, democracy and reunification as provided for in the Geneva agreements. Though moral—and, to some extent perhaps, physical—support may be afforded by North Vietnam and other fraternal socialist states (so the argument runs), the NLF is basically an independent political entity with a policy and will of its own. This campaign has been waged through the propaganda disseminated by the Liberation News Agency, replayed and echoed by Communist (and non-Communist) media throughout the world; through a steady flow of messages from the Front to foreign governments and heads of state (particularly of neutralist Afro-Asian nations); by ever increasing attendance at foreign conferences and meetings (generally Communist or leftist sponsored) by a small handful of indefatigable NLF representatives; and by the establishment of permanent NLF "missions" in Havana, Peiping, Moscow, Prague, East Berlin, Budapest, Cairo, Djakarta, and Algiers. All of this activity has profited from the fact that knowledge of the realities of political life in South Vietnam does not extend much beyond its frontiers; all of it has been guided by a keen awareness of the effectiveness of incessant repetition in converting myth to assumed reality.

Throughout South Vietnam, the Vietcong have developed and employed the NLF apparatus in their intensive effort to organize the population (especially the rural population), involve it in their insurgency campaign and bring it under their political domination. The detailed application of this effort varies from locality to locality, and is materially influenced by such local factors as the relative degree of Vietcong strength in the area. The objective, however, is always to secure total participation and total involvement on the part of the local population in order to establish total Vietcong control. They endeavor to persuade—and, if conditions permit, compel—every inhabitant of a given area to join and work actively in some NLF component organization. Farmers are encouraged or forced to join the Liberation Peasants' Association; women, the Liberation Women's Association; children, the Liberation Youth Association. Where Vietcong control is strong, no one escapes the net. Physically fit males not sent off to some other Vietcong military unit serve in the local militia squad or self-defense platoon; women, children, and old men help make bamboo stakes and traps or dig up roads to harass government forces. They serve as informants and couriers, or go on purchasing expeditions to nearby government-controlled market towns. Everyone participates and ensures that his neighbor does so as well. All of this activity is coordinated and directed by local NLF committees which where circumstances permit, assume the prerogatives and functions of local government. These local committees in turn are directed by superior echelons, capped, at least ostensibly, by the central committee of the NLF itself.

The NLF's organizational structure is paralleled and controlled at each echelon by a complementary PRP structure. Under the general command of its central committee, the PRP is organized on a geographic basis through the various regions, provinces, and districts down to the village level. Each geographic echelon has a directing committee responsible for controlling all PRP—hence all Vietcong, including NLF—activities within its area. These committees vary in size and organizational complexity, even

[12] P. J. Honey, "North Vietnam's Workers' Party and South Vietnam's People's Revolutionary Party," Pacific Affairs Quarterly, winter 1962–63, p. 383.

among equivalent geographic echelons, but each one has a single chairman and several subordinate members or subcommittees with specific functional responsibilities. The number and nomenclature of these functional subcommittees also varies from area to area, but they normally cover military affairs, economic and financial affairs, and what the Communists term "front affairs and civilian proselytizing," whose chairman is responsible for controlling all NLF activity in that area. If the PRP organization at that echelon is sufficiently well developed, he in turn will have subordinate members of his PRP subcommittee to direct each of the local associations affiliated with the NLF. Though captured documents indicate that the Vietcong try to keep the level of overt PRP participation below two-fifths of the total membership of any given NLF component, the organizational structure we have just described (reinforced by a network of covert PRP cells throughout the NLF) keeps all components of the NLF at every level under complete PRP control.

The Vietcong's terrorist and military apparatus was developed and is directed by this same organizational structure, which insures that armed activity at all levels is rigidly subordinated to political objectives and kept under tight party control. The Vietcong military establishment now has over 90,000 full-time troops (including over 12,000 North Vietnamese regulars) augmented and supported by something over 100,000 paramilitary personnel and part-time guerrillas. This whole force, however, was built up for political reasons, to serve political ends. The Vietcong political apparatus was at work laying the foundations for insurgency long before there was even so much as a Vietcong hamlet self-defense squad.

The director of the military affairs subcommittee (mentioned above) is frequently also the commander of the Vietcong force attached to that geographic echelon. Village directing committees have village platoons under their control; district committees, district companies; provincial committees, provincial battalions. Regional committees have forces of regimental and multi-regimental size at their disposal, and the whole Vietcong military establishment is subject to the direction of PRP's Central Committee. Throughout this military structure, the same basic principles of organization and command relationship are uniformly applied. There is no such thing as a Vietcong military unit of any size independent of the party's political apparatus or free from tight political control. Probably no more than a third of the Vietcong forces are party members, but by virtue of its organizational mechanism the PRP controls the "Liberation Army" in the same way that it controls the National Liberation Front.

An understanding of the Vietcong's organizational structure enables us to recognize the real significance and function of the more than 50,000 persons infiltrated into South Vietnam since the Lao Dong Party's 1959 decision to pursue its objective of political conquest by waging insurgent war. Until mid to late 1963 these infiltrators were virtually all ethnic southerners drawn from the pool of regrouped Vietminh forces and supporters taken north in 1954. They were not foot soldiers or cannon fodder (at least not until Hanoi began sending in whole North Vietnamese units in late 1964 or early 1965). Instead they were disciplined, trained and indoctrinated cadres and technicians. They became the squad leaders, platoon leaders, political officers, staff officers, unit commanders, weapons and communications specialists who built the Vietcong's military force into what it is today. They also became the village, district, provincial, and regional committee chiefs and key committee members who built the Vietcong's political apparatus.

The earlier arrivals had had at least 5 days of indoctrination and training in North Vietnam, or elsewhere in the Communist bloc, before departing on their southern missions; some of the later arrivals have had nearly a decade of such preparation. Until the recent sharp rise in Vietcong battlefield casualties, approximately a third of all the personnel in Vietcong military units at and above the district company level were "returnees" trained in the north. At least half of the membership of most PRP district committees, and an even larger proportion at higher echelons, also appear to be "returnees." Without this infiltration from the north, in short, the present Vietcong organization could never have been developed.

VI

The Vietcong insurgency is clearly a masterpiece of revolutionary organization, but its total effectiveness and real political strength are extremely difficult to assess. The bulk of the Vietcong's organizational efforts have been expended in rural areas and it is there that they are strongest. (The government controls all of the cities, major towns, and provincial capitals and all but a handful of the district seats.) There are indications, however, that sharply rising Vietcong taxation rates, increasingly frequent, resort to impressment to secure troops, and the Vietcong's manifest inability to deliver on political promises of earlier years are all beginning to erode their base of rural support. During the past year nearly 800,000 refugees fled from the hinterland to the vicinity of government-controlled towns. Some of these were fleeing from natural disasters, some from the simple hazards of war (though the direction in which persons of this category opted to flee is significant), but many were obviously endeavoring to get out from under the Vietcong. Furthermore, in assessing Communist claims of control it should be noted that over half of the rural population voted in the May 1965 provincial elections, despite Vietcong orders to boycott them.

In the cities, the Vietcong have an obvious terrorist capability but are politically quite weak—a fact of which they are aware and which, according to captured documents, causes them considerable embarrassment. They have been unable to turn the urban political ferment of the past 3 years to any obvious immediate advantage. None of the participants in the genuine social revolution now taking place in the urban areas of South Vietnam has sought Vietcong support or entertained overtures of political alliance. Though they have undoubtedly penetrated such groups as the Buddhists and the students, the Vietcong have made no visible headway in subverting or bringing them under the NLF banner. Just how weak the Vietcong are in the cities was demonstrated twice last fall (on Oct. 15 and Dec. 19) when two public calls by the Vietcong for a "general strike" went totally unheeded and produced no visible change whatsoever in the pattern of urban life.

Despite its leaders' obvious organizational talents and revolutionary skills, the Vietcong movement is beset with a number of fundamental weaknesses. It has no universally appealing theme in any way comparable to the Vietminh's espousal of anti-French nationalism. Persistent propaganda efforts to portray the Americans as successor imperialists to the French have simply never taken hold. The concept of reunification has relatively little appeal for peasants who regard someone from the next province as an alien. The idea of reunification does appeal to politically minded urban elements, particularly to refugees from the north, but within such circles there is a great reluctance to accept the Vietcong's identification of reunification with political domination by the present Hanoi regime. Having lived through the sequence of historical events we have outlined, politically conscious Vietnamese are not easily deceived by the NLF's pretensions to independence and freedom from northern control, particularly since the military side of the Vietcong insurgency is now being waged with an ever larger number of North Vietnamese troops.

The current struggle in South Vietnam is a historically rooted, political phenomenon of infinite complexity, particularly since it involves an externally directed Communist drive for power interlarded with a genuine indigenous social revolution. In analyzing such a phenomenon, "truth" is often a function of one's angle of vision, and myth is not always easy to distinguish from reality. Despite the fact that there are many aspects of the current situation in Vietnam concerning which confident assertion is a mark of ignorance or disingenuous intent, there are certain aspects of the insurgency, and of the Vietcong structure through which it is being waged, which are not open to intellectually honest dispute.

There are unquestionably many non-Communists heroically serving in various components of the National Liberation Front out of a desire to redress genuine grievances or in the honest belief that they are thereby helping to build a better political structure for their native land. As an organization, however, the NLF is a contrived political mechanism with no indigenous roots, subject to the ultimate control of the Lao Dong Party in Hanoi.

The relationship between the Vietcong and the DRV is not that of politically like-minded allies. Instead, it is essentially the relationship between a field command and its parent headquarters. Such relationships are never free from elements of tension and discord. Within the Vietcong movement, and even within its controlling hierarchy, there are unquestionably varying judgments (at least privately held ones) about the wisdom of present tactics and the best course of future action. (There are obvious differences of opinion regarding the struggle in Vietnam even within the Lao Dong Party Politburo.) Nevertheless, the whole Vietcong organizational structure and chain of command has been carefully designed to minimize the risks of insubordination. Though for tactical reasons the overt propaganda outlets and spokesmen of the NLF sometimes take political positions which differ at least in emphasis from those emanating from Hanoi, the chances of the Vietcong's developing or adopting a genuinely independent political line in opposition to orders received from North Vietnam through the Lao Dong Party apparatus are slight indeed.

Finally, although the Vietcong organization is unquestionably a major factor in the South Vietnamese political scene, the NLF mechanism which it controls has no serious claim to being considered, as Hanoi insists, the "sole legitimate voice of the South Vietnamese people." Were it ever to be accepted as such, the record of what has happened in North Vietnam in the years since 1951 makes it abundantly clear what lies in store for the more than 16 million Vietnamese who live south of the 17th parallel, especially for those who have resolutely fought against the Vietcong insurgency from its inception.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield on the same terms to the distinguished senior Senator from Florida.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall of course vote for the pending bill. I

supported the bill in committee. I support the bill now.

Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, spoke at the Governor's Day luncheon of the Florida Citrus Showcase sponsored by the Florida Citrus Mutual in Winter Haven, Fla., on Friday, February 18, 1966, just a week after his return from Vietnam. His speech related in the main to his observations in Vietnam, with particular reference to food and the agricultural situation there.

I feel that Secretary Freeman's speech throws much light on conditions in Vietnam which are directly related to the contents of the pending bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the Secretary's speech printed in the RECORD in full at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN'S SPEECH AT THE GOVERNOR'S DAY LUNCHEON OF THE FLORIDA CITRUS SHOWCASE, SPONSORED BY THE FLORIDA CITRUS MUTUAL IN WINTER HAVEN, FLA., FEBRUARY 18, 1966

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished officers and leaders of Citrus Mutual, of the Citrus Showcase, the mayor of this lovely community, members of your State cabinet, your State treasurer, your commissioner of agriculture, members of the State legislature, leaders of the citrus industry, ladies, and gentlemen, I am delighted to be here. I am flattered that you would ask me back again. I was here with you about a year and a half ago and enjoyed it thoroughly and am certainly pleased to be here once again.

I want, today, to talk to you a little bit in broad terms about agriculture in the world in which we live. Agriculture is the key to world peace. Agriculture is the key to the victory in Vietnam.

First, however, I want to express my most sincere commendation to you, your organizations and to this industry, to the leadership, the foresight you have shown, to your excellent job of marketing. I remember quite vividly about a year ago, when your distinguished executive vice president, Bob Rutledge, who serves you so effectively, came to my office and reviewed and discussed with me some of your marketing plans. And I listened with special interest because I have been concerned. You had learned how, as our agriculture has generally, to produce mightily. Sometimes that really challenges us in this country.

It is a blessed thing for which we ought to be truly thankful, but we haven't always learned how to live with that abundance, how to market it, and how to effectively get it where it is needed at the terms and conditions and at the price where people will utilize it. And so to note the excellent progress in your new plant, the fine reception of the new concentrate, to note some of the good work you have done in marketing abroad, I am glad to have the chance as the Secretary of Agriculture to come here and say to you, well done.

A week ago today, I was in a little village in South Vietnam at a training camp called Vung Tau. I was sitting on a folding chair beside a canal listening to one of the most impressive men I have ever heard in my life. Dressed in a simple, black pajama, he outlined for me the course of training of the rural construction cadres, made up of peasant boys who volunteered to go back into their home provinces and villages to hold those villages, to pacify those villages, after the military has taken them away from the Vietcong.

He was a tremendously impressive fellow. Some had likened him to a saint. He said in a very soft voice that these young boys are looking for some meaning in their lives which had been wrecked by war. All their lives had been spent in a nation engaged in war. They have been pretty cynical, generally, as to their stake in its future. And he told a little legend, very simple, about the beautiful lady and the dragon and how an accommodation between the lady and the dragon was developed and sustained. The spiritual side of life was the beautiful lady, the materialistic and powerful side of life was the dragon, and the harmony of the two was what gave meaning to life.

He went on with some other legends, and then said in a soft voice, "to the Vietnamese, this is much more understandable than the material of communism. The boys who have gone out of here have learned to be for something. They go out to secure and to hold these villages and fight to hold them if necessary."

And then he developed some of the symbolism which was a powerful part of this training course. He gave me one of their graduation pins. It has a T–H symbol on it, somewhat like our own 4–H Club symbol. He drew a hammer and a sickle on the blackboard, and then put the T–H over it. The hammer and the sickle were obliterated and he said these boys are obliterating that hammer and sickle everywhere around Vietnam.

We then looked at the rifle range. These men, he told me, fire more ammunition than the regular troops that are trained for actual battle. Then we saw the classrooms where they get general exposure to health, vocational, and agricultural training.

At the conclusion of their rural construction training, the night before they graduate, they sit out all night long and make up their minds whether they want to take a pledge which is part of the graduation ceremony next day, and take on the responsibility for caring for the ideals which he outlined; self-discipline, service, honesty, mercy to the old, the sick and the needy. This was couched in the traditional Vietnamese terms rather than ours but the meaning was exactly the same.

He said that during the new year celebration, the big ceremony of Vietnam, down the road in a single military camp they had 50 percent AWOL; in a military police training school they had 25 percent AWOL. But there wasn't a single man in the rural construction cadre who left. I was tremendously interested in this training center, because they have a workable system and it's based on hard experience that can win peasant support and ultimately win the war in Vietnam.

The military struggle is a bitter, difficult, complicated one. You don't know who the enemy is a good share of the time. We have the power and the resource and the fighting capacity to win the fighting war. But that doesn't do much good if a week later the Vietcong infiltrate the area and take the village all over again. And that's what is happening. What's got to be done is this: We've got to win the hearts and minds of those poor people who have been promised and promised and promised and abused and decimated all these years.

Last year, 1,500 local government officials were brutally murdered, some of them tortured and captured, simply because they were doing a good job. The Vietcong is on an organized, purposeful program of terror and destruction. This would be the equivalent in the United States of 50,000 mayors and county commissioners. Now if 50,000 local officials in this country were murdered in one year—it's anybody's guess as to what it would mean. Now these boys who go out of this camp are to work with the military in areas being pacified or already pacified. They are to go into an area in teams of 59 men. They are highly trained; highly armed. They know how to use those weapons. They are highly motivated to help the peasants, but they are ready to fight. But they don't go into the countryside to fight, they go there to build.

And as Gen. Nguyen Duc Thang, Minister of Rural Construction, a very impressive young Vietnamese general, said to me, "we don't go to hit and run, we go to hit and stay." And they go to the villages—their home villages in many cases—and they seek to get close to where those people live; to let them know that their government believes in them, wants to help them, to give them a stake in life.

I said to the general, "Well, now, I am the head of a cadre and I'm going into a village that has just been reclaimed. What's the first thing I do?" He said to me, "You keep your mouth shut." I thought that was a pretty good answer. He said when those folks want some help, you help them to help themselves. You don't give them anything; because if you give them something, it's not really theirs. If the Vietcong destroy it, it is not their loss. But if you help them build something and the Vietcong destroys it, then it is their loss.

About 20,000 have been trained already, and their training will be stepped up. The Vietnamese Government has selected a number of villages to be pacified with the help of these cadres. This is a hardheaded, hard-hitting, systematic job of pacification. And it is, as I say, a thoroughly planned and purposeful one. It carries within it, I think, the formula of victory.

Now this is the meaning of the spirit of Honolulu. I have just been back a few days and I have been rather shocked to find a good bit of cynicism about this in some quarters. I have difficulty understanding that because in Honolulu the President dramatized for the attention of the entire world the best in principles, the best in standards, that this Nation has; that we built ourselves to greatness with service, humanitarianism, concern for the people.

This is a second front of a two-front war. We have to win the tough, hard, difficult military part of this war. But of equal importance has to be the second part, what they call a social revolution in Vietnam. The word revolution has a much more positive cast to it, and it is broadly used, to give an identity, to give a meaning, to give a purpose to the lives of those people so that when the Vietcong come in, the people will notify the authorities so they can be rooted out. If they hide the Vietcong, if they protect them, if they don't report them, then it is an almost impossible task. So there is a two-front, sharp, clear objective—an objective in which I think we can feel pride, that we as a nation go out not only to stop the onrush of communism, but also go on to start and carry forward the onrush of human and social betterment.

I submit to you here today that that won't be done if agriculture is not in the forefront in that effort. I said when I returned that in this war, fertilizer is just as important as bullets, and so it is. The essentials for effective agricultural production are ready, and we can make striking progress in agriculture in Vietnam.

What I found, really, was far beyond my expectations in light of the hardships under which those people live. If you ever wanted to see a justification for some of our dollars to be spent on helping other people, take a look at agriculture in Vietnam. It has only been 10 years and yet those little farmers, most of them tenants, or landowners with very small holdings, are using very modern practices of improved seed, fertilizer, chemicals, and pesticides, disease control in animals, and all the rest, whenever they can get it. They don't want it free. They want to buy it. But so far we haven't done as good

a job as we should, in making it available. But where it has been available, they make every effort to get it.

I talked to one peasant who walked 15 miles with a basket on his head to buy 50 pounds of fertilizer and get a little package of seed and walked 15 miles back to his little hamlet. He knew about fertilizer. He knew about improved seed. All he wanted was a chance to use them, because, when he does, his yield of rice goes up 50 percent. And when yields go up 50 percent, he can buy his kids some clothes, and they have a little money in the village to build a little school. They then build a little better home. Then they have a stake in something. Then when the Vietcong come in after it, they are prepared to fight, and inform, and resist. What we need to do is to integrate agriculture effectively in the forefront of the second front of this two-front war.

Last Sunday, I was on the coast about in the midlands in Vietnam in an area called Phan Rang. I stood on a little plot of land on the coast that was plain sand. It had been sand dunes. It had been government land. It had been levelled off. Chinese technicians from Taiwan were there. They worked with the Vietnamese farmers on new techniques in growing vegetables. An onion, an adaptation of the Granex onion out of Texas that had been adapted by one of our plant technicians—took them 4 years to do it—was being planted on that hectare of land the peasant had gotten as a part of the land reform program. He netted on that 2½ acres 200,000 piastres—that's $2,000 in American money. Growing rice in the same area, they were netting about $20 an acre.

That peasant had a little irrigation system. He and a dozen others had gone together to buy a little gasoline engine pump for a shallow well. They had put in a little irrigation works—some shallow ditches. We saw the water flowing out. Onions, garlic and other kinds of vegetables were growing profusely. I had a picture taken with him with a basket of onions and vegetables besides, of all things, a bright red motorbike. He had made a little money, the first thing he wanted was a motorbike. Comparatively, you'd buy a Cadillac. And maybe he will one day, too. But a motorbike is a desirable status symbol; it means transportation.

And in this same area, I went to the village where he lived. They had a little self-help program to build a warehouse. The material was made available to them by the Vietnamese Government with our help. The people built the warehouse themselves. They were renting space in it to dry garlic. The rent was being paid. The village had made a little money and they were putting it in a school and a health clinic.

This was the only place I went in Vietnam where the province chief could travel at night out in the countryside. Most of the time they would go to see the people during the day. This fellow said to me, "I don't bother these people who are working in the fields by going to see them in the daytime. I go out and see them in the night, when they are available."

He was able to do that because his area was pacified. If the Vietcong move into that area he would be notified. He was a tough soldier but he was very good with these people, and it is not a normal mandarin attitude, you know, to say, "I adapt myself to the people." Politicians do that in the United States. They do not normally do that in Asia. But this philosophy was going forward. He could go out at night, because if anybody infiltrated that area, he got the word. And when he got the word, he got the troops out there and the Vietcong didn't last very long. This was an example of what can be done. It isn't easy.

These peasants have been promised to death. They are pretty skeptical; pretty cynical. They have been terrorized, brutalized, murdered, taxed by both sides, run off their land, run back on their land, and they have been in this war for 20 years. But I feel, really, that the sense of hopelessness and complacency that seems to permeate some parts of this country is not permanent. There is a base, for real hope; that we can win this war; that we can help these people. This nation can be a real bastion for freedom if we remember that this is a two-front war, that force alone is ineffective, that to go along with it you have to have service, accomplishment, and build a stake in society.

A lot of people have asked me, "What about these young generals? Do they mean it and will they do it?" It's hard to tell. You can only make a judgment.

I spent 3 hours in an airplane with General Ky. He is 35 years old. He is the Prime Minister. He was the commanding general of their air corps; very colorful, very smart, no particular background in government as such. I met all the corps commanders and all the top generals. The ruling group is about a dozen. I found them, without exception, bright and alert. They said the right words, and they said them with feeling.

For example, General Ky said a number of times: "It is a military war and a war for the hearts of our people. We cannot win one without winning the other. But the war for the hearts of the people is more than a military tactic. It is a moral principle. We are trying to bring about a true social revolution. We are instituting a program for a better society."

He then went on to say, "I think that the present government by and large has the confidence of the people. I think it has a greater measure of support than any of the previous governments. But that's not enough. We must have a government which has been freely elected by the people. Despite the many tasks we have on our hands today, I feel we can take on one more. And one, which next to winning the war I speak about, is most important and that is building democracy in Vietnam."

Prime Minister Ky said extemporaneously when the Vice President left Saigon: "I am sure Mr. HUMPHREY, prior to his visit here, was not convinced of the ability of the young generals, sometimes called the young Turks, to rule our nation. I'm sure that now he must recognize that we are more civilian than the civilians, and we love freedom more than freemen and desire democracy more than you do in the United States."

The Prime Minister grabbed a microphone in Honolulu at the conclusion of the press conference and said, "I'm not a war lord. I'm tired of fighting. I've been shot at all my life. I risk assassination every day. I want to win this war and help my people." He said, "I don't have a car. I don't have any property," and went on to say that his stake was one of service.

Only time will tell how sincere and effective these young generals are.

I was impressed with them, with their ability and their dedication but also with the fact that they are a smart, tough bunch. They had to be to survive. Some of them have been wounded six times. They were fighting in the jungles almost before they could walk. To survive that and the political wars, the coups and the rest, they have to have something on the ball. And they know as sure as day follows night that they can't win that war, repel that invasion, and make Vietnam a free nation unless they can earn the support and loyalty of their people. And so for that reason if for no other reason, they are going about their business. They don't do it always like we do. They are not as efficient and effective as your Commissioner of Agriculture here, for example, and your State Treasurer. Not as experienced in government, but they are tough minded, alert, and determined.

I went to Vietnam and took with me at the President's instructions 10 of the best agricultural specialists in this country in the fields of crops, chemicals, livestock, irrigation, and fishing—and we came back feeling positive; not overwhelmingly optimistic, building glowing word pictures, but feeling that there is a real purpose and that this is not a hopeless morass, that this war can be won and that it is vitally important that it should be won. We also felt real pride in our own profession of agriculture, because it is the key. Agriculture is the key in Vietnam, as it is the key around the world in the great race taking place between food and people.

On February 10, the President sent to the Congress a great message, a food-for-freedom message, calling on this Nation to mobilize its agricultural resources and to wheel them into action to help those nations who would help themselves so that this race can be won and the world will be able to feed itself. This is the greatest challenge we face down the road.

All of us who work in this great area, then, work not only to serve our Nation and our communities. We stand right at the heartbeat of the future well-being of mankind. A world that isn't fed, a world plagued and dogged by famine and desperation and malnutrition, is never going to be a peaceful world. So as you skillfully carry forward your work in this great industry, we join in seeking to use the power that comes with this great capacity to produce and as a great free Nation to use it effectively, so other people can have as great a stake in freedom as we have and there is no stake where there is no food.

The challenge down the road is a great one but is one that I think we can meet. I came back from Vietnam challenged but reassured. We'll win this one as we have won them before.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania permit us to have the yeas and nays on final passage?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there has been some discussion in the last couple of minutes about the possible bombing or mining of Haiphong Harbor. I should like to call to the attention of the Senators the statement made by Secretary McNamara on page 177 of the record where he testified that since the tonnage required for the support of enemy troops in South Vietnam is relatively small, the function of mining the harbor of Haiphong—and I imagine it would be the same result from bombing the harbor of Haiphong—would not materially affect the course of the war itself.

I wonder if the committee is in accord with the view of the Secretary, that it would not presently be useful from our overall point of view to attack Haiphong either by bombing or mining.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That view was stated in an indirect fashion by General Wheeler, as I recall, in his testimony before the committee. I must say, with all due respect to General Wheeler—and I do have very genuine respect for him—that in my opinion it flies in the face of commonsense to say that the closing of the harbor at Haiphong has a lower priority than the bombing of the petroleum dumps, the

petroleum for which has come in through Haiphong Harbor.

It seems to me it would be self-evident even to a lay mind that it would be more effective to close the stopper of a bottle than to pour out the contents and set the bottle back down to be refilled. That is all that would be accomplished by clearing the petroleum dumps, because the next day a tanker could come into Haiphong and replenish these dumps.

There are a number of ways to close this harbor other than bombing. I am not committed altogether to closing the harbor by bombing. It so happens that there is a narrow waterway leading into the harbor. Two dredges work there constantly. Those dredges could be sunk by naval gunfire to close the harbor for a short period. It could be mined, or it could, if desired, be bombed; or a naval blockade could be established with a half dozen destroyers.

But I think it is self-evident that the closing of the harbor itself would be more injurious to the war effort of the North Vietnamese than bombing supplies, even as important as a petroleum dump, which can be immediately replenished by another tanker coming into that harbor. It simply does not make sense to me to say that closing the harbor has a much lower priority than these petroleum dumps.

Mr. CLARK. So to that extent, the Senator disagrees with Secretary McNamara?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Oh, yes, indeed, I disagree flatly with him on that point, and also disagree with General Wheeler.

I wish to add that at one time all the Chiefs of Staff thought that closing the harbor at Haiphong should have a very high priority, and it is only of late that there has been any disagreement among the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Gladly.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Georgia brought up the point I intended to bring up, there is disagreement in testimony before the committee. So I hope the American people will be informed, and information not classified. There is disagreement among the military as to the importance of closing the harbor at Haiphong.

Why should they not close that harbor? Only two railroads come down from China. One which we have not been hitting since the resumption is the railroad from the industrial section of Manchuria into Vietnam. The other railroad comes from west to east. From the standpoint of commonsense and economy, why would they use that? But we have been hitting that latter railroad. There are a few roads which in the main I understand are not in too good shape.

But nobody could know what is coming through the Haiphong Harbor. Testimony before the committee admits, a very large majority of the oil moving into North Vietnam comes through the harbor at Haiphong. Obviously, those trucks that go down the Ho Chi Minh Trail must have that oil to be used. Statements have been made that it is thought relatively little ammunition comes through the harbor; but who knows what is in the boxes on the docks of that harbor? There is no reason for anybody to extrapolate what the many ships going into that harbor have on them. Anybody who looks at the map knows the Haiphong Harbor is the easiest, least expensive, and most effective way of getting in the tremendous amounts of supplies coming into North Vietnam to kill our troops in South Vietnam. If anybody does not think most of it is coming through the harbor, where else it is coming from?

The answer we hear is, "They don't need very much." But I was down in the Mekong Delta in recent weeks, and saw hundreds of magnificent weapons—made mostly in China, but also quite a few from Soviet Russia—on exhibit in the center of the town square in Can Tho. That exhibit showed to my satisfaction where those weapons were coming from. If they do not come over the railroad we are not attacking, and if they do not come from the harbor, where are they coming from? As we know, the Communists do not have any logistic support in the way of air power.

Mr. CLARK. I say to my friend, the Senator from Georgia, I have only one or two questions more. The hour is getting late; we are almost ready to vote. I should like, if I can, to finish it up.

On page 178, the Secretary of Defense testified that the industries in North Vietnam contribute very little to the supplies used in the south for the prosecution of the war.

He also said that wiping out the entire industry of North Vietnam would have no measurable effect upon their capability to furnish the supplies they are presently supplying to the Communist forces in South Vietnam.

Does the Senator agree with that?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. No; I do not agree with it in toto. I think it is substantially correct. But I have information and we have had some evidence that there is an iron foundry in the vicinity of Hanoi, which manufactures literally millions of hand grenades that are being used in this war.

With that exception, I think that the Secretary's statement is approximately correct.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his patience. I have one final question.

It appears in the hearings that if we were to destroy the petroleum depots in North Vietnam, and they got no fuel for their trucks in the south, they—that is, the enemy—could move the quantities of supplies now being moved by animal and by manpower. At page 299 of the hearings, Admiral McDonald asserted that the Vietcong in South Vietnam need few petroleum items, because they walk everywhere.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Well, that is true when one measures their equipment against the vehicles that are operated in modern warfare.

But petroleum is still a very essential element of war. Most of the materiel that is carried from Haiphong down into South Vietnam over the many branches of the Ho Chi Minh trail is carried by trucks. We have had the good luck once or twice lately to find a truck convoy exposed on the roads and attack it from the air, and have destroyed a great many of the trucks.

Those people, however, are resourceful. We had evidence before the committee that they were using elephants to carry supplies, and that they were using large numbers of people, bearers, who can carry three or four times their own weight.

Mr. CLARK. And bicycles.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Yes; that they would put on a bicycle 300 or 400 pounds of equipment, and push it along.

They are very resourceful people. They have been engaged in a war of this nature now for more than 20 years.

Mr. CLARK. Since the Japanese moved in.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. They have had a great deal of experience in it, and are probably the most efficient guerrilla fighters on earth today, and would compare favorably with any in recorded history.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend the Senator from Georgia, and I yield the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request, and yield to me for a moment?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I mention to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] asked a question which has not been answered, and I would appreciate the help of the Senator in supplying an answer.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I thank the Senator for the compliment implied.

Mr. SCOTT. I am sure the Senator has information which would be helpful and useful.

The reference made by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania was to page 178, the testimony of Secretary McNamara, wherein he stated:

> The industry in the north is so small that it plays a very little role in the economy of the north, and I think any of the analysts who have studied the problem would say it could be completely eliminated and not reduce in any substantial way the contribution of the North to South Vietnam.

Paraphrasing the Senator from Missouri, he said that if they are getting their material through Haiphong, it does not amount to anything, and if North Vietnam is not contributing anything of substance to South Vietnam, meaning to the South Vietnamese, the anti——

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Vietcong.

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, the Vietcong, in other words—then said the Senator from Missouri, where are the Vietcong—if I can paraphrase him further—where are the Vietcong getting their supplies from?

What would the Senator from Georgia say to that?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I would say that they are getting it from a great many sources. As I stated a few moments ago, undoubtedly thousands of hand grenades are being made in North Vietnam. An iron foundry, I believe, is located on the outskirts of Hanoi, or it could be on the outskirts of Haiphong, but they do have one iron foundry which does make some equipment; but, the great bulk of their equipment, all of their sophisticated equipment, such as 50 caliber machine guns, 55 millimeter recoilless rifles, their burp guns, and rifles—some of which have telescopic sights which can be favorably compared to any weapons we turn out, the great bulk of them come either from China or from Russia. Most of those which come from Russia are actually made at the Skoda Works in Czechoslovakia.

Mr. SCOTT. Therefore, they have to come down from China, not from Russia. Earlier testimony indicates that the bulk of petroleum comes in through Haiphong, yet I am told to ignore that.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. It practically all comes in through Haiphong. Most of the weapons come in through Haiphong. That is the reason why I say that we should close the port at Haiphong. It is a natural step for us to take.

Mr. SCOTT. I completely agree with the Senator from Georgia that it should be closed in one of the several ways the Senator has mentioned, but we are asked to believe something which, to me, is a semantic impossibility. We are asked to believe that North Vietnam contributes nothing to South Vietnam, that anyway it does not matter if petroleum does come in, although it does come into Haiphong from Russia, that the economy of North Vietnam really contributes nothing to South Vietnam and therefore we should not worry about it. Admiral McDonald clarifies the situation further by saying that it does not matter about motorized transportation because everyone in Vietnam walks, anyway. He goes on to explain that last statement by saying that they walk from the 19th parallel but use motorized transportation from the north. If they use motorized transportation from the north, let me observe that I know very little about motors but I do know that they require fuel, lubricants, gasoline, yet we are told that while this comes entirely from Russia yet the contribution from North Vietnam really amounts to nothing to South Vietnam. Now, let me say to the Senator from Georgia, the more testimony I read, the more confused I get. Can the Senator help me find my way through this morass of semantics?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I had assumed that the statement referred to by the Secretary referred mainly to principal weapons which might be manufactured in North Vietnam. I do not believe that the Secretary would take a position the weapons did not come through, because North Vietnam is the only place they could come from. I believe that he is referring to sources of production more than he is referring to sources of supply.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator will recall in one of the hearings that captured North Vietnamese weapons were displayed as coming from China or Russia.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Certainly, none of them was manufactured in North Vietnam.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. But they had to come in through North Vietnam.

Mr. SCOTT. Well, if the contribution of North Vietnam to South Vietnam is not worth anything, in the words of the Secretary—if the Secretary is right—"it could be completely eliminated," referring to the industry of the north, "and not reduce in any substantial way the contribution of the North to South Vietnam."

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. He is bypassing the fact that the North Vietnamese people are receiving oil and Chinese and Russian weapons; is that not a fact?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. As I stated, I thought the Secretary was referring to sources of production and not sources of supply.

Of course, North Vietnam has a very limited industry. They do manufacture some weapons, but the principal weapons being utilized against us are made in China or sent from Russia. They are the two principal sources of supply. They are supplying them with vast quantities of sophisticated, deadly, and lethal weapons.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the appropriation for military construction requested in this supplemental bill amounts to $1,238,400,000, distributed among the services as follows: Department of the Army, $509,700,000; Department of the Navy, $254,600,000; Department of the Air Force, $274,100,000; and Department of Defense, emergency fund, $200 million.

I would like to point out that this is only a further increment to military construction funds for southeast Asia. To date we have already appropriated for southeast Asia, approximately $417,700,000, distributed as follows: Army, $162,200,000; Navy, $117,600,000; Air Force, $137,900,000.

By the way of explanation, I would like to point out that funds spent, funds available, and the funds presently in this bill will make a total appropriation for military construction, southeast Asia, amounting to $1,656,100,000.

In view of the urgency of this construction money for southeast Asia, the Military Construction Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, did not review the many projects in this bill in our usually thorough manner, meaning that we did not go into a detailed review of each individual project and the holding of extensive hearings. A great deal of the information concerning these projects is classified; however, the Department of Defense and the military services did furnish the subcommittee with classified information as to the location of projects and the intended scope of construction.

This bill contains language which will insure that the Congress will be fully informed as to how the Department of Defense and the military services expend these appropriations. I am sure everyone in this body knows my views concerning the constitutional responsibility of the Congress in matters of defense policy. There is in this supplemental bill, section 102, subsection B, language which reads as follows:

(b) Within 30 days after the end of each quarter, the Secretary of Defense shall render to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, a report with respect to the estimated value by purpose, by country, of support furnished from such appropriations.

I wish to point out to my colleagues of the Senate that part of this construction money will be expended on permanent facilities both in the United States and overseas; for example, money will be spent for construction on bases for Guam, Okinawa, Wake Island, and in the United States which I will discuss later in this presentation.

A major construction effort is required to provide the proper logistic base from which to project our military operations in South Vietnam. The major portion of the military construction funds in this bill amounting to $736,600,000 is for construction in South Vietnam; approximately $325 million is for facilities outside of South Vietnam to support our logistics and communication bases; and $63,421,000 is for construction in the United States, which is solely to support our southeast Asia operations. As further examples, we plan to spend approximately $36 million in the Republic of the Philippines mainly for supply and operational facilities including hospitals and utilities. Thirteen million, six hundred and ninety thousand dollars is earmarked for Guam for hospitals and medical facilities, operational facilities and troop housing.

I would like to close, Mr. President, by saying that the effectiveness of our highly trained forces with their modern equipment will be greatly enhanced when the items contained in this military construction program begin to be used.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair). Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday, the Senate will now proceed to vote on H.R. 13546.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 87, nays 2, as follows:

[No. 59 Leg.]

YEAS—87

Aiken	Fulbright	Mundt
Allott	Harris	Murphy
Anderson	Hart	Muskie
Bartlett	Hartke	Nelson
Bass	Hayden	Neuberger
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Pearson
Bible	Holland	Pell
Boggs	Hruska	Prouty
Brewster	Inouye	Proxmire
Burdick	Jackson	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Ribicoff
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Robertson
Cannon	Kennedy, Mass.	Russell, Ga.
Carlson	Kennedy, N.Y.	Saltonstall
Case	Lausche	Scott
Church	Long, Mo.	Simpson
Clark	Long, La.	Smathers
Cooper	Magnuson	Smith
Cotton	Mansfield	Stennis
Curtis	McCarthy	Symington
Dirksen	McClellan	Talmadge
Dodd	McGee	Thurmond
Dominick	McGovern	Tower
Douglas	McIntyre	Tydings
Eastland	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	Mondale	Williams, Del.
Ervin	Monroney	Yarborough
Fannin	Morton	Young, N. Dak.
Fong	Moss	Young, Ohio

NAYS—2

Gruening	Morse

NOT VOTING—11

Bayh	Kuchel	Pastore
Gore	McNamara	Russell, S.C.
Hill	Miller	Sparkman
Javits	Montoya	

So the bill (H.R. 13546) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] again has used his unmatched military expertise and his strong and articulate advocacy to obtain the Senate's overwhelming approval of the defense supplemental appropriation.

Again, that outstanding statesman has won for our fighting men, whose vital needs he knows so well, the decisive support they deserve so much. All America is grateful for his deep and abiding devotion. For all America recognizes that he, more than anyone, has assured the reality of his avowed objective: To see that our soldiers are better supplied than any other fighting men on earth. No man has worked harder to achieve that goal.

The success of this vital appropriation was due also to the efforts of the Senate's highly able patriarch, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] who backed this measure with the wise advocacy which has characterized his many decades of outstanding service in this body. To the distinguished senior Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], a debt of gratitude is owed for their strong and articulate support.

Additionally, we are indebted as always to the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] for his cooperative support. The eloquent plea for swift and decisive Senate action by the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee helped immensely to assure this great success.

We appreciate too the help given by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and by the junior Senators from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] and Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], whose analytical discussions were typically provocative and enlightening. To the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] goes high commendation for again applying his cooperative efforts to assure the prompt and orderly action of the Senate on this important measure.

Finally, I personally am grateful to the Senate as a whole both for its swift and efficient action and for giving its unequivocal backing to those brave fighting men who deserve it so much.

DEATH OF MILTON KELLY, OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have just noticed on the AP ticker a news item to the effect that an old and good friend, Milton Kelly, Associated Press reporter since 1930, died today in George Washington Hospital after a long illness.

I have known Milton Kelly for many years. He was a man of sound integrity. He was a fair man. He did his job well.

I have watched him in his illness over the past several years. I have noticed him come back time after time after time, always with a cheery smile. He always did a good job. He was always considerate of others.

It is with deep sadness that I note the passing of Milt Kelly. Mrs. Mansfield and I extend our deepest sympathy to his family. Milt was a good friend and a good man.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will permit me to associate myself with all he has said with respect to Milton Kelly.

It has been my pleasure and privilege to deal with hundreds of members of the press during my public career, which has stretched over a number of years, but I have never known a man I trusted more completely in discussing matters that would help him with the story, but were not for publication, than I did Milton Kelly. He was indeed a gentleman to the manner born, a man of integrity and courage. We mourn his passing, and extend our sympathy to his family.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I, too, wish to associate myself with the remarks just made. It was with sadness that I learned about the passing of Milt Kelly. I knew him as a fine, searching newspaperman, a fine reporter, a man of great integrity and character.

I am saddened to hear the news of his death. I am sure all of us extend to his family our feelings of deep sadness and affection.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I was saddened to learn of the passing of G. Milton Kelly. Milt Kelly, as he was affectionately known, was a highly respected and capable journalist whose pleasant and affable way won many friends for him in his tenure as an Associated Press reporter assigned to the U.S. Senate.

His coverage of some of the most controversial and heated investigations which took place in the Senate during his service here was noted for its objectivity and fairness to all sides. Milt will be sorely missed by the Members of the Senate, his many friends, and by his colleagues in the journalism profession.

AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES, FILE REPORTS, AND SIGN BILLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and the House of Representatives; that committees be authorized to file reports; and that the Vice President or President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TIRE SAFETY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when S. 2669, the tire safety bill, is reported from

the Committee on Commerce it be made the pending business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. The bill just read is to be the pending business on Friday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Montana expect disposition of that bill on Friday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not know.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The bill as being reported by the committee has been worked over, and practically all of the committee is unanimous in the reporting of the bill. Several sections were modified and amended. I do not expect too much opposition to the bill as reported. The bill merely affects uniform tire safety as against another bill on which we are holding hearings which deals with automobile safety.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator anticipate a rollcall vote on Friday?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would like to have a rollcall vote on the bill when we are all through with it. That depends on how far we get with the bill on Friday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator insist on a rollcall vote?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would not insist on a rollcall vote.

Mr. MORSE. I think if the Senator wants it we should have it. It may be necessary to rearrange our programs so that those of us who do not wish to miss rollcall votes may be present.

I do not understand why we quit on Tuesday and reconvene on Friday.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This bill has not been reported. We are working on the report. I believe it will be filed late today. It is doubtful. It may be tomorrow morning. I would be glad to accommodate any Senators if there is sufficient interest in a rollcall vote and the leadership says we will vote on it at a time certain on Monday.

Mr. MORSE. I am not speaking for myself, although I am included in what I say, but I am advised that several Members of the Senate plan to be away on Friday for various party affairs—I mean political party affairs—and perhaps we could have a vote on Monday and not have a vote on Friday, in view of the fact that there is this long postponement from Tuesday until Friday when we are ready to stay here during the week and do business. I am ready to stay Friday, but I wish to know if it is necessary to cancel my engagement on Friday to be here to cast my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; I would not say that. We will see what we can do. I am certain this can be worked out to the satisfaction of all Senators.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Washington would be the last to suggest otherwise.

USE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1046, Senate 801.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill, S. 801, to improve the balance-of-payments position of the United States by permitting the use of reserved foreign currencies in lieu of dollars for current expenditures.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 801

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any foreign currencies held by the United States which have been or may be reserved or set aside for specified programs or activities of any agency of the Government may be used by Federal agencies for any authorized purpose, except (1) that reimbursement shall be made to the Treasury from applicable appropriations of the agency concerned, and (2) that any foreign currencies so used shall be replaced when needed for the purpose for which originally reserved or set aside.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1078), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to permit Federal agencies to use any authorized foreign currencies held by the United States which have been or may be reserved or set aside for specified programs or activities of any agency of the Government. The bill would require that reimbursement must be made to the Treasury from applicable appropriations of the agency seeking the funds and foreign currencies so used must be replaced when needed for the purpose for which originally reserved or set aside.

GENERAL STATEMENT

S. 801 was introduced by Senators BOGGS and DOMINICK on January 28, 1965, and was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee. Comments from the following agencies were requested: Treasury, State, Agriculture, and General Accounting. All of these agencies have submitted favorable reports. No objections to the bill have been brought to the attention of the committee.

An identical bill, S. 2115, 88th Congress, was considered by the committee and reported to the Senate on March 3, 1964 (S. Rept. 932). S. 2115 passed the Senate on March 6, 1964. The bill was referred to the House Ways and Means Committee, but no action was taken before adjournment.

S. 801 would provide on a permanent basis authority which Congress has provided on an annual basis for the fiscal years 1964, 1965, and 1966 by the inclusion of an appropriate provision in the Public Works Appropriation Act for those fiscal years.

The following excerpt from the statement made by Senator BOGGS when he introduced the earlier bill explains clearly the way S. 801 is intended to operate:

"If we had a million lire in an Italian bank and the money was earmarked for an educational exchange program, for instance, the lire would simply lie there until a program was begun requiring use of the lire.

"Under the change I propose, the disbursing officer attached to our Italian Embassy could draw out that money to pay authorized U.S. obligations. Whether he drew out 100,000 lire or 500,000 lire, or the whole amount, the educational exchange program in question would still be credited with a million lire on U.S. Treasury books. When the program needed the money, it would be provided either from lire on hand or lire purchased with dollars.

"The Embassy, on the other hand, would have had its account lessened by the amount of lire spent. The net effect of this bookkeeping and banking interchange would be to use the available foreign funds and keep U.S. dollars in U.S. hands."

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I wish to thank the majority leader for bringing up S. 801 at this time. It will be of substantial importance in solving the balance-of-payments problem. It occurs to me that it is a step that should have been taken much earlier. I hope that it will be possible for the House to press forward early enough so that action on the bill in that body can be taken in this session.

Again, I thank the distinguished Senator from Montana for having brought the bill up at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It was a pleasure to do so.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

REPORT ENTITLED "RESPONSES TO INQUIRIES ABOUT THE NORTHEAST POWER FAILURE"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1079)

Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, submitted an interim report of that committee entitled "Responses to Inquiries About the Northeast Power Failure November 9 and 10, 1965," which was ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Rear Adm. Willard J. Smith, U.S. Coast Guard, to be Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, with the rank of admiral;

Capt. William B. Ellis, Capt. Douglas B. Henderson, Capt. Russell R. Waesche, Jr., and Capt. Mark A. Whalen, for promotion to the grade of rear admirals.

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. BENNETT:

S. 3117. A bill to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Utah State University; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3118. A bill to permit the city of Senatobia, Miss., to count certain expenditures as a local grant-in-aid to the east Senatobia urban renewal project; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 3119. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, so as to prevent the loss of veteran pension benefits as the result of increases in social security benefits authorized by the Social Security Amendments of 1965; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3120. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Pigford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 3121. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department, and for other purposes;

S. 3122. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended;

S. 3123. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, and for other purposes; and

S. 3124. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries of officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. TOWER, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. DOMINICK:

S.J. Res. 148. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit voluntary participation in prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

RESOLUTION

STUDY AND INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY OF ANY MATTER PERTAINING TO THE DISPLAY AND USE OF THE U.S. FLAG

Mr. TOWER submitted a resolution (S. Res. 237) to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to make a study and investigation of any matter pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. TOWER, which appears under a separate heading.)

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO THE DISPLAY AND USE OF THE FLAG

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, present law governs the display of our flag, which stands as a symbol of our great Nation, of our heritage of liberty and justice for all. One of the primary purposes for the law, is of course, to insure that our flag is properly displayed and properly respected.

In recent years, the Congress has drawn together "the existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag," which can be found in Public Law 829 of the 77th Congress and in Public Law 107 and 396 of the 83d Congress. In my opinion, a further review of such customs and rules is now necessary in order to insure continued proper respect for our flag.

I am, therefore, today submitting a resolution authorizing a comprehensive study and investigation of any and all matters pertaining to the display and use of our flag, with a view to determining the need for, or the desirability of enacting new legislation with respect to display and use of the flag.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD and lie on the table for 10 days so that others may cosponsor it if they desire.

In recent years there have been abuses in the display of the American flag and in the use of the flag in design and decoration of items of clothing. While none of these instances has involved intentional disrespect to the flag, I believe rules and regulations for flag use and display should be further studied and clarified.

Congress has previously drawn together the rules and customs pertaining to display of the flag as the symbol of our Nation, our heritage of liberty and our devotion to justice for all. It is fully consistent for Congress now to check those rules to see if an updating would be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGOVERN in the chair). The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Texas.

The resolution (S. Res. 237) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. RES. 237

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a comprehensive study and investigation of any and all matters pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States with a view to determining the need for or the desirability of enacting new legislation with respect to the display and use of the flag of the United States.

SEC. 2. The Committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, through January 31, 1967, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

THE FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATIONS OF CERTAIN WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS—AN AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 507

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I introduce an amendment to S. 3034, a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to engage in a feasibility investigation of certain water resource development proposals. The bill, which was introduced by the chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, was made necessary by enactment of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act of 1965. Section 8 requires that after July 1, 1966, the Secretary of the Interior cannot prepare feasibility reports under reclamation law for water resource projects without specific legislative authorization.

I offer an amendment to S. 3034 for the purpose of including two irrigation pumping units, Fort Thompson unit and Grass Rope unit, one on each side of the Missouri River in central South Dakota. Both projects were included in the South Dakota pumping division, a part of the Missouri River Basin project as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944. Four other pumping units were previously included in S. 3034. All of these irrigation pumping units were part of the "Report on South Dakota Pumping Division, South Dakota Missouri River Basin Project" prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation in 1959.

The Fort Thompson irrigation pumping unit is located in Buffalo County, S. Dak., and lies in the Crow Creek Indian Reservation. The Grass Rope unit is in Lyman County, S. Dak., and is situated in the Lower Brule Indian Reservation.

Fort Thompson would provide irrigation for some 7,500 acres—2,300 of which is Indian land. The Grass Rope unit consists of 4,500 acres of which 3,500 acres is either Indian tribal land or Indian allocated land. Both units are particularly important to provide a needed impetus to the economy of these Indian reservations; they lie in a semiarid region, where the average annual precipitation varies from 15 inches to about 24 inches. The predominant crops are wheat and other small grains. With irrigation, this would switch to corn and forage crops. The assurance of a steady feed supply would result in more livestock raising and fattening.

Without an assured water supply, these lands produce only a fraction of their potential. Irrigation would increase production on the lands irrigated and permit more efficient use of the adjacent dry lands. The stabilized production on the irrigable acres would have a general stabilizing effect on the economy of the whole area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 507) was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 14, 1966, the names of Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. THURMOND were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3081) to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to make it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to impose sanctions against its members for exceeding production quotas, introduced by Mr. DOMINICK on March 14, 1966.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that Mr. GROSS of Iowa had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference of the two Houses on the bill (H.R. 6845) to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act, vice Mr. CORBETT, of Pennsylvania, excused.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 10553) to preserve the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, for congressional employees receiving certain congressional staff fellowships, and it was signed by the Vice President.

WHERE DOES DE GAULLE GO FROM HERE?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, all of us are here becoming increasingly apprehensive about the actions being taken by the head of the French Government, Gen. Charles de Gaulle.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Where Does De Gaulle Go From Here?" published recently in one of America's great newspapers, the Kansas City Star, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WHERE DOES DE GAULLE GO FROM HERE?

The myth that Charles de Gaulle is the only practical major statesman in the Western world dies hard, but that it is dying, of this there now seems little serious doubt.

The President of France professes to believe, in effect, that the postwar threat of Communist aggression—whether from the Soviet Union or Red China—no longer requires coordinated precautionary action on the part of countries dedicated to the twin principles of human freedom and national independence. Since 1958, therefore, he has gradually geared his foreign policy to liberate the French people from any form of what he likes to call "vassalage" to the United States, based on the persistence of that threat.

In Europe, De Gaulle's "realism" apparently demands that France at the earliest opportunity renounce the fundamental commitments it assumed 17 years ago with respect to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This opportunity will be presented in 1969, when the 20-year treaty automatically comes up for revision. The Organization's 14 other members already are on notice that France then intends to withdraw from all integrated defense arrangements, which lie at the core of the NATO concept, offering, as a substitute, to enter into a system of bilateral military alliances of the conventional type.

In Asia, this same political philosophy has led De Gaulle to shatter any possibility of a common Western front designed to contain the expansionist ambitions of the Chinese Communist Government. (These are currently disguised as the promotion of "wars of national liberation," but only the other day they were nakedly revealed along India's northern frontier.) French policy presupposes no need to avoid another Munich-type appeasement in Vietnam, evidently on the theory that Red China is not embarked on any course even remotely resembling Nazi Germany's of a generation back.

At first, and for some time thereafter, the President of France had articulate disciples throughout the West who welcomed his essentially nationalistic approach as a refreshing exercise in commonsense, as opposed to the dangerously fuzzy internationalist point of view. More recently their voices seem to have grown less confident. At least, the chorus of praise certainly has not swollen, nor has any other responsible Western statesman joined the De Gaullist camp. And last week's exchange of messages between Paris and Washington came close to giving the game away.

De Gaulle, it appears, makes a sharp distinction where NATO is concerned. France, he has indicated, is willing to preserve the outward facade of the organization as a regional defense arrangement within the framework of the United Nations Charter. What it will not tolerate after 1969 is a continuation of NATO's inner structure, providing for the integration of all military forces assigned to the organization and for the stationing of foreign units on French territory without being directly under French command.

There cannot be the slightest question as to what acceptance of this requirement would entail. The function of NATO, as originally conceived, was to create something heretofore unknown in peacetime, a wholly cohesive multinational defense force, with land, sea and air arms, ready at a moment's notice to repel an attack on any member. In substance, De Gaulle would have that instrumentality replaced by an assembly of strictly national components (or components under the command of the country where they happened to be deployed), with what would amount to loose coordination at the policy level.

Here, by general admission, is the difference between day and night. De Gaulle rationalizes his proposition on the twin assumptions that the peril of a Communist attack on Western Europe has diminished since 1949 to a point where a capacity for instant response is no longer necessary and that France's sovereignty on its own soil must be upheld at any cost to the efficiency of that response. On the first of those assumptions the French President may be right or wrong. Neither the United States nor, presumably, any of France's other NATO partners is prepared to run the tremendous risk involved in a misjudgment.

On the second assumption, however, De Gaulle has implicitly undermined his own case by asking for a military alliance with this country. For if France is capable—as it was not in two previous world wars—of meeting its own security needs after the disemboweling of NATO, why such a request to be allowed to remain under the defense umbrella of the United States? Was it not precisely recognition of this country's primary role in NATO that produced the talk of intolerable subservience for a proud people?

The conclusion becomes inescapable that De Gaulle wants to have his cake of precommitted American protection but to eat it at the same time in a more palatable form which will permit him to pose as independent of all such international nonsense. The difficulty with that ingenuous gambit is, as President Johnson promptly informed him, that France cannot have the confection he seeks. The United States simply will not fall in with a fragmentation of its responsibilities to the Atlantic community.

From the very narrowest interpretation of France's self-interest, moreover, De Gaulle's proposal for gutting NATO must look to a friendly outsider like folly compounded. That organization does not merely represent a mechanism for deterring an armed assault against his country from any direction and thus forestalling the necessity to improvise a collective defense after the fact, as has arisen twice in living memory. (In both instances there was time for such a luxury, which may not be available on the next occasion.)

NATO also has turned out simultaneously to supply the French another and more particular safeguard. The integration of West Germany's total military establishment into a regional structure, thereby precluding its use hereafter as a threat to any other NATO partner, constituted an almost miraculous dividend for a neighboring country which the Germans had invaded three times in the last century. The possibility of a revival of the militaristic spirit has worried many liberal Germans since the end of the Second World War, to say nothing of the West at large. But no country, obviously, has a bigger stake than France in averting such a development.

What, then, is to be made of a proposition that would destroy this procedure for giving a major nation the physical security it has every right to possess, without conferring upon it, once more, the capability of separate aggressive action? Surely even De Gaulle cannot expect successfully to claim privileges for his country and deny them to West Germany. Has the president's self-deception over the greatness of France (in physical terms) at last blinded him to a still greater potential immediately to the east? Has his sense of history so far deserted him that he no longer shares his countrymen's ancient nightmare?

Or does De Gaulle think that his proposed American alliance would be sufficient for all eventualities, so that he can dream in peace of a time when France's spiritual image will dominate the world? The mystical strain in this distinguished Frenchman, which rendered him such a difficult colleague in the recent wartime alliance, may not bother those who have pronounced him today the most down-to-earth leader of the free world. It has, however, grown into a steadily increasing source of anxiety and exasperation for everyone else, including a considerable number of his own compatriots, chiefly because of a geographical accident which has given France a wholly disproportionate power to disrupt cooperative planning, whether in NATO or the European Common Market.

Thus far the President of France appears to have had his way in blocking any advance, through the second of those institutions, toward a United States of Europe. But on the Atlantic front last week he was finally confronted by a long-delayed moment of truth. Firmly, if politely, President Johnson told him that while revision in the North Atlantic treaty was susceptible to negotiation, the United States would not be party to any eviscerating operation or, equally, any decisions not taken in full consultation with all members of NATO. (Long ago, it may be remembered, De Gaulle had proposed a British-French-American triumvirate to run the organization.)

Where does De Gaulle go from here? It is a nice question, of interest to the entire

West. As for Asia, De Gaulle might reasonably conclude he has done fairly well. In place of a former, and deeply tarnished, French presence he has substituted what might be described as a French individuality, completely disassociated from those of France's traditional allies, the United States and Great Britain.

De Gaulle (the practical man) advocates the evacuation of all American forces from South Vietnam, in return for an unenforceable neutralization of all southeast Asia—mainly, it would seem, through the device of coalition governments in which the Communists are to participate. He apparently has managed to sell this unattractive idea not only to many nonalined nations but also to a substantial number of Western European countries preoccupied by their own affairs and anxious to avoid any involvement at so great a distance.

The chance that Red China, with a rocket-deliverable nuclear armament, might ultimately prove a direct menace to France seems to have eluded his imagination. Or it may be that, at least subconsciously, he feels free to suggest so perilous a course, knowing that it will probably never be implemented. Nevertheless, there are signs that even here his advice is making little or no progress among Asian peoples who have the most to lose and who grow more and more skeptical of Chinese Communist motives. How strong his support has been in Western Europe remains debatable, apart from an understandable desire—in the light of postwar exhaustion and end-of-colonialism confusion—to keep aloof.

At home De Gaulle's backing has begun to fluctuate. There is a little more vocal criticism of his foreign policy, especially in relation to the European and Atlantic communities. But the President seemingly continues to be regarded by a majority of his countrymen as indispensable. However much some of them may personally disagree with his international program, they clearly tend to consider its acceptance as a lesser evil than the constant fear of a reversion to the kind of feeble government France experienced prior to 1958. Furthermore, many Frenchmen presumably emerged from the trauma induced by the traitorous surrender of their country and its costly aftermath with a natural hunger to be left alone.

Unfortunately, the contemporary world, as seen from this side of the Atlantic, is not one in which any country can retire behind a maginot line and believe itself safe by strictly minding its own domestic business. Still less can it expect indefinitely to receive the benefits of a free world order, without offering full reciprocal contributions. In essence, this is what President Johnson pointed out to De Gaulle last week. Where the President of France will go from here no one can foretell. But he has now been warned that, as far as the United States is concerned, at present he is going exactly nowhere—either in Europe or in Asia.

UNIFORM DATES FOR DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1404) to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Uniform Time Act of 1966".

SEC. 2. It is the policy of the United States to promote the adoption and observance of uniform time within the standard time zones prescribed by the Act entitled "An Act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States", approved March 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 450; 15 U.S.C. 261–264), as modified by the Act entitled "An Act to transfer the Panhandle and Plains section of Texas and Oklahoma to the United States standard central time zone", approved March 4, 1921 (41 Stat. 1446; 15 U.S.C. 265). To this end the Interstate Commerce Commission is authorized and directed to foster and promote widespread and uniform adoption and observance of the same standard of time within and throughout each such standard time zone.

SEC. 3. (a) During the period commencing at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday of April of each year and ending at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday of October of each year, the standard time of each zone established by the Act of March 19, 1918 (15 U.S.C. 261–264), as modified by the Act of March 4, 1921 (15 U.S.C. 265), shall be advanced one hour and such time as so advanced shall for the purposes of such Act of March 9, 1918, as so modified, be the standard time of such zone during such period; except that any State may by law exempt itself from the provisions of this subsection providing for the advancement of time, but only if such law provides that the entire State (including all political subdivisions thereof) shall observe the standard time otherwise applicable under such Act of March 19, 1918, as so modified during such period.

(b) It is hereby declared that it is the express intent of Congress by this section to supersede any and all laws of the States or political subdivisions thereof insofar as they may now or hereafter provide for advances in time or changeover dates different from those specified in this section.

(c) For any violation of the provisions of this section the Interstate Commerce Commission or its duly authorized agent may apply to the district court of the United States for the district in which such violation occurs for the enforcement of this section; and such court shall have jurisdiction to enforce obedience thereto by writ of injunction or by other process, mandatory or otherwise, restraining against further violations of this section and enjoining obedience thereto.

SEC. 4. (a) The first section of the Act of March 19, 1918, as amended (15 U.S.C. 261), is amended to read as follows:

"That for the purpose of establishing the standard time of the United States, the territory of the United States shall be divided into eigth zones in the manner provided in this section. Except as provided in section 3(a) of the Uniform Time Act of 1966, the standard time of the first zone shall be based on the mean solar time of the sixtieth degree of longitude west from Greenwich; that of the second zone on the seventy-fifth degree; that of the third zone on the ninetieth degree; that of the fourth zone on the one hundred and fifth degree; that of the fifth zone on the one hundred and twentieth degree; that of the sixth zone on the one hundred and thirty-fifth degree; that of the seventh zone on the one hundred and fiftieth degree; and that of the eighth zone on the one hundred and sixty-fifth degree. The limits of each zone shall be defined by an order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, having regard for the convenience of commerce and the existing junction points and division points of common carriers engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, and any such order may be modified from time to time. As used in this Act, the term 'interstate or foreign commerce' means commerce between a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession of the United States and any place outside thereof."

(b) Section 2 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Within the respective zones created under the authority of this Act the standard time of the zone shall insofar as practicable (as determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission) govern the movement of all common carriers engaged in interstate or foreign commerce. In all statutes, orders, rules, and regulations relating to the time of performance of any act by any officer or department of the United States, whether in the legislative, executive, or judicial branches of the Government, or relating to the time within which any rights shall accrue or determine, or within which any act shall or shall not be performed by any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, it shall be understood and intended that the time shall insofar as practicable (as determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission) be the United States standard time of the zone within which the act is to be performed."

(c) Section 4 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. The standard time of the first zone shall be known and designated as Atlantic standard time; that of the second zone shall be known and designated as eastern standard time; that of the third zone shall be known and designated as central standard time; that of the fourth zone shall be known and designated as mountain standard time; that of the fifth zone shall be known and designated as Pacific standard time; that of the sixth zone shall be known and designated as Yukon standard time; that of the seventh zone shall be known and designated as Alaska-Hawaii standard time; and that of the eighth zone shall be known and designated as Bering standard time."

SEC. 5. The Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1001–1011) shall apply to all proceedings under this Act, the Act of March 19, 1918 (15 U.S.C. 261–264), and the Act of March 4, 1921 (15 U.S.C. 265).

SEC. 6. This Act shall take effect on April 1, 1967; except that if any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, observes daylight saving time in the year 1966, such time shall advance the standard time otherwise applicable in such place by one hour and shall commence at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday in April of the year 1966 and shall end at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday in October of the year 1966.

SEC. 7. As used in this Act, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession of the United States.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to promote the observance of a uniform system of time throughout the United States."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], who had a great deal to do with the bill, not only the drawing of the bill but the problems involved. He spent a great deal of time with witnesses in order that we might come out with a bill we think is uniformly acceptable to the people of the United States. There may be some exceptions, but in the main this is correct.

I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire for that purpose.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will concur in the amendment of the House to S. 1404. Before the question is put, I wish to offer a brief explanation of the bill as it now comes before the Senate.

What will the bill do if, as I hope, it is approved today and is signed into law by the President?

In 1966, it will mean that any State, city, town, or political subdivision that chooses to observe daylight saving time shall go on daylight saving time at 2 a.m. on April 24 and stay on daylight saving time until 2 a.m. October 30.

In 1967 and thereafter—and this provision was added by the House—it will mean that everyone will observe daylight saving time from the last Sunday in April to the last Sunday in October, with the exception of those States—and it must be the entire State—where the legislature decides to remain on standard time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks a more detailed summary of the provisions of S. 1404, as amended by the House.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the bill is a giant step toward the elimination of the manifold problems which have arisen because of the clock confusion existing in this country for many of the past years.

Testimony presented to our committee has indicated that just to revise and republish the schedules and timetables of the buses, airlines, and railroads costs millions of dollars a year in added costs because of the confusion resulting from daylight saving and standard time. The estimates put these annual costs at close to $5 million a year. Most, if not all, of these extra and burdensome costs will be eliminated by the enactment of this bill.

In addition, and more important, the bill will go a long way toward the elimination of the confusion, frustration, and bewilderment which have afflicted millions of Americans as a result of being an hour late or an hour early for a train or a plane, or for an appointment or a meeting. These enormous hidden costs are the price we have paid for our clock confusion. They will be substantially eliminated by the enactment of the bill.

Obviously, the enactment of the bill will cause some areas and some communities to change the time practices which they have followed in recent years. Considering the wide-ranging variety of dates during which daylight saving time is observed—there are as many as 23 combinations of dates for beginning and ending daylight time in some States—I think it is fair to say that the bill has been drafted to create as little disruption among affected States and communities as possible.

In this connection, I point out that the Interstate Commerce Commission still retains, under the bill, the authority it now has to fix, and to move if necessary, the boundaries of the standard time zones. Some of the problems which might arise under the bill can be resolved by adjustment of the time zone boundaries by the ICC.

These are the reasons why I urge the adoption of the motion to concur in the House amendments.

I wish to make perfectly clear the difference between the provisions of the Senate bill and the House bill as amended. As passed by the Senate, the bill merely made uniform the dates on which States and communities that elected to have daylight time should start and finish daylight time. In other words, the Senate bill would have eliminated the confusion that arose from 23 different dates when States went on and came off daylight time. The Senate bill did not in any way affect the rights of any State, county, city, or political subdivision to make its own selection.

The House added to the bill a provision that I honestly believe is highly desirable. It went one step further and provided that after 1967—which provides ample time for State legislatures to act—daylight saving time, beginning in April and ending in October, on the same dates, shall be the time throughout the Nation, except in States whose legislatures determine that they shall remain on standard time during all the year or during that portion of the year between the dates in April and October when daylight saving time is in effect.

The only point on which there could be some objection to this agreement—and I want to be perfectly frank about it—is that the bill provides that the entire State must act as a unit. In other words, under the bill, a legislature could not vote to have part of the State be on daylight saving time and a part of the State on standard time.

There is one saving feature, however. The bill leaves unimpaired in the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to change existing time zones. So if there should be any States in which it is desired that a part of the State be on daylight saving time and a part of the State be on standard time, because to require uniformity would impose a hardship, recourse may be had to the Interstate Commerce Commission for a change in time zones, which might overcome the objection. Of course, as a rule, the time zone boundaries run north and south, not east and west, so there are some limitations to that recourse.

But essentially the provision added by the House is that daylight saving time shall be in effect between April and October, beginning and ending on fixed dates all over the country, except in States where the legislatures vote to continue on standard time.

I trust that the passage of the bill will be a giant step toward the establishment of uniform time throughout the country. I hope that the Senate will concur in the House amendments and will take a step which will be of immense public benefit thoughout the country.

EXHIBIT 1

PURPOSE AND SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to establish uniform dates for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in all States and jurisdictions where it is observed. The further purpose of the bill is to allow each State through enactment of State law to exempt itself on a statewide basis from the provisions of the bill which establish daylight saving time. Any State which elects to exempt itself and not follow daylight saving time would be required to observe standard time as provided for by the act of March 19, 1918 (40 Stat. 450; 15 U.S.C. 261–264).

Thus the bill is designed to eliminate at least the greater part of the confusion and unnecessary costs which ensue from the current conflicting time standards which exist in the United States.

The bill would—

1. Establish a policy of the United States to promote the adoption and observance of uniform time within the standard time zones prescribed by the legislation.

2. Implement this policy by authorizing and directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to foster and promote widespread and uniform adoption and observance of the same standards of time within each standard time zone.

3. Require that all observance of daylight saving time commence at 2 a.m. on the last Sunday in April and end at 2 a.m. on the last Sunday in October.

4. Allow any State to exempt itself from the daylight saving time provisions but only if the State, through legislative action, provides that the entire State shall observe the standard time otherwise applicable under this legislation.

5. Express the intent of Congress that the section dealing with daylight saving time and the exception providing for any States remaining on standard time (sec. 3(a)) supersedes any laws of the States or political subdivisions thereof insofar as they may now or in the future provide for time changes different from those in section 3(a).

6. Empower the Interstate Commerce Commission to apply to the district courts of the United States for injunctive or other relief in the event of violations of the provisions related to daylight saving time.

7. Add 3 new zones to the existing zones, primarily to provide for Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and certain possessions of the United States.

8. Make the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1001–1011) applicable to all proceedings under the legislation.

9. Provide that April 1, 1967, be the effective date of the legislation except that any State or political subdivision thereof observing daylight saving time in 1966 shall commence such observance at 2 a.m. on the last Sunday in April and end it at 2 a.m. on the last Sunday in October.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire stated that some States are divided on this issue. Missouri is one of those States. St. Louis is in the eastern half of Missouri; Kansas City, another great city, is in the western part of the State. Traditionally, there has been widespread opposition to uniform time in Missouri. Last year, the legislature attempted to establish a statewide uniform time rule in the State, and the opposition was so serious that the proposal was defeated.

Traditionally, St. Louis, in the eastern half of the State, is on daylight saving time, because most of the trade from St. Louis moves to the East.

From Kansas City and the western half of Missouri, the trading area traditionally goes West.

The people of Missouri have become accustomed to following in their own part of the State the time that they have used there for many years.

To change that time and make the time uniform on a statewide basis instead of giving the State the right of local option would be terribly disruptive from a business and industrial standpoint in Missouri. It would be very harmful to our community and social activities in the State if this ruling were forced on us at this time. In my opinion, it is unrealistic to force an entire State to choose one system or the other.

On yesterday 10 of the Missouri State senators introduced a resolution in the Missouri Senate to declare that the official policy of Missouri is to allow local option on *daylight saving* time.

I believe that the question of daylight saving time should be left as it is now, a matter of State or local option. Actually that is what we have here, but we are saying that it is to be on a State-by-State basis. However, we would be unable to split the State in two.

Missouri is in an unusual situation because, as I have said, the eastern half of Missouri belongs to the East and the western half belong to the West.

For that reason I urge that the Senate reject the House amendment and that we insist on the Senate-passed bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks made by my distinguished colleague. There is strong disagreement in Missouri over daylight saving time. St. Louis and the surrounding metropolitan area follow daylight saving time. Based on the correspondence that we have received, the people are very anxious to continue with that program. Kansas City and the balance of the State favor standard time.

Legislation was introduced in the 1965 session of our State legislature to establish uniform time. However, so much opposition arose that the bill was tabled.

It was then clear that the people of Missouri prefer to decide this matter locally, as they have done for many years. Regardless of whether a general vote would decide for or against daylight saving time, a great many people would be inconvenienced. Cultural and recreational programs, as well as business activities, would be disrupted.

The people of Missouri are unable to reconcile the two time zones and have expressed their desire to continue to have a choice in this matter.

I therefore hope that the Senate will vote against the House amendments to S. 1404 and insist on the bill as passed by the Senate last summer.

It is with regret that I see a bill that was passed by the Senate on a basis that was satisfactory to my State, amended in the House. I am sorry that more of my colleagues are not present, because I believe if they were here my distinguished colleague from Missouri and I might convince them that the Senate bill was a better bill.

Mr. President, with that in mind. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I should like to say to both distinguished Senators from Missouri that our committee was thoroughly cognizant of the situation, not particularly with reference to Missouri, but with reference to the possibility of this situation arising. We discussed asking for a committee of conference instead of moving to concur.

The reason that we are moving to concur in the amendments of the House is that the House approved their bill by a vote of 292 to 93. Various amendments were offered to the House bill. Those amendments were voted down. One of those amendments was the very amendment in which the Senators from Missouri are interested. That amendment concerned the partition of States, rather than having statewide control. Because of the rather overwhelming vote of the House, we decided to move to concur.

In fairness to the distinguished Senators from Missouri, when we presented the bill to the Senate, it was originally the bill of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] and myself. It was a bill that I had worked on for several years. We very carefully took one step at a time and tried to make uniform the date of opening and closing of daylight saving time and not interfere in any State, although we felt that probably it would be inevitable that this would happen.

A bus, a train, or an automobile passed through seven time changes while traveling 35 miles a couple of years ago. We had the situation in which community X and community Y would be on and off daylight saving time and the next community would be on daylight saving and the next community would be off.

I had hoped that this could have been taken care of by permitting States to vote to split their State in half, so that there would not be such a hodgepodge situation.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I think we could agree if that could be done. That would be what we would need.

Mr. COTTON. We were not trying to force this situation on any State. We considered the overwhelming vote in the House and the fact that an amendment embodying the desires of the two Senators from Missouri was voted down. That was the reason that we voted to move to concur.

Mr. SYMINGTON. What was the vote when the Senate passed the measure?

Mr. COTTON. There was no rollcall vote.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In other words, it was unanimous in the Senate, but some one-third of those voting in the House voted against the amendment.

I have great confidence in the conferees on this legislation because I know what a superb committee it is. The distinguished Senator for Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is chairman of the committee, and the distinguished ranking minority member is the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

I know my friend from New Hampshire is very sympathetic to the concept of local option.

With all due respect to the situation in which there were seven time changes in 35 miles, one would have to go several hundred miles in the State of Missouri to encounter a change.

We hope that the Senator in charge of the bill will take this measure to conference rather than give up at this time.

This is a very important matter to the people of Missouri. The thinking of the people in Missouri is sharply delineated. One could almost draw a straight line down our State to show the division on this subject.

I ask that the bill be taken back to conference to establish what the people of Missouri desire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I want to be perfectly frank with the Senator. Were I on a committee of conference, I should try to come back with a compromise that would permit States to determine whether they wanted local option and not permit States to have more than two time zones.

I think that would be a reasonable ground of compromise. I have the feeling that my distinguished chairman and the others on our committee might well feel the same way.

I have not discussed the subject with them. We simply voted as we did because of the overwhelming vote in the House. I would be the last one to try to have the Senate push down the throat of any State something that was an inconvenience or a hardship. I am not arguing contentiously on this matter.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, if the distinguished chairman feels the same way about it, and would take it to conference, I am sure that the people of Missouri and my colleague and I would be entirely willing to accede to that and have two time zones in the State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish that the distinguished Senator and his colleague, the two able Senators from Missouri, would not ask to send the bill back to conference. It is my belief that it would not change what the Senate is attempting to do now.

I would point out that there is an option in the House-passed bill which I think would fit in with what the Senators from Missouri are so valiantly and so doggedly trying to accomplish, and that is a right to petition to the ICC, which could take into consideration an effective case of this kind, as I understand the bill, and perhaps give the Senators an outlet and make it possible for them to achieve the objective they desire.

Mr. COTTON. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. That is a perfectly natural inference for the distinguished majority leader to draw, but I am afraid, in fairness to the Senators from Missouri, that recourse to the ICC would not take care of their situation, because Missouri is right in the middle of a time zone. May I make this suggestion: We do not need to go to conference. Would the Senators from Missouri be satis-

fied—I think we have an amendment to this effect; we have been working on it—if instead of agreeing to the House bill as passed, we agree to it with one amendment, and that is that States could only be split into two parts?

Mr. SYMINGTON. We would take that.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Yes, Mr. President, we would accept that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We could send it back to the House, but, of course, the whole purpose for having this bill is to get some uniformity through the country, and we were hoping that, if the Senate passed the bill with the House amendment, by 1967 the Legislature of Missouri will say, "Well, let's not be different from everybody else; we will come along."

The House deliberately pushed it up for a year, until the legislature in the Senators' State meets, as I understand. But I can also understand how controversial and deepseated this time business becomes in a State legislature, particularly where you have people who are from nothing but the rural areas, as against the people in the cities. I know the problem.

I have no objection to doing what the Senator from New Hampshire suggests. I am hopeful, though, that we will retain the part of the bill that says in 1967 or later that the States will come along, so that we can get this uniformity. I do not know whether the House will accept that. I do not think they have too deep feelings about any one State, but that they would want to make it uniform.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the committee is being very fair. I think what the able ranking Member, the Senator from New Hampshire says is very logical. It is not, in our case, just a matter of the country against the city. We have two large cities which feel differently.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. We are early in the session now. We have had very little trouble with the bill thus far. We will be here for many months. I appeal to the distinguished chairman to give this matter full consideration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think what the distinguished majority leader meant was that there is provision for an appeal to the ICC in this case, but the Senator from New Hampshire suggests that it would be highly improbable that the appeal coming from Missouri, situated as it is, would be favorably received. But you can appeal to the ICC.

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is not a more fair and just man in this body than the Senator from New Hampshire. I appreciate his suggestion.

I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am in accord with the statements made by the Senators from Missouri, because I have the same problem.

I wish to mention another problem that deals along the same line. Kansas is a State that has a time zone change. When you run into time zone difficulties, you can have some real problems. We have a division between central time and mountain time, and I do hope that the Interstate Commerce Commission, if we cannot obtain the amendment suggested, which might be helpful even in our own State, will give some consideration to the problem.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They will still have the right to move the time zones. As a matter of fact, I am not sure that some of the time zones should not be moved, to make them correspond more nearly to the traffic and the growth of population.

When the time zones were first set out, they were more or less arbitrarily selected. There was not too much testimony or consideration of the problem.

Mr. CARLSON. It can create a real problem, as the distinguished Senator from Washington knows. I am fairly in accord with the positions taken by the Senators from Missouri. I sincerely hope their problem can be taken care of.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not see any other Senators on the floor from the Far West. Yes, there is one over there. But we would like the bill to stay as it is. It would save us considerable trouble.

I think in some cases there is 3 or 4 hours difference in the time. That means that many times people, at the wrong time of the evening, try to get in touch with one about some very important matter, and they forget about the change in time, and cannot understand why they have difficulty.

But uniformity is even more vitally necessary for people who travel. The situation as it exists is a most confusing thing, and I am hopeful that the State of Missouri will see the light and come into the fold with the rest of us.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I am not exactly sure what the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire is. We have a problem in Tennessee; most of the State is on eastern time, but a portion is on central time. As I understand the Senator's amendment, it would mean we could have four different times in Tennessee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, no.

Mr. BASS. Will the Senator explain what his amendment would do?

Mr. COTTON. The suggested amendment is this: I fear that all the Senators do not have copies of the bill, but on page 6, the bill provides that all States shall be on daylight saving time, except that any State may by law exempt itself from the provisions of this subsection providing for the advancement of time, but only if such law provides that the entire State, including all political subdivisions thereof, shall observe the standard time.

Now, my suggested amendment would be to strike out the word "entire" and insert in lieu thereof "or a single contiguous part thereof," which would mean that any State could select any part of the State—it would not have to be just half, it could be a third or any part of the State—and retain standard time for that part, but all the rest of the State would have to be on the other time; you could not have four or five or six different times.

Mr. BASS. And that would have to be done by the State legislature?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. COTTON. That is right.

Mr. BASS. In other words, where we have two time zones now, if the eastern part of the State is on eastern standard time, the rest of the State, even though part of it might be on central time, would have to go to daylight saving time?

Mr. COTTON. It would have to advance the clock 1 hour from whatever time it was on, except for one section of the State, one contiguous part thereof that the State legislature could act upon.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Washington and the Senator from New Hampshire that the amendment suggested, we think, would be very fair to Missouri. Our situation is very unusual, with industries on both sides of the State and the time zone line nearly down the center. If that could be split to not over half, it would certainly be a move toward uniformity.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope the RECORD will be clear that when the Senator from New Hampshire uses the word "contiguous," he means that literally, because one of the important reasons for this bill is that small areas can have different times. But if you have one area which is contiguous, which would be a large area in the Senator's State, it is not as bad as having a number of time zones arranged in spotted or patchwork fashion.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments, with an amendment which I now send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 16, strike out the word "entire" and after the word "State" insert the language "or a single contiguous part thereof."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] to concur in the House amendments with amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

SHIPPING JAM IN VIETNAM

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, one of the great problems in Vietnam is in the shipping and unloading end of our supply chain. It seems that we do a fairly good job in moving the supplies as far as the harbor areas of South Vietnam but at that point, due to a lack of unloading equipment and facilities, the ships pile up in great numbers and wait for long periods of time in order to be unloaded. I have reports that some ships have waited an excess of 100 days in the Vietnam harbors in order to be unloaded.

Approximately $1 million a day is being lost because of this jam. Recently 100 ships were waiting in South Vietnamese ports to be unloaded and another 100 were standing by in either the Philippines or Okinawa to proceed to Vietnam as soon as room could be created for them to anchor and unload.

Such a shipping jam creates considerable hardship in a number of areas. For instance the crews of these ships oftentimes are not able to take shore leave, some spending as much as 65 days in the harbor before being able to go ashore. In an area where daytime temperatures sometimes approach 120° onboard the ships, this creates a tremendous morale problem. The United Seaman Service is very concerned about this morale of our seamen in Vietnam. This agency has centers throughout the Pacific. Prior to recent times, however, they had none in South Vietnam. One has been established in Saigon since Christmas of last year and the service is attempting to establish more. They have been assured by the Army that one is in the works in the Cam Ranh Bay harbor construction project. They are attempting to get final Army approval to establish one at Da Nang and one at Qui Nhon.

In addition, it creates a problem from the standpoint of having enough available vessels to ship not only to South Vietnam but to other parts of the world. For instance, at the present time, when the Nation is engaged in the most serious freight car shortage in its history, huge numbers of freight cars are piled up in west coast ports, unable to be unloaded because there are no available ships on which to place their cargo. This, I hope, will be partially rectified by the announcement last week by the Maritime Administration that some 86 ships are being taken from the Government's reserve fleets and assigned to steamship companies for operation on behalf of the Military Sea Transport Service. I understand that an additional 25 reserve fleet ships are now undergoing reactivation, or are scheduled for breakout in the next few months.

In addition to that, two Maritime Administration employees are being assigned to South Vietnam to coordinate the handling of these ships. It is hoped that they will supplement the efforts of general agents, subagents, and shipmasters in the Vietnam area to assure logistic support for all general agency ships. These men will also coordinate the efforts of the military and the agents to provide expeditious cargo discharge and turnaround of all general agency ships. Unfortunately, however, I believe this is insufficient to solve the problem. We need great additional numbers of barges, tugs, and floating cranes to supplement those there in the unloading of the ships.

Airpower has become increasingly important in recent years and is particularly important in recent years and is particularly important in South Vietnam. However, two out of every three soldiers fighting in Vietnam were moved there by ship and 98 percent of the supplies to support our troops in Vietnam have been transported by ship. When this is realized then it becomes obvious that our merchant fleet is still a subject of tremendous importance not only to our economy but to the defense of our country.

Some improvements in the loading time have been made recently in Saigon. I am informed that military supplies are removed at Saigon in 4 to 5 days and that nonmilitary supplies, such as provisions under our AID program, are unloaded in 12 to 14 days. However, as late as last week, there were 25 bags of mail undelivered to seamen. Thinking back to the time when I was in the military service during World War II, I can conceive of nothing more damaging to morale than nondelivery of mail to our people overseas.

Mr. President, to further compound this shipping problem and to rub salt in the quick, we have the allied problem of ships of the free world servicing North Vietnam and the Vietcong. The Department of Defense admitted publicly that 119 free world ships entered ports servicing the Vietcong during 1965. These ships carried a total of $12.2 million worth of goods, including some military supplies. Mr. President, it is indeed ironic that, at a time when Great Britain, for instance, is soliciting our support in her boycott of Rhodesia, ships flying the British flag are carrying supplies to aid and abet our enemies.

Mr. President, let me say that from reading a recent Washington Post article, we have found a quotation from Foreign Secretary Stewart of Great Britain. He says:

> The principle of preserving free trade is important to us as a trading nation.

The article states:

> But there are no signs that the Government is planning any action to outlaw the business transacted with the Hanoi regime.

The Foreign Secretary further states:

> We have not got the legislative power to order these ships not to trade (with North Vietnam) except when it comes to strategic goods, nor can we stop them from flying our flag. No case has yet been made out for us to introduce new legislation.

Mr. President, it was not until the middle of February when our Government finally decided that we should boycott these ships. Since that time, ships carrying cargoes to North Vietnam have been prohibited from carrying the U.S.-sponsored cargoes. But even this boycott only runs to the individual ships. It does not run to the parent company owning the ship.

Mr. President, our armed services have been called the best equipped troops in the world. However, it is impossible for them to maintain this position unless they get the supplies and equipment they need to fulfill their mission. I, therefore, hope a thorough investigation can be made to survey the transportation requirements for Vietnam by land, sea, and air to insure that every necessary and possible step is being taken to get our men in and out of Vietnam on time and with whatever arms and supplies necessary.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. BASS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I believe that the Senator from Tennessee has made a timely speech as well as a splendid suggestion. The Senator is speaking about a matter which is complicated from a military standpoint, as well as from the point of view of the rest of the traffic there. I hope that he will follow up on his own thoughts and suggestions, which will be rendering a fine service to the country.

Mr. BASS. I appreciate the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, because of his important position on the Armed Services Committee and his keen awareness of the needs of our troops in Vietnam.

SALE OF PARTICIPATION CERTIFICATES IN FNMA

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, last week the Senate passed a bill to amend the Small Business Act.

During debate, the proponents of the bill in speaking on behalf of the administration insisted that the extra interest charges by selling these small business mortgages would be less than one-quarter of 1 percent. We who opposed this bill insisted that the interest charge would be at least one-half of 1 percent higher, thereby representing an extra charge to the taxpayers.

It is interesting to note, that the following day after the enactment of the bill, the Federal National Mortgage Association sold $410 million worth of participation certificates. The interest rates they paid was 0.6 percent higher than the interest rates for corresponding Government issues.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent that the announcement of that sale, appearing in the Wall Street Journal of March 17, be printed in the RECORD, followed by a list of quotations of Treasury bonds, along with the interest rates on that same date.

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

PARTICIPATION CERTIFICATES OF $410 MILLION IN THE GOVERNMENT MORTGAGE LIQUIDATION TRUST, FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION TRUSTEE

(New issue, dated April 4, 1966, due April 1 as shown below)

The participation certificates are serial certificates issued in registered form only, in denominations of $5,000, $10,000, $25,000, $100,000, $500,000, and $1 million. The amounts, maturities, interest rates, and offering prices of the participation certificates are shown below. The principal, together with the last installment of interest, is payable at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York upon presentation at such bank and surrender of the certificates. The interest is payable by check, semiannually, on October 1 and April 1 in each year. The participation certificates are not redeemable prior to maturity. This advertisement is neither an offer to sell nor a solicitation of an offer to

buy any of these securities. The offering is made only by the prospectus, which may be obtained from such of the underwriters as are registered dealers in securities in this State.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *March 17, 1966.*

Amount	Due Apr. 1	Interest rate	Price [1]
$20,000,000	1967	5.40	100
20,000,000	1968	5.45	100
20,000,000	1969	5.50	100
20,000,000	1970	5.50	100
20,000,000	1971	5.50	100
20,000,000	1972	5.50	100
20,000,000	1973	5.50	100
20,000,000	1974	5.50	100
20,000,000	1975	5.50	100
20,000,000	1976	5.45	100
42,000,000	1977	5.45	100
42,000,000	1978	5.40	100
42,000,000	1979	5.35	100
42,000,000	1980	5.30	100
42,000,000	1981	5.25	100

[1] Plus accrued interest from Apr. 4, 1966.

GOVERNMENT, AGENCY, AND MISCELLANEOUS SECURITIES

Over-the-counter quotations: Source on request.

Decimals in bid-and-asked prices represent 32ds (101.1 means 101 1/32). (a) Plus 1/64, (b) yield to call date, (c) approximate yield at maturity.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 1966.

Treasury bonds

	Bid	Asked	Previous bid	Yield
3¼s, 1966, May	99.26	99.28	99.26	4.38
3s, 1966, August	99.6	99.8	99.5	4.83
3⅛s, 1966, November	99.1	99.3	99.0	4.78
2½s, 1962-67, June	97.21	97.23	97.21	4.40
3⅝s, 1967, November	98.1	98.3	98.1	4.83
3⅞s, 1968, May	98.28	97.30	97.28	4.90
3¾s, 1968, August	97.6	97.8	97.6	4.97
3⅞s, 1968, November	97.9	97.11	97.9	4.95
2½s, 1963, December	94.15	94.17	94.14	4.64
4s, 1969, February	97.19	97.21	97.19	4.78
2½s, 1964-69, June	93.20	93.22	93.18	4.62
4s, 1969, October	96.29	96.31	96.29	4.94
2½s, 1964-69, December	92.20	92.26	92.20	4.65
2½s, 1965-70, March	92.13	92.17	92.13	4.57
4s, 1970, February	96.20	96.24	96.21	4.92
4s, 1970, August	96.10	96.14	96.11	4.91
2½s, 1966-71, March	91.0	91.4	91.0	4.51
4s, 1971, August	95.14	95.18	95.15	4.94
3⅞s, 1971, November	94.13	94.17	94.15	5.00
4s, 1972, February	94.28	95.0	94.30	4.99
2½s, 1967-72, June	88.16	88.20	88.22	4.61
4s, 1972, August	94.12	94.16	94.15	5.01
2½s, 1967-72, September	88.0	88.14	88.16	4.58
2½s, 1967-72, December	88.0	88.4	88.6	4.57
4s, 1973, August	93.18	93.22	93.18	5.03
4¼s, 1973, November	93.31	94.3	94.0	5.07
4¼s, 1974, February	93.28	94.0	93.28	5.05
4¼s, 1974, May	94.24	94.28	94.24	5.02
3½s, 1974, November	92.6	92.14	92.6	4.96
4s, 1980, February	92.20	92.28	92.12	4.70
3½s, 1980, November	87.22	87.30	87.20	4.64
3¼s, 1978-83, June	83.4	83.12	83.0	4.66
3¼s, 1985, May	82.26	83.2	82.22	4.59
4¼s, 1975-85, May	93.6	93.14	93.4	4.78
3½s, 1990, February	83.4	83.12	83.0	4.66
4¼s, 1987-92, August	92.30	93.6	92.28	4.70
4s, 1988-93, February	90.2	90.10	89.30	4.63
4¼s, 1989-94, May	90.28	91.4	90.26	4.70
3s, 1995, February	79.12	79.20	79.10	4.23
3½s, 1998, November	82.2	82.10	81.28	4.54

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this points out very clearly what some of us argued at that time—that in order to camouflage the true deficit, this administration is selling its assets and by so doing, is paying an extra one-half percent in interest rates. This means that over the life of the $4.7 billion in securities, the administration plans to sell altogether it will cost the American taxpayers $600 million. To cover up the true deficit, this administration is selling its assets and using the proceeds thereof to defray the normal operating costs of the Great Society programs.

It is comparable to selling part of the furniture to pay for the cost of groceries.

STATEMENT BY UTAH COUNCIL OF OUTDOOR ADVERTISING

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Salt Lake City was one of the first cities in the country where hearings were held on the draft standards, criteria, rules, and regulations suggested by the Department of Commerce to implement the Highway Beautification Act of 1965. More than 100 witnesses appeared at the hearings held on March 1 and 2—most of them in opposition. It was the general consensus that the guidelines were far too stringent—in fact, that if put into operation as drawn, they would practically abolish the outdoor advertising industry.

The largest area of dissatisfaction was in the regulations proposed for industrial or commercial areas, rather than those suggested for advertising on the open highways. The definition of industrial and commercial areas was questioned, and there was great discussion of the so-called setback restrictions which defined how far back from the street a sign must be, what its height could be, and how near the intersection it could be placed.

One of the best statements submitted was that of the Utah Council of Outdoor Advertising. I ask that this statement be carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY UTAH COUNCIL OF OUTDOOR ADVERTISING

Reduced to its fundamental thrust, Public Law 89-285, known as the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, provides that States that fail to control outdoor advertising (U.S.C., title 23, sec. 131) and junkyards (U.S.C., title 23, sec. 136) are subject to a penalty of 10 percent each of the participation of the Federal Government in its partnership with the States on their roads program.

The act provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall reach an agreement with the several States in three principal categories, so far as the outdoor advertising industry is concerned:

1. They shall determine and define an unzoned commercial or industrial area.

2. They shall establish standards for the control of the advertising permitted in the commercial and industrial zones and areas, and

3. They shall provide for signs within the right-of-way for areas at appropriate distances from interchanges on the Interstate Systems on which signs giving specific information with respect to food, gasoline, and lodging, including specific brand names, may be erected.

The act and its legislative history show an intent to protect our areas of natural beauty and scenic interest in the rural areas but to leave the urban areas to present customary use. Otherwise, this legislation would destroy outdoor advertising and not control its orderly development as the act requires. The clear command of section 131(d), title 23, United States Code, is that standards to be established after consultation with the States with respect to size, lighting, and spacing shall be consistent with customary use. The statements by Senator Moss, and Senator RANDOLPH on February 4, and Senator MUSKIE on February 16, which establish this intent beyond argument, are annexed in the appendix.

The act also provides that before the Secretary promulgates standards, criteria, rules and regulations in carrying out his agreement with the States with respect to a definition of unzoned areas and regulation of size, lighting, and spacing in the controlled areas, that public hearings in each State shall be held for the purpose of gathering all relevant information on which to base such standards. Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor wrote a letter on September 14, 1965, to the Senate Subcommittee on Public Works from which we quote:

"The policy of the Bureau in reviewing State determinations of unzoned commercial or industrial areas would be developed only after full consultation with the States as well as with interested private business, and every effort would be made to achieve equitable treatment.

"The criteria to be followed in setting the standards for billboards in both zoned and unzoned areas, designated as commercial or industrial, would be designed to assist the advertising industry to achieve an orderly development of this important and legitimate business enterprise."

Notwithstanding the clear legislative intent that the doctrine of customary use shall be followed in urban areas, the Bureau of Public Roads, a division of the Department of Commerce, proffered in the Federal Register of January 28, 1966, six categories of draft standards, criteria, rules, and regulations which are not only inconsistent with the doctrine of customary use but are radically violative of it and would completely destroy outdoor advertising industry.

The evidence adduced at the public hearings March 1 and 2 abundantly disclosed this proposition. We shall hereafter refer to this in somewhat more detail.

A particularly disturbing aspect of this legislation lies in the following unusual concept; the Federal Government here does not legislate directly upon the people affected, thereby escaping some of the direct whiplash of public opinion and indignation, but rather tells the State, in this case the State of Utah, that unless you do as we say, we shall withhold funds from you—a loss which our State can ill afford. This is the use of raw economic power unmasked and is subject to ruthless abuse. The beginnings of abuse have been evidenced already, because there is absolutely nothing in the act that authorized the Secretary to proffer draft standards, criteria, rules, and regulations in advance, as he did; and published rules restricting the public hearings to comments and criticisms relevant to the issues as established by him, as he did; and nothing in the act permitted the Bureau of Public Roads to further restrict the scope of these hearings to comment and criticism on the proffered criteria, as it did.

Section 303(a) of title 23, United States Code, requires that before promulgation of these standards necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, the Secretary shall hold public hearings in each State for the purpose of gathering all relevant information on which to base such standards, criteria, rules, and regulations. The clear language of the act and the exclusionary conduct of the Department of Commerce are to be compared, noted, and condemned.

OMISSIONS AND FAILURES OF THE SECRETARY'S PROFFERED STANDARDS, CRITERIA, RULES, AND REGULATIONS

The evidence produced at the hearings raises some problems obviously not fully appreciated before by the Department's planners, some of which are:

1. Standards for size, spacing, and lighting accommodating the principle of customary

use is utterly impossible of linear delineation unless a different set of criteria is established for areas that vary within themselves, as many have been shown so to do.

2. Any definition of an unzoned area that restricts itself to buildings rather than use of land area will produce anomalous and ridiculous results.

3. The planner for the Secretary obviously failed to take into consideration such legitimate needs of the highway traveler as (a) on the primary system small towns such a Smithfield, Richfield, Logan, Vernal, and Grantsville are set in rural areas which run to the very boundary lines of the town. Yet the approaches for 2, 4, 6, and as much as 10 miles prior thereto have historically been used for advertising. Travelers depend on these signs for a multitude of reasons. Many businesses within these towns are completely dependent on this type of advertising. No provision has been made for this need. (b) Some of these areas are now zoned agricultural with sign structures permitted, yet under this act and rules and regulations no such signs would be permitted. (c) Many Utah communities located more than one-half mile off the interstate were shown to have desperate need to advertise reasonably on the highway in order to avoid a financial hardship and ruin, yet the planners have made no provision for any such advertising.

The inherent vice in the Secretary's planners' approach to this problem in all categories has been their failure to realize that a single set of standards are not capable of universal application because of the variety of needs found from area to area.

Historically in America business and trade have followed the building of cross-country highways and the transcontinental railroads. Through our cities and towns these "main highways" have carried the freight of the Nation and along them have grown up the highway service businesses for the convenience and requirements of the traveler and of the people who reside there. In Utah all but the five or six largest cities are what might be called "one-street towns" insofar as the business district is concerned, with a concentration of stores and office buildings in the central business area and other highway related businesses extending each way to the outskirts of town. The main highway has become the business street and residential areas have been built away from main street in the quieter parts away from the noise and confusion of trucks, buses, and interstate commerce. It is only in the larger cities that trucks are diverted onto truck routes and bypasses from the main street. This is the primary system—not the interstate.

On these one-street towns it will be seen that the street runs through a central built-up business district, but with business also extending from the center for several miles along the highway in each direction out of town into the country where you will find service stations, drive-ins, bowling alleys, bottled gas plants, dairies, cattle barns and sheds, potato storage bins, loading docks, fruit stands, and so on. The traveler is often several miles out of town before he enters the truly rural scene. The Secretary's standards do not provide for any advance advertising in these approaches, if rural, and not subject to his definition of an unzoned commercial or industrial area.

Customary use in these areas has been in accordance with local zoning provisions which have permitted advertising signs in agricultural zones. Such signs require no extension of city services such as water, sewer, garbage collection, etc., so have been considered to be located in the public interest where they perform a service in bringing valuable information to the traveler well in advance of his having to make a decision. By means of these advertising displays he could know what type of eating establishments were available, the brands of gasoline he could buy and the character of the hotels and motels in the town. All of this information is appreciated by the traveler.

The intersection restriction prohibiting signs from within 250 feet of an intersection is not consistent with customary use. Often that frontage near an intersection is frequently the only available space in a given block, often occupied by a service station exposing a wall or a low building affording a roof built upon which an off-premise as well as an on-premise sign is found. This again is customary use in Utah.

If a potential location does exist in the middle of the block, it is usually because a building top view can be obtained. The 30-foot height limitation makes this impossible or nearly so, unless the buildings in the foregoing are all very low. A structure on a roof would very likely extend more than 30 feet up from the ground level.

Common and customary practice in the outdoor advertising business has been to build low ground structures in small towns at or within 3 or 4 feet of the property line to allow work room around the structure and to prevent too long an extension into a farmer's field where it would interfere with hay or grain cultivation and watering.

Customary practice in the larger towns and cities has been to follow the building code and zoning laws of the city, which with few exceptions allow an advertising sign to be built with the same setback as any other structure. In the commercial and industrial zones there is no setback required for any type of structure, hence signs have equal treatment with buildings, factories, stores, garages, etc. We consider this fair and equal treatment with other business use.

The proposed size limitation of 300 square feet within 150 feet of the property line does not recognize customary use in the industry for the painted bulletin which has been a standard structure for more than 50 years. These bulletins have a basic size of 12 by 50 feet, but with embellishments sometimes have an area of almost 1,000 square feet. They are built on preferred locations on high traffic arterials of the larger cities. The standard highway bulletin of 12 by 42 feet is used for particularly good locations on the main traveled highways.

The proposed spacing provision of 500 feet between signs eliminates the customary practice in urban areas of building two 24-sheet panels in a facing. The 500-foot spacing provision limiting the number of advertising structures to one in any block is contrary to customary use in urban areas.

The Secretary's planners have proceeded on the assumption that animation, flashing lights, moving lights tending to direct, etc., are evil per se. The evidence and photographs submitted show that this is not the case, but are only hazardous when improperly used.

It would be incomplete to fail to point out that the evidence shows that in the urban areas of Salt Lake City, Provo, and Ogden that some 88 percent of all outdoor advertising is on-premise advertising, not regulated by this act. The remaining 12 percent blends into the dynamics of metropolitan life so as to be indistinguishable from the whole. The Secretary planners would exclude more than 40 percent of one company's poster panel facility, although such facility is in customary use and all respects comparable to the on-premise advertising in the same area with respect to size, lighting, and spacing.

We suggest that from the criticism of the proffered standards and the evidence adduced by the advertising companies in Utah showing customary use, and the evidence adduced by the Motel Association, the Restaurant Association, the local civic planners from the rural areas of Utah, and the chambers of commerce, and many other interested and effected persons, two central themes emerged: One, the concept of linear dimension proffered by the Department's planners is unwise, unworkable, discriminatory, and satisfies no one; and, two, a concept in which the Department acting in the role of a counselor and supervisor encouraging the States to adopt machinery that relies on local boards applying local zoning to effectuate the purposes of the act, and realizing that a continuing educational process placing confidence upon the integrity of local officials will in due course produce the laudatory purposes of this act without violent dislocations to any segment of our Great Society.

The evidence received by the hearing examiner designated by the Secretary of Commerce on March 1 and 2, 1966, unequivocally established the following two basic propositions: (1) That the regulations as proposed by the Secretary of Commerce and published in the Federal Register on January 28, 1966, substantially thwart the intention of the Congress in the adoption of the Highway Beautification Act and substantially deviate from the comments made by the Secretary of Commerce in outlining his intentions prior to the adoption of the legislation. (2) The only regulations which the Secretary of Commerce could properly adopt which would conform to the spirit, intention, and language of the act would be designed to incorporate the principles of customary use and local zoning.

It is, therefore, submitted and we believe that an equitable approach better serving all of these interests would be for the Secretary to require that the several States do establish an authoritative body politic whose function would be to counsel and guide the appropriate local political subdivisions now having zoning power to evaluate and determine unzoned commercial and industrial areas along the interstate and primary road systems, and to hold public hearings in making these determinations so that all interests can be heard. This authority would be expected to establish a permit system allowing for and regulating signs in the controlled areas, and denying permits to such signs not meeting the standards with respect to hazards to public safety or which would obscure any area of unusual natural beauty or unusual scenic interest or would tend to cause a proliferation of signs.

The Secretary would be a supervisor and counselor assisting in the control and regulation of this industry and allowing for its orderly development in the spirit and purpose of the act, and would reaffirm the salutary established principle of the Federal Government cooperating with rather than dictating to local government in the solution of problems that are national in nature as well as local in scope and operation.

NORTH AMERICAN WATER AND POWER ALLIANCE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, because there are some officials in the Dominion Government in Canada, and in the provincial governments, who oppose in principle transporting surplus water from Canada to the United States, and because their objections have made many headlines in the past, there has been some doubt in some quarters in the United States about the future of the North American Water and Power Alliance, or the NAWAPA project, as it is better known. There has been a tendency to brush it off as an impractical dream at least until there is a change of heart and attitude in Canada.

It was encouraging, therefore, to read in the Albertian Editorial, a daily newspaper published in Calgary, in the Province of Alberta, that Mr. Jean-Luc Pepin, the recently appointed Minister of Canada's new Department of Resources and Energy, has no built-in reservations whatsoever about exporting water to the United States, and sees no reason why this should not be done, "If Canada can spare it and we can get a good fee for it."

Mr. Pepin, a former political science professor, who in his new post will have considerable influence on policies on the use and development of Canada's natural resources, frankly labels himself as a "continentalist." He says furthermore that he can see no point in not doing something simply because it has never been done before. He indicates that he is willing to take an objective look at water exportation, which is, of course, the heart of the NAWAPA plan.

Mr. Pepin's attitude is most refreshing, and a hopeful sign for the future of NAWAPA. I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Albertan Editorial, which appeared on March 1, 1966, be carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I also ask permission to have carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very fine article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 13, which outlines some of the water problems of the Great Lakes, and discusses how the NAWAPA project would bring relief to that area.

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

[From the Albertian Editorial, Mar. 1, 1966]

MUCH DEPENDS ON JEAN-LUC PEPIN

(By Peter Newman)

OTTAWA.—It's doubtful if any member of the Pearson ministry is charged with decisions that will have more impact on Canada's future than Jean-Lue Pepin, the ebullient former political science professor who was unexpectedly promoted to the new Department of Resources and Energy in last December's Cabinet shuffle.

As a fledging Minister in a precedent-setting portfolio Mr. Pepin must formulate the long-term policies which will govern the eventual limits of Canadian nationhood, by deciding how much of our natural resources—particularly water—will remain under our own jurisdiction and what proportion will be shared with the United States. His Department will also direct the future development of atomic energy in this country, plan the eventual construction of a national power grid, and deal with the tricky jurisdictional decision of how minerals in the underwater shelves around our coasts are to be developed.

Mr. Pepin's pronouncements on the continental sharing of resources have been limited to the witty but vague observation: "I am a continentalist, if it's in the national interest." What he really believes is that the question must be approached without any political or economic prejudices.

"There was a time in Canadian history," he told me, "when those who advocated the export of coal, oil, electricity, and just about every other resource were thought of as traitors. If it should be proven to the Government's satisfaction that we can spare water and get a good fee for it, I don't see any reason why we shouldn't export. After all, that's the traditional Liberal position. You don't deny something new, just because it's never been done before. You look at each new proposition with total objectivity."

Mr. Pepin's pragmatic approach to what will surely become the central issue in Canadian-American relations over the next decade also applies to domestic constitutional problems. He is one of the few Pearson Ministers from Quebec—or from any other Province, for that matter—who is convincingly optimistic that the current impasse in Federal-provincial relations will be resolved without a major constitutional convulsion.

He recognizes no contradiction in the idea of the governments in Quebec City and Ottawa both attempting to aggrandize their power, providing collaboration and cooperation between them become the rule rather than the exception.

"The two jurisdictions," he says, "are bound to overlap, but the objective in government action must always be the common good, not the purity of the Constitution." Mr. Pepin believes that the Canadian constitution should be treated as a point of arrival, not a point of departure, and certainly not as a political document. "The writing of a constitution should take place only after we've negotiated all of the necessary compromises and not before. That's why the kind of constitutional conference John Diefenbaker is advocating would be the greatest circus in our history—it's a ridiculous suggestion."

Mr. Pepin's background as a professor of political science (he also has degrees in law and philosophy) shines through his discussion of Federal-provincial relations. It was Mr. Pepin who provided the theoretical backing for the Liberals' cooperative federalism approach in a lengthy academic paper presented to the Quebec Institute of Public Affairs in the fall of 1964. Now, he's elaborating his "vacuum theory," which holds that governments must move into every area of social activity not adequately occupied. "But there is no reason," he says, "for the Federal Government to remain in areas which are either in the letter or the spirit of the constitution essentially provincial. This includes such fields as education and social security, all of which the Provinces should be allowed to occupy."

At the same time, Mr. Pepin sees the need and desirability for more Ottawa initiatives in such areas of national concern as the erection of a cross-country power grid, the treatment of polluted rivers, and exploitation of the Continental Shelf. "It's one thing to insist that the underwater minerals belong to the Provinces," he says, "but what about the fishing, navigation, and defense activities that take place on the water's surface? These are Federal concerns, and any solution can't exclude the Federal Government."

In his approach to these and other questions, Mr. Pepin is definitely on the side of the New Guard from Quebec, but unlike such colleagues as Messrs. Sauve, Marchand, Trudeau, and Pelletier, he is not a man of the left. His political coloring is closer to that of Jean Lesage or even Lester Pearson, with pragmatism always taking precedence over ideology.

"What I like about Mr. Pearson," says Mr. Pepin, "is the complete denial of fanaticism in his approach to problems. He is also one of those rare English-Canadian politicians who understand the special position of French-Canadians and the frustrations of being a French-speaking Canadian in Ottawa."

The fact is that Mr. Pepin is one of those rare French Canadians with whom Mr. Pearson has achieved total personal rapport.

Despite his comparative youth (he's only 41) and inexperience (he's been in practical politics for only 3 years), Mr. Pepin has so far handled himself in his difficult new job with exquisite savoir-faire. But as he himself knows, he has yet to be tested in a real confrontation with the parliamentary opposition or to take the kind of decision which will reveal exactly where he stands on the fundamental issues facing his department and his country.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Mar. 13, 1966]

THIRSTY NATIONS SEEK ANSWER—WATER, WATER EVERYWHERE?

("That which no King before me had done, I did * * * great canals I dug * * * and brought abundant waters to all the people.")

(By John Ludwigson)

So boasted one of the most powerful monarchs of the ancient world, Nebuchadnezzar II of Babylon. His irrigation works, filled with water from Tigris and Euphrates Rivers, made Babylon the garden spot of the Middle East.

Yet today Babylon is a desert. Nebuchadnezzar's mightiest works lie buried beneath centuries of dust and silt.

What happened?

Years of war and strife took the toll, but the end came finally when, as the neglected canals choked up with silt, Babylon ran out of water.

Yet, water is plentiful on earth.

Even as the Babylonians watched their once-green city dry up, abundant water flowed on in the rivers.

The United States, particularly the northeast, is one of the best-watered countries on earth. Yet last year the northeast found itself in a drought.

Official reports traced much of the trouble to neglect—the same problem that ended the glory of Babylon.

Though New York, indeed, had a splendid water supply, leaky mains and careless users brought the city to the brink of disaster. City planners, who had been boasting of an insured supply for the foreseeable future, ate crow while preparing to tap the Hudson River.

Cleveland, with one of the largest lakes in the world on its doorstep, is in a little better position. As Water Commissioner Thomas E. Stanton observed recently, Lake Erie is a nearly inexhaustible supply.

But rapidly increasing numbers of users and galloping pollution may eventually strain even that source.

Great Lakes water levels are in such a delicate state that lawsuits are now pending to force the city of Chicago to end diversion of Lake Michigan waters which it uses to flush its sewage down the Illinois River.

Last year, Lake Erie was about 18 inches below normal, but the Army Corps of Engineers bulletin on lake levels predicts a rise in all the lakes this year to nearly the all-time average levels.

Rainfall dumps an average 4.4 billion gallons of water on the United States every day. In a year, at that rate, we would all be wading through an average depth of 30 inches of accumulated water.

Actually only about 1.1 billion gallons a day finds its way into rivers and lakes. It is used over and over again for a total water use of some 360 billion gallons a day in this country alone.

Since most uses of water don't actually consume it—the water runs back into rivers and lakes through sewers and natural runoff—the supply could, potentially, be stretched even further. It could; that is, if Americans were not so accustomed to the idea of free, fresh water.

Water extracted from someone else's sewage, no matter how pure, isn't John Doe's idea of what he wants to drink.

And so, as 29,920 gallons a second of somewhat used water flowed past in the Hudson River, New Yorkers rationed water in a full-fledged drought.

Meanwhile, in sunny and dry California, with half as much rain as New York, life went on as usual.

Ever since 1913 when Los Angeles' first aqueduct, 215 miles long, opened, the area has understood the need for advanced water planning and careful use of the water available.

Even as the Californians chuckled over the drought in New York, they were planning to tap new sources of water for their mushrooming population.

With all relatively nearby sources already spoken for, the thirsty Californians have been thinking big—on a continental scale. And that is where Cleveland comes in again.

For a scheme proposed by a Los Angeles engineering firm would not only supply California but 32 other States, 7 Provinces, and 1 territory in Canada and the 3 northern States of Mexico.

Its originators, the Ralph M. Parsons Co., named the grandiose scheme the North American Water and Power Alliance (NAWAPA) in honor of its international character.

NAWAPA would take water from the Yukon, Peace, and Fraser Rivers in northwest Canada. The water would be stored in a 500-mile-long reservoir in the Canadian Rocky Mountains.

Canals would carry the stored water to the southwest, of Columbia River and—of interest to Cleveland—to the Great Lakes.

"This diversion canal would alleviate falling levels and pollution of the Great Lakes," Parsons reported. "It would also augment the power potential of the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers.

"It is possible to develop this canal so it would be navigable * * * to the heart of Alberta * * * a transcontinental waterway could be developed * * * with its western terminus at Howe Sound, British Columbia."

For a cost of around $100 billion, the plan would provide water enough for the next 100 years, Parsons engineers estimated.

Water brought south in the system would irrigate a strip of land 2,500 miles long and 35 miles wide—86,300 square miles, including an area in Mexico equal to eight times that watered by the Aswan High Dam in Egypt.

Of course, in doing this, the plan would also inundate thousands of square miles of this continent's most beautiful scenery. But conservation groups have been slow to rally to defense of the forests.

David Brower, executive director of the Sierra Club, one of the Nation's foremost outdoor and conservative organizations, explained:

"This is something that will need a great deal of study. We would be quite concerned about the scenic resources that would be inundated.

"But we are fighting three major battles now (concerning the California redwood trees, damming of the Grand Canyon and the Columbia River) and just haven't had the time for it."

"It seems to us," Brower observed, "there would be a great advantage in having people go where the water is and in becoming less enamoured with increasing the population of one area."

In 1964, the Special Subcommittee on Western Water Development of the U.S. Senate Committee on Public Works prepared a report on NAWAPA.

The subcommittee, headed by Senator FRANK E. Moss, Democrat, of Utah, concluded, in part:

"Water shortages are not peculiar to the western portion of the United States. The East has its problems and so does the South. But these problems take a different form. Mostly it is a question of being able to use what is available. Standard of water quality is the biggest problem east of the Mississippi.

"But in the Western States and to a degree in the Midwestern States even the highest water quality standards won't produce enough water. It just isn't there. And the problem will get worse."

On September 1 last year, Senator Moss introduced a resolution urging United States and Canadian studies of the water resources that would be involved. The resolution now is before the Public Works Committee.

Since it would be principally their water that would be involved, Canadian approval of NAWAPA is essential. That approval seems unlikely, at least right away.

Official comments north of the border have ranged from a flat "no" from the Premier of British Columbia to a cautious "maybe" from Prime Minister Lester Pearson.

A Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, newspaper quoted Pearson: "This can be one of the most important developments in our history. We will be discussing this with the United States."

Yet, former Conservative Prime Minister John Diefenbaker, pledging his party's opposition to the plan, accused the Liberals (Pearson's party) of willingness to "pull the plug on one of our most vital resources."

A Vancouver, British Columbia, paper, noting comments of Gov. Mark O. Hatfield, of Oregon, took what may come to be the prevailing Canadian stand:

"Governor Hatfield said that from the point of view of economics the people and industries that needed the water should simply locate in Oregon, not spend billions moving Oregon water south.

"It is difficult to argue with his economics and logic. They apply as strongly to British Columbia, which would suffer considerably if most of its major valleys were flooded out, turning them into a giant conduit to California."

But perhaps the final solution to the world's water problems will come straight out of a space capsule.

Astronauts on their way to the moon and Mars will have only a small, fixed amount of water for all their needs. To make it last, space capsules will be equipped with complex recovery systems that will extract drinking water from sewage.

In a crude way, that is what present-day municipal sewage and water purification plants do. In the future—perhaps not very distant future—much more efficient methods may have to be employed to provide water for our burgeoning population.

In the form of desalinization plants which make potable water from sea water, these plants are here already.

They are not limited to sea water, however.

One could, for example, produce drinking water from Cuyahoga River, if it became necessary.

PROPOSAL TO MERGE ARMY RESERVE AND NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, a very serious question has been bothering me since the introduction of the new budget for fiscal 1967. This question has to do with the reappearance in the Defense budget of Secretary McNamara's proposal to merge the Army Reserve and the National Guard by transferring all of the Army Reserve drill pay strength to the National Guard.

Why has the Secretary of Defense come back to Congress with an identical version of this merger plan after Congress had so emphatically stated its position last year?

What is behind Mr. McNamara's new move after this same Army Reserve reduction-merger proposal blew up in the face of its advocates last year?

It should have been dropped forthwith in the interest of the military services and national defense. To the contrary, it is back again in the same old form, and it is my understanding that, notwithstanding the strong position taken by the Congress last year, the Army has issued instructions to its commands in the field regarding it. These instructions say that the original plan of last year was being reintroduced and would be scheduled for execution beginning July 1 of this year, with the major part of the reorganization being accomplished in the period from July through September and the entire reorganization to be completed by December 31, 1966.

Now it seems to me that this is presuming a lot toward the Congress—in fact it presumes a complete change of congressional mind as to the validity of the discredited proposal of last year. And further, it presumes that Congress is going to change the law to permit the Defense Department to accomplish what it could not do by circumventing the law through Executive mandate.

The reorganization of the Army's Reserve components announced by the Department of Defense on December 12, 1964, would have reduced the authorized paid drill strength by 150,000; it would have inactivated 21 divisions—15 National Guard and 6 Reserve—and would have placed the management of all paid drill units under the National Guard Bureau and the 52 States and Territories of the Union. This administrative shuffle, despite claims that it would promote streamlining, efficiency, and economy, leaves something to be desired. Among other things it replaces supervision of the Army Reserve by full-time Army professionals with part-time personnel who participate only in weekly drills.

My immediate concern is what such a reorganization would do to our military posture. It is possible to recover from bad management over a period of time, but a wrong decision affecting national security could be irretrievable.

The complete waste of manpower in the direct reduction and discard of 150,000 trained personnel, and the reduction of 21 combat divisions, has serious implications with respect to our military posture.

Today we are deeply committed in Vietnam. We have forces deployed to the Dominican Republic. We are maintaining major forces along the Iron Curtain in support of NATO.

Still fresh in our memories are the missile crisis in Cuba in 1962 and Khrushchev's threat in 1961 to come to terms with East Germany thus triggering a crisis over Berlin. Reservists were called to the colors on both of those occasions. But an even greater Reserve response was required in 1950.

Should we become engaged in an operation approaching the size of the Korean war, we would, under the Department of Defense merger proposal, encounter considerable difficulty in the deployment of

trained forces of the same magnitude as we had in that conflict. During the Korean war we committed eight Army divisions and one Marine division. Supporting us were an international division of three brigades—Australian, British, and Turkish—and 14 Korean divisions.

We must remember that the new proposal of the Department of Defense calls for only six deployable combat divisions from the Reserve component of the Army. These, together with the 16 provided in the Active Army create a total of 22 deployable combat divisions, other than Marines, available on relatively short notice.

Now of this total of 22, we have 5 divisions committed in Europe and 2 in Korea which are not redeployable. The net remaining is 15 divisions, the equivalent of which are 3⅓ currently in Vietnam.

But suppose, as has been conjectured by more than one member of the Congress, that Vietnam requires an effort much like that in Korea. If this should be the case and would require eight Army divisions in Vietnam, that would leave a strategic Reserve of only seven, six of them National Guard.

Are these enough?

I think there is reason to cast serious doubt upon the adequacy of this figure. If I may use a term favored by the Secretary of Defense, the "options" open to the other side are too many.

Berlin, Cuba, Korea represent points where pressure can be applied by the other side, for example, and I am not at this time prepared to accept the thesis that we can meet any likely combination of contingencies with a maximum deployable strength of only 15 divisions.

I say this while recognizing full well the additional strength available in our Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, together with their Reserve components. But how are we to know that the ax which has been sharpened for the Army Reserves is not also being honed for the reservists of the other services.

Another disturbing factor is the loss of trained personnel voluntarily serving in the Army Reserve that would occur through the merger.

In peacetime the National Guard occupies a dual role. It is a State force available to the Governor for any emergency in his State such as riots, strikes, disaster, and civil defense. In time of war, when available, it augments the Active Army.

Reservists cannot be assigned to National Guard units without their consent. They must volunteer for the Guard. The Army Reserve contains many highly qualified personnel in the executive, technical, and management world. The dedication of these individuals to service of their country when needed is beyond question. But they would not be prone to serve voluntarily in units that are subject to peacetime callup for emergencies that States often face.

I think the Senate would find it illuminating to inquire as to the success which the National Guard has had in affiliating these Army reservists who were disenfranchised from paid drilling units as of last December 31, and I hope that this subject will be gone into during committee hearings on the budget and legislating affecting the Reserve components.

You will recall that in the Defense Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1966 the Congress provided money for both the Army Reserve and the Armory National Guard but with provisos that the Army Reserve shall be programed for an end strength of not less than 270,000 during the fiscal year and the Army National Guard for an end strength of not less than 380,000. This action fully supported the conclusions of investigative bodies and both Houses which found that the merger would be inimical to national interest; would cause a serious loss of combat readiness in the affected Reserve units; and would, for all practical purposes, destroy the Army Reserve by transferring all of its organized training functions to the State Guard organizations.

Despite this congressional action of last year, and in the face of the deferral request by all members of the Armed Services Committee and the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, the Department of Defense, nonetheless, proceeded a short time later to issue an order reorganizing the Army Reserve. This order involved the inactivation by December 31, 1965, of 6 Reserve combat divisions, 4 divisional headquarters commands, and others, for a total of 751 units having 55,000 personnel in paid drill.

Concurrently with this reorganization there was created a selected Reserve force with increased training, manning levels, and equipment priorities.

I think the selected Reserve force, in its concept, is excellent and deserves wholehearted support, but it does not go far enough. It should be extended to include all paid drilling units of the Army Reserve.

Instead, however, this selected Reserve force consists of three divisions and six independent brigades from the National Guard, with supporting units from both Reserve and National Guard. A total of 976 company and detachment size units are involved, of which 744 are from the National Guard and 232 from the Reserve.

The 55,000 personnel lost to paid drill status in the Army Reserve reorganization presumably were to be used to improve manning levels in the remaining Army Reserve units and the selected Reserve force. It is claimed that personnel released will enable the selected Reserve force units to be brought up to 100-percent manning level and the immediate Reserve—high priority—units of the Army Reserve to be brought up to the 80-percent manning level.

The facts are that the inactivated units in many, many cases are not located in the same geographical area as are the selected Reserve force or the immediate Reserve units which could employ their talents. And in those cases where selected Reserve force units of the National Guard are nearby, the reluctance to join for the reasons stated earlier is, I understand, holding down enrollment of these disenfranchised reservists.

Why has the Department of Defense persisted in this reorganization plan, after Congress has disavowed it?

Why has Secretary McNamara by decree moved to obtain what Congress would not give him?

And is the abolition of paid drill for Army reservists in favor of the National Guard in the next budget an effort to validate this earlier action?

And will Secretary McNamara attempt to shift the blame to Congress if the administrative reorganization he has already placed into effect is not supported in the budget?

It is a matter of record, Mr. President, that elements in the Pentagon for the past several years, have been engaging in a persistent fight to reduce the Reserves. The record also shows that Congress, which has the Constitutional responsibility to establish troop levels and military policy by law, has been just as determined to maintain the strength of the Reserves.

The efforts to cut back the Reserves have been accompanied by some very questionable practices—withholding of funds, denial of equipment and support, neglect and indifference toward the programs. The Pentagon cannot deny that the Reserves have been undermanned, underequipped and undertrained—because the Defense Department leadership did not carry out the will of Congress.

The Reserves are among the best bargains that the taxpayers can buy. Of course, it is expected that the Defense Department and the military services will make recommendations for changes in Reserve programs. These are necessary to prevent stagnation. But I believe that the executive branch should support the law of the land, or, if not satisfied with it, seek to have it changed through recommendations to the Congress where the issues can be fully explored.

It is a breach of good government to persist in a course of action which has been unacceptable to the Congress.

I hope that the legislative branch this year will succeed in ending the turbulence in Reserve programs which has been created by this attitude of the Defense Department so that the reservists can get back to their business of preparing themselves for the time when their country needs them.

MRS. IRENE FLETCHER SELECTED AS UTAH "MOTHER OF THE YEAR"

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Utah has selected its "Mother of the Year." Her name is Mrs. Irene Fletcher, widow of Dr. Calvin Fletcher. Not only is Mrs. Fletcher a charming and worthy choice, but she is the sister-in-law of the current "American Mother of the Year," Mrs. Harvey Fletcher.

I congratulate both Mrs. Fletchers.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news story and an editorial regarding Mrs. Fletcher from the Salt Lake Tribune.

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

UTAH MOTHER OF THE YEAR—WIDOW OF USU PROFESSOR WINS TITLE

A woman who claims she is not a public person, Friday was catapulted into the public spotlight when she was named Utah's Mother of the Year for 1966.

Mrs. Irene Thompson Fletcher, Logan, a sister-in-law of the reigning American Mother of the Year, Mrs. Harvey Fletcher, Provo, was selected by the Utah Mothers Committee from a group of nine finalists.

REALLY SURPRISED

Widow of Prof. Calvin Fletcher, former head of Utah State University department of art, the State's 1966 Mother of the Year said Friday she was really surprised at her selection.

"I'm not very much of a public person," she said, "and have not taken part in public activities very much. I haven't done as much as some of the other women, so I was really surprised when they chose me."

Mrs. Fletcher said she never expected to get out of Logan in the competition.

CONSIDERED REFUSING

Her name was entered in the contest by the Logan Jaycee Jills, she said, and after their first request to enter her name, she thought she would refuse.

"But the children were such good children and I was afraid they would think I was ashamed of them, so I let them (Jaycee Jills) enter my name," she said.

For a woman who is not a public person, Mrs. Fletcher has made a number of public contributions.

An artist, she has painted a mural in the children's section of the Cache County public library in Logan and teaches an art class weekly in her studio.

PAINTINGS DISPLAYED

Her paintings have been displayed at the State capitol, in a State fair collection, at Utah State University, and in several schools in Logan.

Active in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Mrs. Irene Fletcher was a genealogy missionary and on the Logan and Mount Logan IDS Stake primary boards. She has held offices in the Daughters of Utah Pioneers and is a member of Utah Creative Arts.

Two alternates also were announced Friday. They are Mrs. Leland Monroe (Minnie Lewis) Angus, Roosevelt, and Mrs. David L. (Mildred Pinnock) Sargent, Cedar City.

TWO HAVE 16 CHILDREN

Mrs. Angus is the mother of seven children and Mrs. Sargent has nine children.

Mrs. Fletcher is stepmother of eight children and mother of six.

"We always felt the children should have a responsibility—outside busy work—to the family," she said. A lot of the credit for the success of the family goes to the children, she said. "They made the task easy."

ANOTHER MRS. FLETCHER

"We had a happy home life." In these words are found the key to the success of Mrs. Irene Thompson Fletcher, of Logan, Utah's 1966 Mother of the Year.

This simple sentence is about her own family life as a child. But it is often repeated today by 14 children, 6 her own and 8 who were left motherless by the deaths of her husband's first 2 wives and were reared by Mrs. Fletcher.

Using as a standard her own happy home life, Mrs. Fletcher drew close around her all 14 children—all of whom have achieved success in their chosen fields, ranging from wives and homemakers to professional careers—and created for them also a happy home life.

Yet, somehow, with a dozen plus two children about, Mrs. Fletcher still found time to be active in church work, PTA, and a number of civic and professional groups. Somehow, also, she found time to paint. Accomplished artist that she is, she has works in numerous public buildings as well as in private collections.

The home life of the Fletchers—he died in 1963—was marked by firm but kindly discipline, a daily program of work, high personal standards of conduct for each member, weekly checkup meetings, and a weekly program of home and fun evenings. And, of course, love. These, of course, are simple virtues and simple principles that anyone can practice—and must—to achieve a happy home life.

Congratulations to Mrs. Fletcher. She will be a worthy candidate for the national Mother of the Year title, currently held by her sister-in-law, Mrs. Harvey Fletcher.

(At this point, Mr. BASS took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

A RESIDENCE FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I urgently hope Congress will move ahead in this session on plans for a permanent Vice-Presidential residence.

I am convinced that there is a clear need for a Vice-Presidential residence, a need that actually should have been met years ago. It makes no sense to postpone action on this matter, because the need will only grow as the country grows with each succeeding Vice President.

Although I have had the privilege of living next door to the Vice President for the past 9 years, in Chevy Chase, I want to make it clear that I do not speak at his suggestion. Indeed, every time I have tried to discuss this subject with him, he has found some way to abruptly change the conversation to some other theme. Actually, he is too busy and too dedicated a public servant to worry about house plans and where he is going to live.

It is equally clear that the greatest country on the face of the earth ought to be able to provide adequate quarters for its Vice President, even if he prefers not to discuss the subject, or even if he recommends against it.

Although I would personally hate to lose the Humphreys as neighbors, I am concerned about their security, their convenience, and their capacity to meet their expected obligations in their present location.

Their home is located virtually on the curb of a very busy street, where traffic is bumper to bumper during the rush hours, and where, with comparative ease at any time of day, a disturbed person could throw an explosive into their home.

Every time the Vice President steps out his front door, before he can get to his car, he is surrounded by friendly people. He is such a warm and engaging person that he cannot resist such affection. However, it hampers his every move.

His house, which is an approximate twin to mine—we live on Coquelin Terrace where all the houses are very similar—was a modest structure to begin with. Now the basement has been occupied by the Secret Service. Mrs. Humphrey's secretary has taken over the den. Officials often claim the living room. It seems that the Vice President and Mrs. Humphrey will soon be confined to the kitchen.

The Vice President says he is perfectly happy where he is. That is irrelevant, for all the reasons I have suggested. I think Vice President HUMPHREY would be happy in a one-room hut as long as he were permitted to continue in public service. The question is not the happiness of any one Vice President, but whether, after nearly two centuries of nationhood, the United States should delay any longer providing suitable quarters for its Vice President.

As for the argument that the United States cannot afford to build a vice-presidential home, that makes little sense to me. If we can afford an aquarium to take care of the fish here in the Nation's Capital, we can surely afford an adequate home for the Vice President—the second most important official in this great country.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it was once my privilege to own a home in the same block as the Senator from South Dakota and the then Senator from Minnesota, who is now the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. McGOVERN. I am sorry that the Senator moved away.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It was a nice neighborhood with good neighbors. I would say at the time we came here that was about as much home as we could afford. As we grow older we are able to do a little better in life.

I know that the Vice President built a room or two onto his home to try to make it adequate for his needs.

The Vice President should have a home, not for the Vice President but for the United States, where he could take some of the entertainment burden off of the President of the United States, as he is asked to do from time to time with visiting dignitaries from foreign lands and those who visit the Capital.

It is fine to make a showing of having high officials of very modest means. On the other hand, people who come here, especially from foreign lands, are asked to visit with the Vice President because of the burdens on the Presidency. I imagine they are somewhat shocked to find they are driven out to Coquelin Terrace to share the modest means that the Vice President has available.

It would be appropriate that he have a home in keeping with those who have some of the better homes in Washington, D.C., not for himself, but for the Nation.

It would be well that he be able to entertain as well as the Chief of Naval Operations. I am not trying to root the Chief of Naval Operations out of his home, but the Navy has some land at the Naval Observatory at Massachusetts Avenue and this would make a couple of acres available. Maybe he could find space where a few people could park their cars in front of his home and there would be room for the Secret Service to protect the Vice President. After all, he is only a heartbeat away from the Presi-

dency, and this Nation should have facilities for the Vice President.

As the Senator well knows it is not unusual for a person to be appointed as a member of the President's Cabinet, or to a high executive position, who has great means. Sometimes they are millionaires many times over. Such people can come to town and lease a home that would be adequate for one of the embassies of a major country. They can entertain and carry out all of the functions expected of a great country in the way of receiving, entertaining, and providing official receptions for foreign visitors, as well as important Americans.

It would be appropriate that the Vice President could do so as well. We do not expect the Vice President to be a man of wealth and great means. The American ideal is that he not be that. I think it would be very fine if we should insist the Vice President have an adequate residence.

I believe that I once heard a replay of the Vice President's speech at the Gridiron Club where he stated the only home he was interested in trading for was one with large columns and a large lawn, in the heart of the city, but he was saying that as a matter of jest, I am sure. It would be very appropriate that we insist the Vice President be in a position to carry out effectively all of the burdens that both his job and the Vice-Presidency imposes upon him.

I second the motion by the Senator. We should insist that the Vice President have an adequate residence.

Mr. McGOVERN. I think the Senator's point is well taken.

As the Senator from Louisiana knows, we annually appropriate assistance for a good many countries all over the world. I have always supported those programs, or the bulk of them, but many of the countries we are assisting would not waste a moment's time questioning the need for an adequate home for their Vice President or their other high officials.

We are not talking about one particular individual, Vice President HUMPHREY. We are talking about a permanent home for the Vice President who would be the President of the United States if anything should happen to the President.

As the Senator stated so well, we have in our present Vice President a man who could do a splendid job representing this country with foreign countries, foreign visitors who come here, and he could take some of the responsibility off of the President.

I sincerely hope that the Congress will act on this matter.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It has been my privilege to visit many countries of the world. I have not visited all countries of the world by any means, but I have visited quite a few countries around the world in Western Europe, Central America, South America, and Japan, and I know of no Ambassador who represents this country who has facilities any more modest or nearly as modest as the Vice President of the United States.

While it is true that Ambassadors technically represent the President of the United States, the Vice President, in a great many cases, represents the President of the United States. He is the President's alter ego in many respects when he is representing the President and receiving people in this country.

His requirements, I believe, are even more important than a great number of our Ambassadors, for many of whom we have provided very adequately, indeed.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

I believe I have been in a position, perhaps a unique position, to watch the coming and going of the Vice President in recent years and during the time he was in the Senate.

I do not know of anyone in public life who works harder and puts in longer hours. I think that the Vice President has probably saved the Government enough money in overtime labor, for which no claim has been put in, to finance a good residence.

I hope, because of the needs of our Vice President and for the permanent good of the Nation, that we will not delay on this matter longer. Much time has passed already. I hope we will act in the near future. There is nothing to be gained by further delay.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I wish the Senator had moved on this subject sooner because this Senator has children about the same age as some of the children of the Vice President. I imagine if it happened many years ago they could have been invited to very nice parties for the children of Senators and Congressmen, as well as foreign visitors, and the children of the Senator from Louisiana, in their younger years, might have been invited.

I appreciate the Senator's sentiment because the Humphreys are wonderful hosts.

Mr. McGOVERN. I have not discussed this matter with the Vice President because he refuses to talk about it. I did not tell him I would discuss it on the floor of the Senate today. Indeed, I have taken the floor with some hesitation, knowing that he does not want to make a large issue of the matter. But this is a responsibility we ought to move on and resolve as expeditiously as possible.

I yield the floor.

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 proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PERMIT VOLUNTARY PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of Senators CURTIS, MUNDT, THURMOND, SIMPSON, MCCLELLAN, BENNETT, ALLOTT, LAUSCHE, WILLIAMS of Delaware, COTTON, CARLSON, JORDAN of Idaho, PEARSON, TOWER, MURPHY, and DOMINICK I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to permit voluntary participation in prayer in the public schools, and ask that it be printed under the rule.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may lie on the desk through Friday, April 1, 1966, to permit additional Senators to append their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 148) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit voluntary participation in prayer in public schools, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the joint resolution is short and simple, and reads as follows:

> Nothing contained in this Constitution shall prohibit the authority administering any school, school system, educational institution or other public building supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds from providing for or permitting the voluntary participation by students or others in prayer. Nothing contained in this article shall authorize any such authority to prescribe the form or content of any prayer.

The motivation for this resolution stems from three court decisions which provoked a king-sized protest throughout the land and was followed by the introduction of more than 150 resolutions in both branches of the Congress.

The first of these was the Engel against Vitale case in the U.S. Supreme Court, commonly referred to as the Board of Regents case in New York. The board, created by the constitution of New York, acting officially recommended a prayer composed for or by the board and directed that it be recited aloud, in the presence of the teacher. Suit was filed against School District No. 5 in Hyde Park, N.Y. On appeal, the case went to the U.S. Supreme Court, which sustained the plaintiffs in the case and invalidated the action of the school and the board.

The second case was that of the Abingdon School District in Pennsylvania against Schempp and involved a State statute enacted in 1959, requiring that 10 Bible verses be read without comment at the opening of each school day in every Pennsylvania public school. Children could be excused on the written request of the parent or guardian. This too was struck down by the U.S. Supreme Court.

The third case, that of Stein against Oshinsky was tried in the U.S. District Court of New York and then went to the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. It did not go to the U.S. Supreme Court. Mr. Oshinsky, principal of School District No. 184 in Whitestone, N.Y., ordered teachers who were instructing kindergarten classes to

stop them from reciting a simple, ancient prayer with their morning milk and cookies which went as follows:

> God is great, God is good,
> And we thank Him for this food.

The teachers were also instructed or ordered to stop the recital of an afternoon prayer, also of ancient origin, which read:

> Thank You for the world so sweet,
> Thank You for the food we eat,
> Thank You for the birds that sing,
> Thank You God for everything.

Finally, teachers were ordered to permit no prayers in any classroom in District No. 184.

Parents of children of various faiths sued to enjoin school officials from preventing recital of prayers on the children's initiative.

I may say, parenthetically, that the suit embraced some 21 children who were of the Jewish faith and also of the Protestant faith, by denomination, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and others.

The U.S. district court sustained the parents. The U.S. circuit court overruled the district court.

Basically, these cases hinged upon the first amendment to the Constitution which states that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;". The 14th amendment came into play because these commands—that is, in the first amendment—were held applicable to the States as well.

There was a storm of protest over these decisions. For a time it subsided. But it is gathering again in all parts of the Nation.

The fears which these decisions have inspired, the implications which they contain, and the results which might accrue make it imperative that Congress take cognizance of this matter and begin to concern itself with a sustained course of action.

We might yet see school Christmas programs without the use of the word Christmas. Not even "Xmas" would do since it is but an abbreviation of Christmas. Santa Claus may become a memory and we may have to settle for Jolly Mr. Nick. Christmas carols might be excised from the school songbooks. The star which guided the Wisemen might have to recede into orbit. The Nativity scene may have to vanish from school programs, as evidenced by the advice tendered to the Gateway Union School in suburban Pittsburgh—incidentally, advice given, I think, by the district attorney—that if there were to be a Nativity scene, it might be proper and legal only if presented in "a cultural vein."

If the profound legalisms of the courts are carried to a logical conclusion, and to be fully consistent, perhaps God should be removed from the court crier's exhortation at the opening sessions of the U.S. Supreme Court when he says, "God save this honorable Court." But God also appears in the oaths which Senators take. His name appears on our coinage. Every witness who is sworn before testifying before a congressional committee ends his oath with "So help me God." Presidents, from Washington to Johnson, have implored God's help in their inaugural addresses and state of the Union messages. Perhaps it must be stopped. Perhaps the Judicial Code must be amended so that jurors who are sworn will not be required to say, "So help me God." Army, Navy, and other service chaplains may have to be admonished how far they can go in invoking God's grace. Even that sacred document—the Declaration of Independence—may have to be modified, for in it, Jefferson used terms as "Nature's God," "The Creator," and concluded with the affirmation, "With a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence."

I propose a simple amendment. It is voluntary. It is permissive. It places the responsibility upon local school authorities. It gives no authority to an official body to dictate the form or content of a prayer. Such authority may provide for or permit voluntary participation only. And that is the whole of it.

Since the court decisions referred to earlier have been handed down, millions upon millions of words have been written on this subject. Polls have been taken. Insofar as I can determine, more than 81 percent of the people disagree with the courts. Two weeks ago, one man came to Washington and dumped 52,000 original letters of protest on my desk. Prayer groups are organizing. Sooner or later, Congress must come to grips with this matter.

What I propose is no disrespect to the Court. It is only that I disagree. Lincoln accepted but stoutly disagreed with the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott decision. It remained for blood and for the 13th amendment to overturn that decision. In 1913, Congress and the people reversed the Court in the imposition of a tax on incomes. But for that, there would hardly be a Great Society today because it takes money to run the Great Society.

In all of the prayer cases, the decisions were based on an interpretation of the Constitution. That Constitution was ordained by the people. Moreover, the people reserved the right to amend it. The issue from here on is therefore quite clear. Shall the people be afforded an opportunity to act on language which will clarify this vexing problem before it is carried to ridiculous extremes by other suits which may be filed? I do not now propose to repeal the first amendment to the Constitution. I do not propose to reverse the Court. I do propose a clarification so that these decisions and their possible implications will not hover over every teacher, every principal, and every educator in the land as well as over the school boards and authorities who are charged with administering our public educational system.

It will be noted that the amendment contains the words "providing for or permitting." It may be contended that to provide for voluntary participation in prayer is also offensive since it must mean in a tax-supported public school. Just how offensive is it?

The Court crier who asks God to save this honorable Court every time he opens a session across the way does so in a magnificent marble building constructed with public funds. The Chaplains of the House and Senate offer their prayers in the people's own Capitol, built with public funds. In that Capitol is a prayer room where Members may go and it was designed and built from public funds appropriated by Congress. Every U.S. vessel, every Government-owned camp, cantonment, barracks, chapel, or other building where prayer is offered by service chaplains has been erected with public funds. The prayers pronounced over the caskets of the young dead coming back from Vietnam are said by chaplains who are paid from public funds. Any argument against providing a place for voluntary prayer because it takes place in a structure built with public funds would sound rather hollow in the face of reality.

To all this, I add a few personal thoughts. A thousand years before the Galilean was born—yes, and perhaps several thousand years—the original parents were warned about the "tree of knowledge of good and evil." They were warned only that to touch it or eat of the fruit meant death. But the tempter serpent beguiled Eve, and she took of the fruit and shared it with Adam. There was no compulsion. There was complete freedom of choice and, having chosen, they must bear the consequences. This, then, is the foundation for the whole doctrine of vicarious atonement. This freedom of choice not only in the spiritual but the material world as well has been eroding and with it come the vexations, the frustrations, and the desperations which mark the lives of so many.

Man must look to a God for comfort, for solace, for consolation, for guidance, and for hope. Glibly and superficially, it is argued that the place for this is the church which children attend once or twice each week, or in the home where the preschool hours are given to preparing for school, the after-school hours in unleashing youthful energy, and the early preretirement hours with books and television and the other diversions of the day.

The really alert hours—perhaps 6 or 7—are spent in school. These are the formative years for 50 million youngsters. These are the hours when the habit of prayer can best be nurtured.

Prayer is the roadmap to God. It should become the greatest adventure for young minds. Each must find the way for himself. This takes some doing—the development of right habits, the building of spiritual muscle. This can come only from practice and rehearsal day after day when young minds are alert.

How strange that we spend hundreds of millions of public funds every year to develop physical fitness and harden the muscles of American youth, but when it comes to hardening the spiritual muscles through the practice and rehearsal of prayer, it becomes enshrouded in quaint legalism and the jargon of church and state.

Mr. President, I finish by saying: Give Caesar what he requires, but give God a little also.

I hope that this measure will commend itself to many Senators so that they may

append their names as cosponsors in addition to those names that have already been reported.

STUDENTS TALK 15 HOURS FOR VIETNAM RELIEF FUND

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, much is said these days about the inability of American teenagers to identify with something of substance. I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article which appeared in the March 2 Laramie, Wyo., Daily Boomerang under the headline "Students Talk 15 Hours for Vietnam Relief Fund."

As reported by my longtime friend and Laramie, Wyo., legionnaire, Ward W. Husted, the teenagers, spearheaded by Tom Mast, Lew Roney, and Jim Ginther, spent some 15 hours speaking over radio station KLME on behalf of the American Legion's Vietnam Relief Fund. The students were responsible for collecting nearly $470 for the fund. They "identified" that day with a cause of great substance.

I ask that the article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with my remarks, as one more indication, not only of the measure of support which Americans give to the very dirty but very necessary war in Vietnam but as an indication of the translation of that support into action by a group of high school students in Laramie, Wyo.

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

STUDENTS TALK 15 HOURS FOR VIETNAM RELIEF FUND

Laramie High School students, spearheaded by their own student council talked for over 15 hours Saturday.

With the cooperation of station KLME and its manager George Blum, the teenagers proved to the world that they were for something, and that they were solidly behind the American service men and women who are fighting for liberty and freedom in Vietnam.

Under the chairmanship of Tom Mast, and Lew Roney and Jim Ginther as cochairmen, 200 LHS students worked and performed from 9 a.m. Saturday until 12:35 a.m. Sunday broadcasting and collecting for the American Legion Vietnam Relief Fund. Many local business and professional men were interviewed during the day, live entertainment was brought in from all parts of the city, and records spun between acts.

All through the day and evening calls came into KLME offering subscriptions to the fund, and within minutes a LHS collector was at the door to pick up the donation. When the LHS team called the show off early Sunday morning they were happy at the $475.07 that had been contributed to the fund.

Legion Commander Doris Christ, of Albany County Post 14, expressed the thanks of all Legionnaires to the students of Laramie High School and to radio station KLME for the fine demonstration of public service last week. In this era of "demonstrations" this was one that brought credit to Laramie and all its people, she said. Station KLME will continue to receive contributions to the Vietnam Relief Fund.

A bright spot of the campaign is that every penny donated will find its way to Vietnam, to back up U.S. servicemens' civic action work among the Vietnamese people. All administrative costs will be paid by the national organization of the American Legion, Mrs. Christ said.

THE KANSAS MILLING INDUSTRY

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the economy of the milling industry of Kansas, indeed much of the economy of the Midwest relating to processed agricultural products, faces a threat because of a disparity in freight rates to the east and south, that is to say, a disparity in the freight rates from the sources of agricultural production to the great metropolitan areas of consumption.

The solution to this problem relates to freight rates, but the eventual solution, if there is to be one, lies in the fundamental forces of competition between regions, each exercising to its fullest capacity its natural advantages.

No one in the State of Kansas has dealt more intelligently or with greater dedication with regard to this problem than Dr. James A. McCain, president of Kansas State University. He serves as a chairman of a 12-State Governors' committee to examine ways of maintaining the strength of the agriculture industry in the Midwest and in Kansas. As an educator he has educated; as an administrator he has dealt with a large body of complicated facts in a precise and excellent manner; and as a concerned citizen he has sought not to shun controversy but to manage it for the welfare of Kansas, the Midwest, and indeed the Nation.

Mr. President, an editorial in the Kansas City Star entitled, "Middle West in Throes of Regional Competition" expresses these sentiments and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

MIDDLE WEST IN THROES OF REGIONAL COMPETITION

Dr. James A. McCain, president of Kansas State University, has been performing a valuable service to the economy of this part of the country. He has done so through his efforts to inform the public on the problems faced in preserving and extending markets for our processed agricultural products.

The crux of the dilemma seems to be that this trade territory, which is strong on agricultural production, does not have many big centers of population. Thus the products of the farm must be shipped either in raw or processed form to places where they will be consumed. For employment and business expansion in our area, we need to maintain processing industries.

McCain's interest in the subject was heightened, when he was named chairman of a 12-State Governors' committee to examine ways of "saving" the flour milling industry in Kansas and other Middle West States. The threat to that industry came from a disparity in freight rates to the East and Southeast as beween wheat and flour. Rates were reduced on wheat but not on flour, putting Kansas mills at a disadvantage.

After many hearings and much study, McCain has come to some conclusions which are important to Middle West area problems and not alone on flour milling. One judgment is that the area can't logically complain about technical progress, even when it interferes with traditional trade patterns. As an example, the mills shouldn't protest because the railroads have found cheaper methods to transport wheat. The difficulties lie in the fact that less expensive transportation has not also been developed for flour or that when it has been provided, the savings have not been passed on in reduced freight rates for flour.

Freight rates can ultimately determine where livestock shall be fed, whether where the livestock is grown, as in the Middle West, or where the meat is consumed, as on the west coast, McCain points out. The Kansas State president insists that producers in this area must maintain the highest possible level of efficiency in order to insure the lowest possible costs of production and a quality product. It follows that processors also must have maximum efficiency to get the end product to consumers at a competitive price. Dr. Elmer H. Kiehl, dean of the college of agriculture at the University of Missouri, has been saying essentially the same thing.

This is not the kind of a problem that can be solved by the adoption of resolutions or even legislation. McCain is emphasizing that there are some areas where complaints on freight disparities might logically be made. Also, freight rates are extremely important to the Middle West's overall economy. But eventually the solution, if there is to be one, lies in meeting competition with other regions. It means exploiting our natural advantages to the hilt and creating others. It is his conclusion that the Middle West can compete, but it won't be easy.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON SUPPORTS TRUTH IN LENDING AND TRUTH IN PACKAGING

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, for 6 years Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, has fought unceasingly and tirelessly for truth in lending.

Repeatedly he has taken the floor and worked in committee to prevent deception practiced on unknowing and uninformed borrowers who, when buying on the installment plan, are paying far more in interest rates than they know. Actually, installment buying has become the merchandising of indebtedness. Men and women, millions of them, who desire to improve their standard of living, are being misled, and paying heavily for this deception.

The courageous Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has actively led his Senate troops through the muddy fields of the truth-in-lending battle on behalf of the consumers of America. The 87th Congress had been in session for less than 4 months when 21 Members of this body joined Senator DOUGLAS in sponsoring S. 1740, the truth-in-lending bill. I am proud to say that I was among the original cosponsors. At that time Senator DOUGLAS said, on April 27, 1961:

The testimony before the committee (the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency) revealed a number of major abuses in the field of consumer credit.

And so the testimony had.

As President Johnson observed in the opening sentence of his message on truth in lending and packaging, and other matters of interest to consumers, which he sent to Congress yesterday, March 21, 1966:

The consumer's interest is the American interest.

And so it is.

PAUL DOUGLAS reintroduced his truth-in-lending bill in the 88th Congress and again in the 89th Congress. I supported his bills.

The concept of truth in lending now has the warm support of President Johnson, just as it had the support of the late President Kennedy, and I am hopeful that positive action can be completed this session of the Congress.

Unfortunately, much as I applaud and approve of the President's support, I believe it fair to point out that in his message to the Congress concerning truth in lending, there are areas which can be strengthened. Indeed, the full cost of credit should be stated simply and clearly before any credit contract is signed as the President has stated, but I hope the bill which comes before the Senate will specify that the disclosure of the credit cost be required annually. It makes a difference to the consumer, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has long pointed out.

The champions of the consumer deserve our deep appreciation because we are all consumers.

The able Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] has long advocated truth in packaging and the far-sighted Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] has been the champion of the long-suffering housewife who finds it difficult to know the difference, if any, in king size, super size, or double economy size.

Senator HART has fought for truth in packaging, and in his message on consumer interests Monday, March 21, the President called for fair packaging and labeling which would—

First. Require that each package provide simple, direct, accurate, and visible information as to the nature and quantity of its contents, including ingredients where this is important.

Second. Keep off the shelves packages with deceptively shaped boxes, misleading pictures, confusing or meaningless adjectives, inappropriate size or quantity markings, and promotional gimmicks that promise nonexistent savings.

Third. Provide for the establishment of reasonable and appropriate weight standards to facilitate comparative shopping.

As the President correctly points out:

An accurate and informative package and label need not add to the producers' cost. It will add to the welfare of the American consumer.

We owe much to the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives who have given so tirelessly of their time to bring to the attention of the American public the need for truth in lending and fair packaging and labeling.

For example, Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, of Missouri, has persisted successfully in her efforts to make food, drugs, and cosmetics more safe.

In her floor remarks yesterday she cited examples of how truth in lending would help the consumer. It is pertinent to repeat this one example:

Said Representative SULLIVAN:

Under present practices: On department store revolving credit, say you charge $700 worth of purchases. You might be told that you would pay a small service charge for each month that you owed money to the store.

Under truth in lending: You would be told that the store's finance charges were at the rate of 18 percent per year and you would receive a monthly statement showing the dollars-and-cents costs for credit during the previous month.

The truth will free the consumer from being overcharged or short-weighted.

President Johnson has further enhanced his great record in the field of domestic legislation. It has been a record unequalled in presidential history.

PRESENTATION OF SAM RAYBURN GOLD MEDAL IN BONHAM, TEX.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, last Friday, March 18, 1966, was Sam Rayburn Gold Medal Day in Bonham, Tex., as declared by the mayor of Bonham, Mr. John M. Crockett, in honor of the presentation of the Sam Rayburn Gold Medal which was authorized by a joint resolution of Congress in 1962.

It was my honor on that day to present the Gold Sam Rayburn Medal honoring the late Sam Rayburn "For services rendered to the people of the United States" to his two surviving sisters, Mrs. S. E. Bartley and Mrs. W. A. Thomas in the public ceremony held in front of the Sam Rayburn Library in Bonham.

We were honored on that occasion to have with us Miss Eva Adams, Director of the U.S. Mint, the Honorable Robert A. Wallace, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and the Honorable Robert Bartley, member of the Federal Communications Commission and the nephew of the late Sam Rayburn. In addition, there were several Texas Congressmen, U.S. Circuit Judge Homer Thornberry, U.S. District Judge Sheehy, and a large crowd of the late Sam Rayburn's friends at the public ceremony.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution declaring March 18, 1966, as Sam Rayburn Gold Medal Day, a copy of the program, the remarks of Miss Eva Adams and the remarks of Robert A. Wallace, and my remarks be printed at this point in today's RECORD.

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

Whereas the Congress of the United States, on the 26th day of September 1962, by joint resolution, authorized that a gold medal be struck and presented to the estate of the late Speaker, Sam Rayburn, "for services rendered to the people of the United States;" and,

Whereas said gold medal has been struck and will be presented to the recipients thereof in Bonham, Tex., on March 18, 1966, at 2 p.m., in a public ceremony on the grounds of the Sam Rayburn Library; and,

Whereas on said occasion, we will be honored with the presence of many distinguished citizens and public servants, especially the Honorable RALPH YARBOROUGH, U.S. Senator from Texas, who authored the resolution for the striking of said medal, the Honorable Robert A. Wallace, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and the Honorable Eva Adams, Director of the U.S. Mint; and,

Whereas we are again honored through the life of Sam Rayburn, our fellow citizen, though he be dead, and we are further honored as a community by the presence of such distinguished company as will be in our city: Now, therefore,

I, John M. Crockett, mayor of the city of Bonham, do hereby designate Friday, March 18, 1966, as Sam Rayburn Gold Medal Day in the city of Bonham, Tex., and call upon all of the citizens of this community to bear witness to the importance of said occasion and assist all visitors to our city on that occasion in every way possible.

Witness my hand and the seal of the city of Bonham, on this the 3d day of March 1966.

JOHN M. CROCKETT,
Mayor, City of Bonham.

PROGRAM: PRESENTATION OF SAM RAYBURN GOLD MEDAL, THE SAM RAYBURN LIBRARY, BONHAM, TEX., MARCH 18, 1966, 2 P.M.

Master of ceremonies: Buster Cole, secretary-treasurer, the Sam Rayburn Foundation.

Invocation: Rev. William Cheatham, pastor, First Presbyterian Church, Bonham.

Welcome address: Gene Danner, member, Bonham City Commission.

Introduction of distinguished guests: Buster Cole.

Remarks: Miss Eva Adams, Director of U.S. Mint.

Remarks: Hon. Robert A. Wallace, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Presentation speech: Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH, U.S. Senator from Texas.

Acceptance speech: Hon. Robert Bartley, member, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C.

Benediction: Rev. Jack Carson, pastor, First Baptist Church, Bonham.

THE SAM RAYBURN GOLD MEDAL

(Remarks by the Honorable Eva B. Adams, Director of the Mint, at the presentation ceremonies of the Sam Rayburn Gold Medal, the Sam Rayburn Library, Bonham, Tex., 2 p.m., March 18, 1966)

One hundred and ninety years ago on the 25th of this month, the Continental Congress of the United States rendered George Washington a great honor. For wise and spirited conduct in the siege and acquisition of Boston, General Washington was tendered a gold medal expressing the thanks of the Congress, in their own name and in the name of the Thirteen Colonies whom they represented. This was the first gold medal awarded to a citizen by our Government.

Since then we have honored our Presidents by striking gold and bronze medals bearing their likeness on the obverse, with appropriate symbols, words, and motifs on the reverse. We have also honored Secretaries of the Treasury, Directors of the Mint, and those generals and admirals who rendered outstanding service in the defense of our country.

Today we honor a man who was none of these.

Today we honor a man who was a private citizen, a representative of the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Texas. So in this respect the occasion that brings us here is unique.

The Congress of the United States has not frequently bestowed such an honor on a private citizen. On fewer than 12 occasions has Congress passed a resolution authorizing the U.S. Mint to strike a gold medal honoring a private citizen with the simultaneous striking of bronze medals for sale to the public. The two Americans immediately honored before Mr. Rayburn were Dr. Thomas A. Dooley III, and Robert Frost—the former a great humanitarian physician, the latter a great poet of the American people.

Bronze medals of Sam Rayburn, identical to the one struck in gold, are now available for sale. These may be purchased by writing directly to the Superintendent of the U.S. Mint in Philadelphia.

The supply of medals in any given category that we offer to the public is dictated by demand. Replacements are manufactured only as required. The medal program of your U.S. Mint, I would like to emphasize, is operated in conjunction with, rather than

in opposition to, the mint's primary purpose—which is to fulfill the Nation's needs for coins.

The obverse side of the Sam Rayburn gold medal was designed and engraved by Mr. Frank Gasparro at our Philadelphia Mint. A full-face likeness of Mr. Rayburn is in the foreground, while in the background is the Capitol of the United States, where he spent so much of his life. His name is engraved around the top, and the year of his birth and death on the right.

The reverse side was designed and engraved by Mr. Phillip Fowler. In the center is a gavel—symbol of the position which Mr. Rayburn occupied for so long: Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States. Across the gavel lies a sprig of blue bonnets—your lovely State flower. Encircling the gavel and the blue bonnets the following words are engraved: "For Services Rendered to the People of the United States."

The medal is striking for its simplicity of design and the power and strength that emanates from the remarkable portrait of Mr. Rayburn. This is as it should be; for these were qualities that characterized the man we honor here today.

THE GOOD OF MAN MUST BE THE END RESULT OF THE SCIENCE OF POLITICS

(Remarks by the Honorable Robert A. Wallace, Assistant Secretary of Treasury, at the presentation ceremonies of the Sam Rayburn Gold Medal; the Sam Rayburn Library, Bonham, Tex., 2 p.m., March 18, 1966)

Each time I return to the Southwest where I was born and where I lived the first 20 years of my life, I feel a deep surge of pride. Here is the pioneer tradition—the tradition of accomplishment by hard work and perseverance. My grandfather, John Milton Stewart, was the chief machinist at the S. L. Irvin Co. at nearby Honey Grove, Tex. He was also a railroadman, farmer, and businessman, possessing the versatility necessary to the taming of the prairie wilderness when the Cheyenne territory was opened in southwestern Oklahoma in 1893.

This is also ancient land. Here the roots of our history run broad and deep. Here the cultures of many people met—Indian, Spanish, Mexican, and American. One complemented the other. Each contributed to the cultural heritage of the past which we presently enjoy.

The man we honor here today was both a product of this rich, diversified culture and a contributor to it. Conscious of the land's history, understanding of its people, Sam Rayburn reflected in his long life of political purpose and purposeful action their aspirations and their dreams. The land and its people are both richer for his having lived.

The strength and dignity of any movement, whether it is a library fashioned of wood or a statue carved from stone, is derived not from the wood or marble of which it is built, but from the man in whose name it was erected. The strength of Mr. Rayburn was as the strength of the land which he loved. His dignity was the dignity of the people whom he served for over half a century. Both the Sam Rayburn Library and the principles of the man which give it strength and dignity are now a meaningful portion of the cultural legacy future generations will share.

The gold medal presented here today honors Mr. Rayburn as an outstanding representative of his people before the greatest political tribunal of our land. It is also a testament wrought in gold of his country's appreciation and indebtedness. In creating this symbol of unselfish service to the people he represented, the country he served, and the democratic principles in which he believed, we follow a tradition as old as our government—a tradition that recognizes a citizen's contribution to the preservation of those ideals and principles that are the cornerstones of our democratic institutions and which give substance and meaning to democracy itself.

Aristotle taught that "the good of man must be the end of the science of politics." It was this principle that guided Sam Rayburn throughout his illustrious life. He was eminently successful in bringing together diverse political elements in our complex political structure. Out of this political synthesis, this crystallization of intellectual ideas from all portions of our country, came laws that strengthened the fabric of our society and enriched the lives of our people. The laws that he helped fashion reflect his belief that the good of man must be the end result of political thought and action.

It is extremely important that we never lose sight of this principle when we formulate laws, enforce them, and interpret them within the framework of contemporary thought and belief. In every facet of our undertakings today, in our endeavor to create a great society at home and a good society of nations throughout the world, we are conscious of this principle—that the good of man must be the end result of political thought and action. It guides our course of action in Vietnam where we seek to restore peace and order in a troubled land so that free people may choose a government and a way of life of their own free choice. It guides our course of action here at home in our efforts to rebuild and dignify our cities, preserve our country's beauty and safeguard our natural resources, eliminate social ills that degrade and destroy fellow Americans, expand and improve our educational systems, and alleviate prejudice and bigotry so that all of us—regardless of his race, religion, or color—may live in harmony and work in unison with each other to achieve goals and dreams we share.

President Johnson, in his message to Congress on American cities, talked about answering an ancient dream: "That dream is of * * * a land * * * of promise, of hope, where it could truly be said, to every man his chance, to every man, regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity, to every man the right to live and to work and to be himself and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him."

There are few Americans who have not shared this dream. It is a recurrent dream, because the moulding of a society where the good of man is the end result of political thought and action is a continuous process. It develops through succeeding generations, and each generation enriches or distorts this dream in proportion to its attitude and approach to solving the innumerable problems we face in our communities and our country. The complexity and enormity of the problems that surround us at home and abroad preclude to any of us the luxury of leisure or indifference in our search for solutions. It is a search in which all must participate, for all are affected.

Here in Bonham and as a Congressman and Speaker of the House of Representatives in our Nation's Capital, Sam Rayburn continually sought opinions of people in all walks of life to help guide his thought and direct his actions. For he realized that democracy to live and flourish must reflect and mirror the thoughts and aspirations of peoples of varied backgrounds, different nationalities, and diverse interests. He realized that to the extent political action reflects the best thought which can be brought to bear on any given problem, to that extent do political laws enrich the lives of human beings and contribute to democracy's growing legacy. He was fortunate to see within his own lifetime the beneficial effects of numerous social and economic laws he helped formulate and bring to fruition—laws that enriched the lives of all Americans and strengthened the democratic principles upon which our society rests. By his life and actions he contributed toward the fulfillment of the American dream and enriched our common heritage.

REMARKS OF SENATOR RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, BONHAM, TEX., FRIDAY, MARCH 18, 1966, IN PRESENTING THE SAM RAYBURN GOLD MEDAL TO MRS. S. E. BARTLEY AND MRS. W. A. THOMAS, SURVIVING SISTERS OF SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN

Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Thomas, Mrs. Bartley, Judge Thornberry, Judge Shiehy, Secretary Wallace, Director Adams, Commissioner Bartley, General Carr, colleagues in the Congress, fellow Americans, fellow Texans, friends, this Nation, this Government, this people have sent these representatives from Washington today to honor the memory and the unselfish achievements of the greatest legislator the American people have ever produced.

Sam Rayburn was not born to be Speaker—he achieved it himself.

William Arbogast, chief Associated Press staff writer, covering the House of Representatives, wrote:

"The story of Sam Rayburn is the story of a lonely little boy helping grub a living out of Texas cotton land and dreaming of a future in politics.

"It is the story of a dream come true in the face of adversity and obstacles which would have discouraged a less determined man.

"Sam Rayburn wasn't born to be Speaker of the House. He got there on his own.

"He was born to be a farmer, and at farming he spent his early life, first in his native Tennessee and then in Texas, which his father adopted as permanent home for the Rayburn family of 11 children.

"As a boy, Sam Rayburn's life was one of toil and monotony.

"'When I was a boy,' he once said, 'I would sit on a fence on Sundays and wish that somebody would ride by on a horse—just anything to relieve the monotony.'"

But Samuel Taliaferro Rayburn came from good stock, from fine people, good in intellect and character and faith—diligent in work, fair in their dealings with all people.

Samuel Taliaferro Rayburn was eighth in a family of 11 children born to William Marion Rayburn and Martha Clementine Waller Rayburn. Born in Tennessee, he came with his parents to Fannin County in 1887 at the age of 5—and it was this land, this people, this area, this Fannin County, this Red River country, that shaped his life of honor and service, and gave him an opportunity to develop both.

He went to school at Burnet and Flag Springs, then to Mayo Normal at Commerce. He taught school at Greenwood, Hopkins County, at the age of 19; he received his B.S. degree from Mayo Normal, now East Texas State College, at 21; taught school for 3 more years; then surprised everyone by announcing for the legislature at age 24.

He won, and at the age of 29, was the youngest Speaker of the Texas House of Representatives in history up to that time. He studied law at the University of Texas and was admitted to the bar.

At 30, Sam Rayburn achieved his ambition—election to the U.S. House of Representatives. He became a Congressman the year Woodrow Wilson became President.

He became chairman of the powerful Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee 2 years before F.D.R. was elected President, and 6 years later was House majority leader. In 1940, he first became Speaker of the House. Ten times he was elected Speaker of the House of Representatives, where he served as Speaker longer than any other man, more than twice as long as Henry Clay.

This remarkable man we honor today was not a passive Speaker—he was an activist. He was no mere moderator. He was his party's leader. He was constructive in his leadership. When the opposing party had the Presidency, as was the case with President Eisenhower, Speaker Rayburn was no mere obstructionist. If it was good for the country, Sam Rayburn was for it. This was his attitude with all the eight Presidents with whom he served.

Sam Rayburn made it clear that he served "with" those Presidents, not "under" them. He strove to maintain the coequal nature of the Congress and the executive in a Government designed to be a government of checks and balances.

Rayburn's service in the Congress was liberal, enlightened, and progressive. He went to the Congress the year Woodrow Wilson was inaugurated, and supported Wilson's new freedom program. Woodrow Wilson wrote a letter of admiration and congratulations to the young Congressman for his skill in steering through the House the stock and bond bill.

Leading columnist, Marquis Childs described how Sam Rayburn was "a partner with F.D.R. in bringing about the New Deal." He was the friend and confidant of President Harry Truman—and pushed Truman's Fair Deal. And speaking of his support for John F. Kennedy's New Frontier, Ralph McGill of the Atlanta Constitution wrote: "This son of the old frontier played a powerful role in the new."

Were he alive today, Sam Rayburn would be the leading architect of L.B.J.'s Great Society.

Sam Rayburn achieved an unmatched legislative record, so astounding in its massive accomplishments that biographer Dwight Dorough called it, "An inconceivable record." It would take hours to chronicle that record. Suffice it to say that it was recognized in his own lifetime.

Honorary degrees were bestowed upon him by Muhlenberg College in Pennsylvania, East Texas State Teachers College, the University of Maryland, Austin College, National University in Washington, Tusculum College, the University of West Virginia, and Syracuse University.

He was elected an honorary member of Phi Beta Kappa and of Phi Delta Phi.

He received the Collier's magazine award of $10,000 for distinguished service.

Christian Science Monitor called him, "The tallest Texan of them all, a solid unfrilled citizen."

He was a strategy leader for John Nance Garner's campaign for the Presidency in 1932, and steered Garner into the Vice-Presidency, the first Texan ever to be Vice President of the United States.

Rayburn's chance to be Vice President came in 1944, but it was canceled out by the opposition of reactionaries in his own State, who were fighting his reelection at home.

Rayburn, more than any other person, was responsible for Justice Tom Clark's appointment by Harry Truman to the Supreme Court—the only Texan ever to serve on the U.S. Supreme Court.

In 1960, Sam Rayburn was a guiding genius behind Lyndon Johnson's drive for the Presidency, which led to Johnson's election to the Vice-Presidency—from which position fate placed him in the President's chair—the first Texan President.

So Sam Rayburn's political genius was a main factor in placing in high Federal office: First, Texas' only two Vice Presidents; second, Texas' only Supreme Court Justice; third, Texas' only President.

More than 200 Congressmen gave tributes to him on the floor of the House; legislatures and city councils passed resolutions in his memory, and the congressional assemblies of nine nations passed resolutions in his honor.

Four Presidents of the United States came to Bonham to honor his memory that sad November day of his funeral here.

John F. Kennedy said of Rayburn: "Immeasurable is your devotion to cause and country and immeasurable is the respect, esteem, and affection which all of us who have served with you hold for you."

Lyndon Johnson said of him: "He was as old as Thomas Jefferson, and as young as John F. Kennedy. Our Democratic Party is the oldest political party in the world because men like the Speaker keep it loyal to the old traditions—and forever alert to new ways to serve social progress and human freedom.

"He was younger than any of us—there was one thing he disliked more than old fogies, and that was, as he put it, 'young fogies'."

Among the honors our people and institutions have bestowed upon Sam Rayburn, the following stand out:

1. Sam Rayburn's oil portrait hangs in the Speaker's Lobby in the Capitol in Washington.

2. Rayburn's life-sized statue is in the Rayburn Building in Washington.

3. The massive Rayburn Building in Washington, named in his honor.

4. Rayburn Reception Room in the Capitol, dedicated to Sam Rayburn.

5. Sam Rayburn Dam and Reservoir on the Angelina River in Texas, named by an act of Congress.

6. Sam Rayburn Oak Tree on the Capitol Grounds in Washington.

7. The Sam Rayburn Library at Bonham, Tex.

8. A Sam Rayburn oil portrait officially hangs in the State capitol in Austin.

9. A Sam Rayburn oil portrait officially placed in East Texas State College.

10. A U.S. Rayburn commemorative postage stamp.

11. A Sam Rayburn Gold Medal, struck by the U.S. Mint by resolution of the Congress of the United States, to be presented in a few minutes to his surviving sisters.

These honors are more than have come to many Presidents, yet all combined are small in comparison with the esteem the American people feel in their hearts for him.

Today, as many times before, you have heard Sam Rayburn eulogized for the great American that he was. As long as there is recorded history, and as long as memories remain sacred, "Mr. Sam" will remain an inspiration. Many an aspiring young man will turn to "Mr. Sam" for his ideals, his determination, and his quiet patience in his long years of apprenticeship.

This Sam Rayburn Medal, this beautiful and enduring Sam Rayburn Library here in Bonham, the Sam Rayburn Building in Washington, and all the other monuments named, all stand as monuments, visible to the sight of all Americans, of the love and respect which his fellow citizens held for Sam Rayburn. But perhaps the most significant memorial of all is the Sam Rayburn scholarship program, where more than 200 distinguished Americans have provided the funds for a program that will encourage the outstanding young people of this Nation to seek careers in public service. There is no better way to memorialize this great man than to encourage others to emulate his great career of distinguished service, accomplishments, and dedication. It is most fitting that these scholarships will emphasize the teaching of government and government service in the Halls of Congress to which Sam Rayburn devoted his lifetime.

As I present this medal honoring Sam Rayburn "for services rendered to the people of the United States" to his two surviving sisters, Mrs. S. E. Bartley and Mrs. W. A. Thomas, who are represented by Sam Rayburn's nephew, the Honorable Robert Bartley, it is my hope that it will be a symbol of our determined dedication to the principles which Sam Rayburn's life illustrated. With Sam Rayburn as a model for the future political leaders of this Nation, the United States will continue on its path of greatness.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, Friday, March 25, is the 145th anniversary of the beginning of the valiant struggle of Greece to free itself from the oppressive domination of the Ottoman Empire, when Americans join with freedom-loving people all over the world in paying tribute to the independent spirit and the courage of the Greek people.

It is entirely appropriate that free people everywhere should acknowledge their debt to a nation which has contributed so much to the development of democratic ideals.

The concept of democracy which lay at the foundation of the government at Athens more than 2,000 years ago constitutes the basis of democracy as we now know it. The methods and practices of the city-State government necessarily have been modified to fit the demands of modern society, but the primary emphasis on the worth and dignity of the individual and on the rule of law have remained unchanged.

Greek contributions to our society have not been confined, of course, to our political institutions. In architecture, literature, philosophy, and sculpture, the imagination and creativity of the Greeks has served as a source of inspiration to all of us over the years. But it is for their contributions to democratic political thought that I especially commend them today.

The struggle for freedom in Greece was not won easily. Nor has it been easy for the Greeks to maintain the freedom thus achieved. Because geographically Greece is a gateway between Europe and Asia it has been the locale of many serious armed conflicts, all of which have done great injury to the economic and political structure of the land but none of which has dampened the spirit of the Greek people.

Today Greece stands practically on Russia's doorstep as a constant reminder and symbol of a people that successfully resisted the clutches of the Kremlin. The Greek people are continuing to strengthen the economic and social fibers of their nation and are a valuable and trusted ally in the NATO pact of nations.

We Americans can never completely repay our debt to a nation and people who have contributed so significantly to the development of democratic ideals and institutions. We are indeed proud of and grateful to the more than 1½ million Americans of Greek descent who have done so much to strengthen democracy and freedom in our own land.

In my own State of Massachusetts we have a sizable Greek community to which I wish to pay tribute. Their influence is widely felt throughout the Commonwealth, and they have provided con-

structive leadership in many aspects of our community life.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in recent months I have received a good deal of mail concerning H.R. 8282, the bill to revise the unemployment compensation laws. The issues are important, and highly technical.

H.R. 8282 is the bill proposed by the administration. Before it comes to the floor of the Senate it must be reported by the House Ways and Means Committee, passed by the House of Representatives, and considered by the Senate Finance Committee. It will undoubtedly undergo considerable change as it moves through the legislative process. My vote will depend upon the exact shape of the bill that comes before the Senate. While comments upon specifics are premature, it is possible to discuss my reaction to the philosophy of H.R. 8282.

This is an appropriate time to consider changes in our unemployment compensation law. Enacted during the depression years, when millions of men were unemployed simply because our entire economy had faltered, this statute has been on the books for 30 years without any basic changes. Today the unemployment problems we face are very different in both quantity and quality.

The curse of unemployment now falls upon a relatively few Americans. Joblessness is at a 12-year low. Our economy is booming. Indeed, many segments of the economy face severe labor shortages, particularly in skilled trades and white-collar jobs. Those who cannot find work fall into three basic categories: those who live in areas—such as Appalachia—where jobs of all kinds are scarce; those who lack the skills to compete effectively in the labor market; and those who are discriminated against on account of age, sex, or color. For these individuals, and their families, unemployment is basically a long-term chronic condition.

Any reform of our unemployment compensation system must balance two critical factors: the need to provide a reasonable level of wage insurance for those who are willing to work but are unable to find suitable employment, and the need to bar those who do not want to work from using their unemployment checks as a substitute for a job. Benefits must not be raised to the point where they would kill or weaken the incentive to work. But they should be high enough to enable a conscientious and industrious person to meet his and his family's immediate, minimum needs during periods of unemployment.

Those who oppose reform of our unemployment compensation system sometimes use real or imagined cases of fraud as a reason to oppose any change. Despite popular misconception, there is actually very little chiseling. Only 12 of every 1,000 beneficiaries were found to have made fraudulent claims in 1964. Only 31 cents of every $100 in benefits was an overpayment for fraud, and almost two-thirds of this amount was recovered. Nor is the current level of benefits a widespread invitation to goldbricking. Maximum benefits range from $30 per week in Mississippi to $65 in California. Nationally, the average benefit paid is about $37 per week. This is less than $2,000 per year, far below the poverty level.

Where fraud, loopholes, and goldbricking exist, they should be rooted out. I support such reforms. But I do not think it fair or accurate to charge our entire unemployment compensation system with sheltering loafers, welfare chiselers, and misfits. Under recession conditions only 65 percent of the unemployed draw benefits. In better times, such as the present, this drops to 40 percent.

H.R. 8282 proposes to meet modern unemployment problems with three fundamental reforms:

First. Establishing minimum Federal standards governing the level of unemployment compensation in each State.

Second. Extending coverage to workers not now entitled to unemployment compensation.

Third. Extending the duration of benefits for workers who are unemployed for long periods of time.

First. H.R. 8282 would establish Federal benefit standards by requiring that the minimum benefit be one half of the worker's weekly wage, with a maximum benefit of not less than two-thirds of the State's average weekly wage. For example, if the average wage in a State is $100, the statewide maximum must be set at $67. Then an $80-a-week worker must receive at least $40—half of his wage loss—a $100 worker $50 and so on until a $134-a-week worker hits the maximum of $67. All who work for a wage higher than $134 would also be limited to $67.

Under present law, the States have great leeway in setting benefits, and the level of unemployment compensation varies widely. In Maryland, for example, the maximum weekly benefit is $46, slightly less than half of our average wage. But in neighboring West Virginia it is $35—slightly more than one-third that State's average weekly wage. In Iowa it is only $30, or less than one-third of Iowa's weekly wage. In Hawaii, it is $55, or roughly three-fifths of the weekly wage there.

I support the concept of minimum Federal standards, although I am not able to say whether I think the levels of compensation proposed in H.R. 8282 are appropriate until I can study the testimony and the reports of the House and Senate committees. In a highly integrated and mobile economy, as ours has become, it is desirable to have some degree of uniformity among the States. Otherwise, States can compete for industry in terms of which imposes the lowest tax and provides the lowest level of benefits. Lack of uniformity may also encourage workers to relocate based upon the level of benefits rather than the availability of jobs.

Second. H.R. 8282 would extend coverage to an estimated 5 million workers, including those in small establishments, in nonprofit organizations, on large farms and in agricultural processing companies. I support this provision. In addition to a worker's own family the entire economy suffers when any substantial group is unemployed and also unable to maintain even a fraction of its normal purchasing power to buy the goods and services others produce.

Third. H.R. 8282 would extend the duration of unemployment compensation by providing a Federal "long-term adjustment benefit" for those who use up their State allowances. In most States this is 26 weeks. Under the proposed bill, payments would continue at State levels for an additional 26 weeks, if needed, so long as the worker maintains his eligibility. An important change would permit these benefits to be paid during a period of approved training or retraining.

For example, a jobless worker may now draw $35 a week for 26 weeks, and then his benefits expire under State law. If his past earnings record and continued availability for work make him eligible, H.R. 8282 would permit him to apply for Federal adjustment benefits—through the State employment office. He would be entitled to his first check on the 27th week of unemployment, also at $35, and he would continue drawing until he finds work or until the 52d week. If, during this time, he participates in an approved training program, he continues to draw benefits. If he refused approved training or suitable work he can be denied benefits.

With the increasing pace of automation, the unskilled or semiskilled worker who is laid off today has a far harder job in finding new employment than in his father's day. He needs a longer period of assistance in which to relocate, obtain training, or find a new job. Congress recognized this need by temporarily extending the benefit period during the 1958 recession, and again in 1961. I think it is appropriate to meet the problem of long-term unemployment on a permanent basis. Again, I reserve judgment as to the specifics.

There are other provisions of H.R. 8282 which are of doubtful utility. H.R. 8282 proposes to scrap the experience rating system, under which each employer is encouraged to achieve employment stability. I am not aware of any reason to abandon this feature of the present law.

H.R. 8282 also proposes to prevent States from disqualifying employees, for more than 6 weeks, except in the case of fraud, labor disputes, or conviction of a crime connected with his work. This means that those who voluntarily quit, or are discharged for misconduct will be entitled to unemployment benefits after 6 weeks. I am not sure this is a long enough period to discourage those who would use the unemployment compensation system as a long-term dole instead of a temporary crutch.

Mr. President, I intend carefully to follow this legislation. I hope there will emerge from the House of Representatives and from the Senate Finance Committee a sound, constructive bill that will merit the support of employers and employees.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT FUNDS IN INDIANA COLLEGES

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, it is good news to many of us that the House Education and Labor Committee has received a unanimous recommendation from its education subcommittee that the full $190 million authorized for National Defense Education Act loans for the coming fiscal year should be appropriated and spent for that purpose.

The original intention of the administration, as evidenced in the budget figures submitted, was to eliminate all new funds for National Defense Education Act loans. But undeniable evidence has gathered that the proposed shift to private guaranteed loans under title IV of the Higher Education Act will not serve the purpose. The administration has consequently proposed a 1-year extension and the use of $150 million in loan funds.

But we need the entire $190 million. I agree with the House subcommittee, and I sincerely hope that in both houses we will conclude to restore the full amount. To deprive even one student of his education for next year by denial of these loan resources is to put an unconscionable burden on that student for the costs of Vietnam.

I have previously cited the specific situation of three Indiana schools faced with this problem. Besides Notre Dame, Indiana University, and Purdue, I have heard from a number of others.

President Robert H. Reardon, of Anderson College, Anderson, Ind., writes:

> We would estimate that about 50 students would have to discontinue or could not enroll as freshmen even if the guarantee program was fully operative. We believe there is a significant need for some national defense loans to low-income families in addition to the guarantee program.

President Alan C. Rankin, of Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Ind., writes:

> We are greatly concerned over a recent administrative decision to phase out immediately the national defense loan program and the health professions loan program. If our university is to participate in the packaging of financial aids, as provided in the Higher Education Act of 1965, it is essential to have the above-mentioned loan funds available to use.
>
> We believe it would be difficult for the banking institutions to provide the training necessary for member banks and adequate funds for the 1966–67 school year. Moreover, to withdraw the above two programs immediately would be a breach of our obligation to students who are borrowing from these programs to see them through to graduation.

President O. P. Kretzman of Valparaiso University in Valparaiso, Ind., notes that the problem is aggravated in the case of a school which has a national rather than a local constituency. His letter is as follows:

VALPARAISO UNIVERSITY,
Valparaiso, Ind., March 14, 1966.

Hon. VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: We would like to encourage you to support the appropriation for $150 million to continue the National Defense Education Act loans for the coming fiscal year. If the national defense student loan program were cut back now, before the various State plans are fully implemented, it would put a burden on our students which we, at least at the present time, do not feel we could assist them in carrying.

One of our problems in this regard is that we have a national constituency. We would normally expect to receive students from 44 to 50 States. We find it impossible, at the present time, to advise students all over the country what is being done to assist them in their particular State. Their local bankers will not presently be advised and be able to supply them with definitive information permitting them to plan their financial program.

In subsequent years, after the arrangements for commercial loans have been completed and put into effect, we would encourage their use especially for freshmen students each year.

We would respectfully request that you use your influence to continue the appropriations for 1966–67 at the current level and then suggest reductions in subsequent years which would be equivalent to the amounts loaned to seniors and others leaving campus. In this way, the students on campus in the fall of 1966 would be furnished loans for this and the next 3 years under the present program which would permit them to complete 4 years of schooling. Those entering in the fall of 1967 and subsequent years would be furnished loans under commercially financed loan plans.

It was very nice to have you on the campus some time ago, and we hope that you will return often. With kind personal regards and every good wish to you in your important work in the U.S. Senate, I am,

Sincerely,

O. P. KRETZMANN,
President.

Finally, there is a letter from Stanley P. Frankewich, director of the national defense student loan program at St. Francis College in Fort Wayne, Ind.:

ST. FRANCIS COLLEGE,
Fort Wayne, Ind., March 17, 1966.

Hon. VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: We at St. Francis College are quite concerned with the discontinuance of the national defense student loans. This discontinuance places a burden on the college in finding other financial aids on such short notice for students who were formerly granted the student loan.

During the past 3 years, we granted loans to 380 students. For next September, we estimate 225 students applying for this loan. Our scholarship, college loan, and work-study programs will provide aid to approximately 50 students. Thus 175 students are dependent on this loan or some equally attractive substitute, because many students applying for a loan do not qualify for a scholarship.

If a substitute program is not available, the students will be faced with the choice of commercial loans at higher interest rates, postponement of their education, or discontinuance of their education.

May we suggest that all efforts possible be made to continue the loan program at least this year and thus give the colleges time to change over to the proposed guaranteed loan program through commercial sources.

Yours very truly,

STANLEY P. FRANKEWICH,
Director, National Defense Student Loan Program.

EXPORT QUOTAS ON CATTLE HIDES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, when the Department of Commerce recently announced that it was imposing export quotas on the export of cattle hides, I was much surprised as well as dismayed.

It has been my understanding that we are doing whatever possible, as a nation, to increase our exports, especially our exports of farm products. We are now, and have for some time been in a serious deficit in our balance of payments; our gold stocks are being depleted. We have committed ourselves in word, at least, to resort to stronger measures in order to create a better situation in this regard.

However, when it comes right down to taking the necessary steps to improve this situation, we balk. It is no longer a question of choice. We must do all we can to halt, and even reverse, the gold outflow.

Therefore I am in disagreement with the Department of Commerce actions to hamper our exports of hides.

The Commerce Department claims there would be a shortage of 2.7 million hides for domestic use this year in an industry which uses 23.8 million hides annually. I submit, however, that the way to increase production of hides is not to hamper the market. Depressed prices will not result in increased production. If there is a shortage of hides now, in the short run, temporary higher prices will increase production.

While there are a number of reasons why the Department's action is poor economics, these recent moves are also wanting on other grounds. Why penalize hide producers from seeking and selling in their best market?

They should be as free to seek their best profits, just as any other segment of American industry should be free. Moves such as this one, which aim at one particular industry, should be protested by every industry. They strike at the heart of our freedom to trade.

I ask unanimous consent to insert a copy of my letter protesting this action to the Secretary of Commerce at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
March 22, 1966.

Hon. JOHN T. CONNOR,
Secretary of Commerce, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Recent actions by the Department of Commerce with regard to the export of cattle hides have raised some serious questions concerning our announced national policy of seeking to increase our foreign trade.

In view of our continuing balance-of-payments deficit, I regard it of utmost importance that we seek every means possible to increase our exports. I believe that this is the announced intention of our foreign commercial policy and a vital part of our attempt to reverse our present adverse gold flow. This aim is valid in my opinion, and I have long supported such policy. In view of the Department's March 11 action in imposing export quotas on cattle hides, and in view of the Department's earlier ruling requiring export licenses for hides leaving the United States for all countries except Canada, it appears that the Department has reversed somewhat its previous position. I believe these actions, which are designed to

inhibit the export of hides, are contrary to announced policy.

I urge the Department to reconsider this action in the light of the following: (1) The Department's action has backed up hides at ports and caused costly delays; (2) the system of export quotas has been found to lead to abuses and often profiteering by favored firms; (3) stopgap measures to hold down prices, in this case the price of shoes, eventually lead to shortages in materials and even higher prices in the products in the long run; (4) normal exporting of hides will help improve our balance of payments and result in the export of less gold.

While these economic arguments are surely reason enough in themselves for a reevaluation of the Department's action, much could be said for the rights of sellers, in this case the cattle and hide industry, to be free to seek their best price in their best market.

I urge that the Department reevaluate its action in setting export quotas for cattle hides, and formulate a policy which will not hamper the necessary and beneficial export of cattle hides.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN TOWER.

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY AT THE MEETING OF THE ESTES KEFAUVER MEMORIAL FOUNDATION

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, on January 17 a reception was held in the caucus room of the Old Senate Office Building. Gathered there were the friends of one of the great men of the Senate, the late Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee.

They were gathered in memory of this man, who had more political courage than anyone I have ever known, whose great heart and great mind were on the right side of every issue he faced in the House or the Senate, regardless of the political consequences.

These people were gathered that January evening not just in memory of him, but to be certain that the ideals for which he stood lived on after him. They heard encouraging reports on the memorial which is being established for him—a library wing at the University of Tennessee where his papers will be stored for the use of future political scientists and historians, numerous scholarships for young men and women at universities and colleges around the country, and awards for those who show the genius of Estes Kefauver in his chosen fields.

One such award was announced that evening—a $50,000 endowment by the Edward J. Meeman Foundation to endow a $6,000 triennial award "to the person who does the most to bring about a union of the free peoples of the world," a cause that was dear to the heart of Estes Kefauver.

The Vice President of the United States, the Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY spoke and announced this award. Mr. Meeman, the donor, who was present, responded.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speeches of both Vice President HUMPHREY and Mr. Meeman appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY TO THE ESTES KEFAUVER MEMORIAL FOUNDATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 17, 1966

We meet to help establish a living memorial to a great man and a good friend.

It is fitting that we meet here, in this caucus room, where Estes Kefauver so ably conducted hearings of great value for the forgotten man in our economy—the consumer.

Estes Kefauver believed in people, and the people believed in him.

He believed that everyone—the worker, the small farmer, the small businessman—should have a fair chance in life and a fair share in America's abundance.

He believed in helping those who could not help themselves—the aged, the children, the sick, the weak.

And the people believed in him. They elected him repeatedly to the House of Representatives and to the Senate, and twice a great many of them did their level best to elect him to the highest office in the land.

From his first day in Congress to his last—the day before he died—he worked, spoke, voted, and fought for the public interest.

He fought for civil rights and civil liberties; for public health; for public power and the Tennessee Valley Authority; for aid to the depressed areas of our country; for a genuinely free and competitive economy; and for many other good causes.

He fought against organized crime; against political bossism; against racist immigration laws; and against monopolists and price-fixers.

Some battles he won, others he lost. But he never let defeat embitter or discourage him; instead, he just came back to fight harder.

Estes Kefauver was tireless in seeking out the voters, in every highway and byway of America. But he also gave generously of his time and energy to causes where no votes were to be won, because he felt it to be his duty.

That is the mark of a statesman—and Estes Kefauver was a statesman of real vision and commanding intellect as well as a master politician, and a master of the common touch.

I think of his work as a young Congressman on congressional reorganization and the achievement of more effective and productive relations between the executive and legislative branches of our Federal Government.

I think of his work as a Senator for closer cooperation among the free nations of the Atlantic—his stanch and active support of NATO, and his tireless efforts to endow it with economic, social, and political as well as military significance.

He was capable of high and lonely courage; he took orders from no one but his conscience.

He was gentle, as only the strong can be gentle. He was infinitely patient and persistent in pressing for these things he deemed right, and immovably stubborn in resisting those he deemed wrong. Yet, at all times—even in the heat of battle—he was courteous, kind, considerate, and generous.

He was a giant of a man—and, like the giant of Greek mythology, he drew fresh strength from each contact with his native earth, the good earth of Tennessee.

It is fitting that he rests there eternally—and it is fitting that we, his friends and colleagues, have gathered here to bear witness that America—and the American people—are better for the life he lived and the example of selfless service he set.

And now it is my privilege and pleasure to make an important announcement on behalf of the Estes Kefauver Memorial Foundation. For this purpose, I would appreciate it very much if Mr. Edward J. Meeman, editor emeritus of the Memphis Press-Scimitar, would join me at the microphone.

There was a long history of relationship between Ed Meeman and Estes Kefauver.

They fought many a battle together—battles I already have alluded to: for the independence of TVA and the proving of the public power concept; for equal rights for all men at a time when such a fight wasn't popular or easy; for the right of dissent, even during those times when such rights weren't easily secured; for, what Estes used to call, "the little people."

Therefore, I think it is most appropriate that today his old friend and collaborator—Ed Meeman—is here to announce an endowment to the Estes Kefauver Memorial Foundation to carry on the purposes for which the two jointly strived.

Mr. Meeman is giving the foundation $50,000 to endow an award to be given triennially to the person who has done the most during the past 3 years to establish a union of the free nations—the "Union of the Free Award."

Teamwork among the free is more important than ever—and Estes would have hoped that the United States would be the Nation to show the way. I am honored to be associated in this occasion.

RESPONSE OF EDWARD J. MEEMAN, EDITOR EMERITUS OF THE MEMPHIS PRESS-SCIMITAR, TO VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY'S TRIBUTE TO ESTES KEFAUVER AND HIS ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE ESTES KEFAUVER UNION OF THE FREE AWARD, JANUARY 17, 1966

Thank you, Mr. Vice President, for these great words about a great man.

It is a trusim that a statesman must first be a good enough politician to get elected.

The late Senator Estes Kefauver was a remarkably successful politician. Indeed, Senator Kefauver was so unusually successful as a politician that this success has, in a good many minds, obscured the fact that he was far more the statesman than he was the politician.

A politician in public office seeks to know what the majority of his constituents want, and strives to meet those needs. The statesman does that, but he does more than that. He studies fully, deeply, and earnestly what the needs of his constituents are, needs of which the majority are not yet aware, and has the courage to work to meet them even before the majority can be persuaded that they exist. This takes intellect, industry, and courage. Estes Kefauver had all three, and became a statesman whose stature as such is increasingly becoming recognized.

As an editor in Tennessee who supported him I had an opportunity to observe this.

Estes Kefauver took a stand for the equality of the Negro long before the majority of the people of his State were willing to do so. Yet that same majority elected him decisively although they did not agree with him on this vital issue. He proved by defeating anti-Negro opponents that although the majority was not ready to be pro-Negro it was no longer possible to win by making race prejudice the issue. Demagoguery could not upset Tennessee, although it had been a member of the Confederacy, as it did some other States. Estes Kefauver's courage had a wholesome historic effect. Tennessee accomplished the great change

brought by the Supreme Court decision of 1954 and the civil rights laws in good order and set an example which mitigated the turmoil which plagued neighboring Southern States.

A parallel was his bold advocacy of a federation of the democratic nations which have a long history of self-government and guarantee their citizens their personal freedom. These nations happen to lie mostly in Western Europe and North America, but the proposed federation would not be limited to these. When his interest in this idea and program was sought by Edmund Orgill, successful wholesale hardware merchant of Memphis, he gave it careful study, found it sound, embraced it, and worked and fought for its realization.

Here, as in the case of civil rights, Estes Kefauver was far ahead of his constituents. His great moral courage carried him forward. When he had an invitation to speak anywhere in the country, and he had many, he often chose this as his theme. When, in running for reelection, his opponent sought to make political capital out of it in a nationalist State—Tennessee is the Volunteer State—crying that "Kefauver would surrender our national sovereignty"—Kefauver did not waiver. He stood by his guns. He explained that he believed that only through federation could the democratic nations be strong enough to survive in a world of dictatorships—only thus could they guarantee the sovereignty of the free citizen over his own life. As in the case of civil rights, the majority of Tennesseans trusted the man they loved, and gave him their votes, even though they had not yet become wholly convinced that federation was the thing to do.

And so, the Estes Kefauver Union of the Free Award, a prize of $6,000, will be given every 3 years to the person who in the preceding period "has best served the cause of democracy by effective efforts to bring about the union of the self-governing peoples of the world who guarantee the freedom of choice and action of the individual in the spirit of Estes Kefauver, who advanced this cause effectively, persistently, and nobly."

The fund which supplies these prizes will be administered by the Edward J. Meeman Foundation, Memphis, Tenn. But it is part of the Estes Kefauver Memorial, in which cause we are gathered here tonight. I prefer to think of it as the Estes Kefauver carry-on—a carry-on to greater success of the purposes and enterprises which he advanced so far.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR PEARSON TO AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the statement I made before the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee today.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JAMES B. PEARSON, OF KANSAS, TO SENATE AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE, MARCH 22, 1966

Soil and water conservation accomplishments in fiscal year 1967 must—in my opinion—advance at a more rapid rate than in 1966; just as I would presume that the conservation accomplishments this year are greater than last, and last year's greater than the year before. This is how we progress—by building and multiplying our accomplishments.

In soil and water conservation this progressive improvement is absolutely essential if we are to correct past mistakes of soil and water misuse, adequately protect these resources, and wisely develop them for the benefit of the American people, now and in the future. Each year must show more progress than the year before.

This is what I would hope to see reflected in the budget for soil and water conservation work, so that the going programs may be accelerated and the serious backlog of uncompleted work may be reduced. As presented, the budget is not adequate to assure the needed accomplishment in fiscal year 1967.

The budget provides for a reduction of $3.6 million in soil survey funds. This is at a time when the importance of testing and mapping soils for sound land use planning and development is becoming more widely appreciated in the rural fringe areas where the Nation is undergoing its most spectacular growth. In Kansas alone, the soils on more than 20 million acres remain to be surveyed.

The proposed cut in Federal support funds would seriously delay the mapping of the Nation's soils. I feel strongly that this money should be restored in the appropriation.

Moreover, I believe that Federal assistance funds for conservation operations of the Soil Conservation Service should be increased to $120 million, to permit acceleration of soils mapping and application of conservation measures on the land.

Watershed planning and development is another area where the backlog of work needing to be done approaches staggering proportions. A modest increase in funds—to $10 million for watershed planning, and to $80 million for watershed protection—would help give this program the added impetus it needs.

I know that this committee is well aware of the benefits of the small watershed program, particularly the multiple-purpose projects that have contributed so much to the concept of local self-help in developing the Nation's water resources for the benefit of the community.

I can tell you that in Kansas we have made impressive progress in many watershed areas under this program. Yet, of 236 watersheds that need attention—and there are others that would benefit by further protection and development—only 21 watershed projects have been authorized for operations assistance. There simply has not been sufficient money made available to do the needed job. Watershed protection and development requires more substantial Federal support of local cooperative efforts, as a matter of growing national concern.

In Kansas, and in nine other Western States, the Great Plains conservation program has given new life and hope to a vast region of great potential. I am happy to say that in Kansas at the beginning of the current fiscal year more than 1,725 farms and ranches with a total of 1,660,000 acres were being operated under Great Plains conservation program contracts. But throughout the Great Plains States, approximately 5,000 applications for assistance under the program have not yet been serviced. I believe this program has proved its worth beyond any question of a doubt, and that it should be accelerated, as, indeed, the economic life of the Nation in general is being accelerated in this period of dynamic national growth.

An increase in Federal support of the Great Plains conservation program to $20 million would help reduce the backlog of pending applications, and thereby bring the Nation that much closer to solving its soil and water conservation problems.

I believe these suggested increases in the budget of the Soil Conservation Service are fully justified to assure the protection, development, and proper use of the Nation's soil and water resources, in order to meet the long-term needs of the American people.

A COMBAT VETERAN SPEAKS OUT ON VIETNAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, an excellent article by Jim Morris, who had served for 5 years and 8 months in the Army, was a captain of the Green Berets in Vietnam, and was wounded three times in action against the Vietcong, appears in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

No one can question his credentials.

His article points out some of the numerous follies which we have been and are continuing to commit in our undeclared war in southeast Asia.

He also makes the very pertinent observation in the first paragraph of his article, which I quote:

Our men are most efficient in killing, but we can kill every North Vietnamese and Vietcong soldier in South Vietnam, and still lose the war.

I have been saying that for over 2 years now.

The facts he sets out just add up to further evidence of the complete unjustification and unwisdom of our being there militarily. Unfortunately, the Nation has now been committed by Executive act to this undeclared war and thereby condemned an increasing number of our fine young men to slaughter.

I ask unanimous consent that the article: "We Must Colonize Vietnam," be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

WE MUST COLONIZE VIETNAM

(By Jim Morris)

(NOTE.—The author, 28, served 5 years in the Army, with two tours—8 months—as a captain in the Green Berets in Vietnam, where he was wounded three times in action against the Vietcong. He left the Army last June and now lives in Oklahoma City.)

Day after day I hear our military's reports about how many Vietcong have been killed, and it dismays me that so few Americans realize killing alone does no real good. Day after day I hear of the legislators and diplomats squabbling over Vietnam policy, and I wonder if they are talking about the same country where I served with the special forces—the Green Berets. Our men are most efficient in killing, but we can kill every North Vietnamese and Vietcong soldier in South Vietnam, and still lose the war. Our military and Government leaders meanwhile ignore a basic fact. Escalation is not the answer. South Vietnam is a country whose Government is totally dependent on us. But its leaders are running the place corruptly and stupidly. We must force them to reform or else forfeit the hope for a real victory.

The two most stable democracies in Asia—Japan and the Philippines—were created within forms molded by the American military. But the billions of dollars we pour into Vietnam go to a regime whose principal characteristics are inefficiency and corruption. None of this will change of its own accord; nor will more planes and tanks and men, more Presidential conferences or Vice Presidential tours, change the situation.

We are going to have to impose rule on this country. We must use the only real weapon we have: money.

Let me stress that I speak without anger toward the U.S. Army, in which I served with pride for more than 5 years, or special forces, which is as much my religion as my former

outfit. But Green Berets live and fight with the people, and so they acquire experiences unavailable even to the highest American officials, who make their tours under the guidance of the Vietnamese mandarins. The Vietnamese Government, since its inception, has been the private preserve of these mandarins, who comprise one of the most detestable oligarchies in the world. The late President Ngo Dinh Diem was one of the mandarins, and control has remained within the Vietnamese Establishment, which contends with Vietcong for the support of the people. Some choice. On one side is Saigon and on the other the Vietcong, who would organize the country into a system of interlocking informants so tight it would make "1984" look like an anarchy.

Since returning home, I have often heard Americans talk offhandedly of the "corruption" and "misunderstanding" in places like Vietnam, but I do not think they understand what it really means in this war. In the spring of 1964 the Rotary Club of Hawaii donated a load of presents to the people of Vietnam. For some reason it was decided to give it all to the Montagnards of Phu Thien district, Phu Bon Province, in the Central Highlands where our strike force was operating. In short order the donation turned into an extravaganza. Officials of the Hawaii Rotary were flown in to make the presentation. Gen. Paul D. Harkins himself flew down by helicopter to make a speech. A large crowd of Montagnards was gathered at the speakers' stand.

Back in Ceo Reo, the province capital, meanwhile, the local Agency for International Development representative was frantic. He had examined the cargo. In a society where soap is just beginning to catch on, there is a limited demand for 3,000 Barbie dolls.

In order to save the United States from embarrassment, the AID man denuded his warehouse, collecting all the farm implements he could find, along with wheat and blankets.

The gift giving was a huge success, and the VIP's departed in an orgy of mutual congratulations. The day after, as we later learned from our friends in the village, the district chief, a lieutenant in the Vietnamese army, seized all the farm implements and other useful merchandise (the dolls were spared) and had them loaded on a truck, donated to him by the U.S. Army, and shipped to Pleiku, where they were sold.

This chief and another not far away had a more regular system of acquiring income. This technique was to move villages. Each time a village family is resettled it is entitled to 1,000 piasters (officially about $14) to establish its new home. But the villagers received only 200 piasters, and the chiefs kept the rest. Several times we tried to acquire evidence to prove this corruption—but who is going to testify against a man whose duties include those of judge, jury and executioner?

We figured that those two swine were each worth a battalion to the Vietcong.

Although upper class Vietnamese officials give lipservice to winning the people, they are usually incapable of understanding the respect for human dignity which this requires. About 2 months after the Rotary Club incident, two of the Vietnamese guards on the Ca Lui bridge decided to get a little carbine practice. For their target they chose an old lady in a village about 200 yards away. They started kicking up dust at her heels with their bullets. She ran across the field toward her home and began climbing the notched log that Montagnards use for ladders on their stilted houses.

She was halfway up the ladder when one of the bullets killed her. I don't think the guards really meant to kill her; their marksmanship isn't that good. One of our strike force company commanders was a nephew of the old lady, and he reported the incident to us. My detachment commander and the province adviser, an American major, went to the province chief and told him the story. The chief responded with an elegant shrug, a legacy from the French, and said that he doubted that it was true, but if it was, there was nothing he could do about it, and why bother? It was just another savage.

This is the way the mandarins normally treat the Montagnards, who are 95 percent of the population of the Central Highlands. The Montagnard tribes have had wars among themselves for many years, but they share a hatred of the ethnic Vietnamese. The Montagnards fight the VC now because it pays pretty well, and because they like Americans, but all they need do is stop fighting the VC, and the Highlands—the middle half of Vietnam—is lost. Should all the VC be killed today, the Montagnards would launch their own war for some form of autonomy. The Hoa Hao and Cao Dai are religious sects whose hierarchies want to carve their own feudal fiefdoms out of the country. The Khmer Serei, a group of ethnic Cambodians, wait the chance to reannex to Cambodia six of the southern provinces along the Mekong. All these groups have well-trained military units, currently serving under the Vietnamese and fighting the VC. The idea that the Vietnamese mandarins can, without reform, mold these people into a nation is a mirage.

Of course there are competent people in Vietnam now, but few have any chance to rise to power, and we must force the mandarins to give them the chance. There was a second lieutenant named Luan in the Vietnamese special forces. The first time we went on patrol together he had a flunkie carry his pack and he walked gaily along leaning on a staff. He wore tailored camouflage fatigues and dark glasses. He was elegant. Eight miles down the trail the flunkie was still carrying his pack, but Luan was carrying the pack of a private who couldn't make it. He had guts and he was smart. If we suggested something in the afternoon, Luan had already done it in the morning. If it was advised in the morning, he had accomplished it in the afternoon before. He would have been an outstanding soldier in any army in the world.

I made the mistake of mentioning to his higher headquarters that he was a good man. Two days later he was whisked away, into some limbo that the Vietnamese army maintains for pro-American lieutenants, and replaced by a man who read maps upside down and parades around with a rusty sword. He is a lieutenant, and his father is wealthy. In Vietnam, talent is dangerous, for it threatens the establishment.

We brought in a prisoner once, a pretty nice old man, the chief of a Vietcong-controlled village. As a conversational opener, the commanding officer asked him if he knew Diem was dead.

He said no, but he was very sorry.

The commanding officer thought he had misunderstood and asked the question again and the answer came back the same.

The village chief thought Diem was a friend of the commanding officer and he was sorry his friend had died. He himself had never heard of Diem, or Vietnam either, although he knew who the Vietminh were and in his extreme youth had been to Pleiku and seen a Frenchman. People like this aren't worried about the Premier, whether he be called Ky or Diem or Khanh. To them, the district chief is the government. We have counted on the Saigon Government to win the districts, and they have failed. Yet Americans acquire the friendship of these people because they tender their own friendship honestly.

Recently, our attention has been drawn to the large-scale attack forces we have assembled to sweep valleys and hillsides, and the suggestion is that we are mounting an offensive that can finally "win." In fact, the infiltration of North Vietnamese units has distracted American forces into a gaudy, but essentially diversionary, war. An insurgency is a very special kind of war: A significant portion of the population must find the government despicable; there must be a countryside to hide in; and there must be help from the outside.

At no time within memory have the conditions for guerrilla war been met so fully as in the Republic of Vietnam. Thus the new, escalated American attacks bring a danger that we will delude ourselves with shows of strength—a very real danger, for most American commanders, as well as most generals giving advice back in the States, were schooled in World War II and Korea. The ramifications of guerrilla warfare do not come easily to soldiers trained to think in terms of real estate. We may conquer real estate, kill Vietcong by the thousands, and still lose the support of the people and thus lose the war.

Yet the situation is not hopeless, in my opinion. We have a dependency named South Vietnam. So far it is a disaster. Now we must get tough with the Saigon government.

Our entire AID and military advisory effort has been run from the top down, meaning that we have entrusted the funds to the mandarins. This has been a drastic mistake we must rectify.

One of the Vietcong's principal techniques is the creation of a shadow government. For every government official they have an equivalent VC official. The French called this system parallel hierarchies. The Americans have created a parallel hierarchy too, with the AID and military-advisory effort. But our parallel hierarchy cannot force changes in the Vietnamese Government.

I am not suggesting that we use our parallel hierarchy to get rid of inept administrators by assassination and terror, as the VC do. But I do recommend that Province AID representatives should have final veto on any money or goods which are distributed within the Province. They should be encouraged to use this leverage to insist on honesty, fair treatment, and the replacement of corrupt officials. Whenever possible, the replacement should be a respected local leader. Our military advisers should have all pay and supplies in their possession until they are issued to the troops. It has always been that way in the Special Forces, and in our detachment the VC-kill ratio between our troops and all other troops in the Province, man for man, was 33 to 1 in our favor. The people supported us because they respected us, as they despised the mandarins.

In this way, in a sense, we will be running the country altogether—and such a program may take a generation to succeed. But the country cannot run itself, and it is our responsibility. It is axiomatic in revolutionary warfare that an insurgency can be resolved in one of two ways. Either the legitimate aspirations of the people are satisfied, or a regime so cruel and oppressive is established that the mere utterance of an antigovernment remark results in prison or death. Unless we force Saigon to provide the former, the North Vietnamese will establish the latter.

We are successful at the killing, and well-meaning about the diplomacy. But we must accept this country on its own terms. An Australian colonel, chosen for Vietnam duty because of his knowledge of the language, of the people and of guerrilla warfare, once summed it up well: "The Vietnamese have a proverb which they don't quote to Americans. 'He who gives and asks nothing in return is despised.' "

THE 48TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBERATION OF BYELORUSSIA

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, this week marks the 48th anniversary of the liberation of Byelorussia from domination by the Soviet Union. Sadly, here independence was shortlived lasting less than 3 years. This is a very short time to be free when you have fought and struggled for freedom for so long. Having been exposed to, and having experienced freedom, the Byelorussian people, I am convinced, will not lose faith and will continue in their struggle to regain their independence.

The history of this small but brave nation offers clear and convincing evidence that the right to self-determination is an aspiration that all oppressed peoples share. Further, the oppressed people of the world long for the day when freedom once again will flourish in their countries and will cast asunder those totalitarian chains that will exploit a nation's economic resources and oppress the spirit and body of the people.

It is important for us as free Americans to remember, Mr. President, that all the peoples of the world are not free. Many are struggling to achieve liberation from the yoke of oppression and persecution; others are striving valiantly to maintain their freedom.

Mr. President, we should particularly remember that no one came to the aid of Byelorussia in its struggle for independence and today there are many small countries that will fall to the same fate without the support of the free world. That is why our Nation is in Vietnam today.

The history of the United States shows that the securing of freedom does not come easy or cheap, but as all Americans know, the blessings of a free society are well worth the price. The prayers and thoughts of the American people, Mr. President, are with the oppressed people of the world and we sincerely hope that all people will soon enjoy freedom and independence.

A COMMONSENSE APPROACH TO SOLVING CRIME

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as we all know, the crime problem in our country has reached a point where many people worry about leaving their homes at night for fear of being harmed.

We all need to look at this problem and its effects on ourselves, our families, our friends, and our property.

Some of the best "down to earth" advice on the subject came Monday, March 21, 1966, from Deputy Chief Lawrence A. Hartnett, who is chief of detectives for the Metropolitan Police Department.

Chief Hartnett spoke to the American Newspaper Women's Club in Washington. Because the advice he offered appears to hit at the center of the problem, I ask unanimous consent to have his address printed in the RECORD for others to read in its entirety.

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

An increase in crime is being experienced throughout the United States and the District of Columbia has not been spared in the general increase.

The impairment of the security of person and property is a matter of major concern.

There are no quick or easy answers. A tremendous effort must be exerted to identify and eliminate the causes of criminal activity.

There has been in recent years much talk, but little constructive action to deal with the increase in crime.

Fortunately, since the President of the United States has voiced his concern, more interest and action has been generated to seek a solution than ever before.

For too long, too little serious attention, and too low a priority have been given to our methods and agencies of law enforcement.

The policeman, the frontline soldier in the war against crime, has been waging a lonely battle. His burdens have been increasing each day.

Police work and policing is no longer merely the presence of a uniform policeman on the beat. It is a complex, involved professional position, requiring utilization of the latest scientific detection, understanding, and a willingness to work under rules and decisions which would have confounded policemen of yesteryear.

What is police work?

Primarily, the police are responsible for preservation of the peace, protection of life and property, preventing and detecting crime, and apprehending violators.

In addition to these principal duties, there are other diversified responsibilities, requiring an exceptional amount of police services, all of them manpower consuming.

Prevention and detection of crime is constantly a battle of wits with the criminal element, with the police bound by rules, but the criminal bound by no rules whatever.

One of the most disturbing trends today is the overzealous pity for the criminal and an equivalent disregard for his victim.

There has to be a change in the thinking of those who are always seeking justification for the criminal deeds.

The public will have to become nauseated by crime and vomit forth the criminal instead of digesting him.

Unfortunately, it appears that the public may be coming to accept widespread lawlessness as an unavoidable adjunct to our way of life.

What has happened to the civic pride? The righteous indignation of otherwise respectable citizens who turn their backs on helpless victims of beatings, robberies, and sex crimes?

Public indifference in combating crime is the real culprit.

This incredibly indifferent attitude can have a disastrous effect on law and order in a community.

Crime is a social problem and a community responsibility which crosses all walks of life.

Law enforcement cannot succeed without the sustained and informed interest of all citizens. It is not enough to reflect our concern over the rise in crime by seeking out single answers or simple answers.

They do not exist.

The people will get observance of the law and enforcement of the law if they want it, insist on it, and participate in it.

Criminal laws have been interpreted more toward strengthening the rights of the criminal and restricting the powers of the police, but the decline of citizens' support for law enforcement is more damaging.

Fear of getting involved and public apathy have rendered too many citizens blind and deaf to incidents of crime; they go to great extremes, even to deliberately lying, to avoid being called as a witness to a criminal act or give information about it.

Unless citizens are willing to testify in court or answer the call for jury duty, we cannot expect the intent of the law to be fulfilled.

It should be remembered that quick detection, vigorous and prompt prosecution, and adequate and certain punishment fitted to the crime, constitute a definite deterrent to the commission of crime and contributes to the reduction of crime.

This is a recognized fact, but it brings our attention to another problem related to effective law enforcement, that I will briefly comment on. That is the courts—the courts that have traditionally been the symbol and guardian of our cherished freedoms; but local criminal courts are so overloaded with cases, understaffed both as to prosecutors and judges, that their functioning is impeded and their effectiveness weakened—all to the advantage of the criminal.

There are many contributing causes to crime, but so often these are used just as excuses for committing crime.

I believe that man is responsible for his actions and, except in a few insanity cases, is a free agent being confronted with a choice between right and wrong and freely makes his choice.

There are some who look at crime and see only the effects of one's physical environment, such as a broken home, slums or poverty, as a cause for all crime. According to this philosophy, a defendant is not responsible for what he has done. Although it may be true that these elements are conditions of crime, the criminals are not all helpless slaves of their environment. I see in many criminal acts the free will choices of men who would rather rob and steal than work, cut or shoot than discuss differences.

Defendants have many champions. Pity should not be for defendants, but for victims.

Every figure in the criminal offenses statistics is, in effect, a violation of some individual's right to peace and security.

Citizens who are indifferent to crime and the general safety of their community are as much an ally of the criminal as someone who provides a hideout for a wanted man.

We need alert citizens who are willing to take positive action, including the reporting of criminal acts and testifying about them in court. Until all honest citizens become involved in the fight against crime, there is little likelihood that our crime rate will cease to grow.

Call the police if you have the slightest suspicion that a crime has been or is about to be committed. We now have a new police emergency telephone number, easy to remember—444–1111.

Of all the suggested causes of crime, I believe the home is a major factor in crime problems.

The family is the first great training school in behavior or misbehavior. Children develop a sense of right and wrong. The home becomes their first classroom and the parents serve as the first teachers. In the home the child learns that others beside himself have rights which he must oftentimes respect. Here the spadework is laid for instilling in the child those values which will cause him to develop into an upright, law-abiding wholesome citizen. He must learn respect for others, respect for property, courtesy, truthfulness, and reliability. He must learn not only to manage his own affairs but also to share in the responsibility for the affairs of the community. He must

be taught to understand the necessity of obeying the law.

These qualities, of course, are transmitted to the child only if they are exemplified and taught within the family circle.

Such conditions as homes broken by divorce—separation, inadequate home, neglectful parents, unsound discipline—too little or none, or occasionally—too severe, immorality, intemperance, gambling, vice, illegitimacy, criminality in the home, lack of religion.

Most crimes are spur-of-the-moment happenings. Few of the average criminals plan their actions in advance, in other words, their victims aren't "chosen." Victims become vulnerable many times due to their own carelessness. They invite trouble by their own actions. Thieves thrive on their victims' mistakes.

Everyone should make it as difficult as possible for the criminal to operate.

If you can recognize your own vulnerability you will have taken a large step toward protecting yourself.

Your best defense against crime is doing all in your power to prevent it from happening.

Crimes that women would most likely be victims of are: Robberies, in the form of pocketbook snatchers; molesters, usually seeking some type of sexual contact; housebreakers, ordinarily they attempt to avoid any direct contact.

However, factors in any of these circumstances can easily project these crimes into the rape or murder category.

A lesser crime that is mentally disturbing, rather than physically dangerous, is the obscene phone call, and these can be a frightening experience.

Let me suggest a few ideas to help prevent them happening to you.

MOLESTERS

Don't be on the streets alone at night, but if you can't avoid walking alone at night: Stay away from dark, lightly traveled streets, even if it means walking out of your way. Stay on main thoroughfares; notice what stores are open should you need to ask for help.

Don't assume that every man walking behind you is following you.

Do be aware of the sound of footsteps; do look over you shoulder occasionally. If your suspicions are even slightly aroused, change your direction.

Use good sense alone in public places. At the movies, try to find an aisle seat next to another woman, a family or a couple. Don't sit near men who are alone and groups of teenage boys.

Don't let loneliness make you careless. A lonely woman who decides to have a drink alone in her neighborhood bar is inviting trouble.

Don't let strangers into your home when you're alone; make no exceptions. If the stranger is a salesman whose product interests you, tell him to return when a male friend or relative can be present. If the stranger is making an unexpected delivery, have him leave the package outside your door; if the package—or telegram, etc., must be signed for, have the form slipped under the door.

Don't hire men who come to your door looking for work. When you need a job done, hire from a reputable agency or ask a friend to recommend someone.

Don't be immodest before workmen, grocery boys, etc.

A man doesn't have to be a rapist to be stimulated by a scantily-clad woman, and, too, many men believe that a lack of modesty is an open invitation to an advance.

Self-service apartment house elevators are notoriously dangerous areas for a woman alone. The rule here is simple; don't step into a self-service elevator at night with a man you don't know or don't recognize as a tenant of the building. Day or night, don't take a self-service elevator alone to the basement.

Whenever you are in a self-service elevator alone, stand next to the control buttons and switches. If a strange man gets on and does anything frightening, press the alarm switch immediately. Always keep both of your hands free as you ride in a self-service elevator. If you're carrying packages, place them on the floor.

Don't hide a key to your house under a door mat, in a mailbox, etc. These tricks are known to just about everyone and are simply another way of inviting trouble.

PROTECTING YOURSELF

Use your entire hand against just one of your assailant's fingers. Grab his finger with your whole hand; make a fist; bend his finger backward with every bit of your strength.

Use the outside edge of your hand to hack at an assailant's windpipe or at the side of his neck.

Gouge at an attacker's eye. If you have fairly long nails, use them as claws to rake and tear at your attacker's eyes.

Use the heel of your shoe to kick and grind at the bone on the bridge (top) of an assailant's foot.

Use your knee—or, if you have the room, your foot—to kick an assailant in the groin. If your handbag is fairly heavy or you are carrying a book, and are grabbed from behind, swing the handbag or book backward as hard as you can to hit your assailant in the upper groin and if you catch him right, he will release his hold, then you run.

WHEN TO—AND NOT TO—FIGHT BACK

There is only one situation in which you should struggle with a man—if he makes a move to do you bodily harm. To put it simply, give up your purse, your jewelry, etc., without a murmur, but fight like a tiger for your life. Some men are interested only in money when they apprehend a woman. Such a man will take whatever money, jewelry, or furs a woman has, then beat a hasty retreat without touching her.

If a mugger or molester moves toward you, or refuses to let go of you after he's taken your possessions, scream—long and loud. If you can break loose, run. If you can't break loose, fight as described earlier.

HOUSEBREAKERS

The housebreaker usually attempts to avoid any direct contact.

Install good locks on doors and windows.

Have good locks on porch and patio doors. Check to see that outside hinges on doors are installed so that the pins cannot be knocked out—not much use having good locks if the hinge pins are accessible from outside.

Most people are lax about locking windows. Just as you lock each of your doors upon leaving the house, lock each of your windows.

Give special attention to windows that are particularly vulnerable—for example, windows in the basement and on the ground floor at the rear of your house.

Something else to consider is "turn-screw" locks for bedroom and other windows that you leave open often. With a turn-screw lock, a window may be opened wide enough to permit air and ventilation, then locked so it cannot be raised higher.

Upstairs windows are accessible to housebreakers known as "cats" or "climbers" who climb ladders, trellises, trees, etc., to second floor windows.

One of the best ways to protect your home is with light—a lot of light, both inside and outside. The last thing any would-be housebreaker wants is to be seen. He depends on darkness for protection. He needs the cover of darkness to sneak in and out of your home without being observed.

Always leave a light on inside—downstairs and upstairs—when you go out at night. Consider installing a new automatic device that turns lights on and off at whatever hours you specify, no matter whether you are at home or away.

PRECAUTIONS WHEN YOU'RE AWAY

A majority of people go on vacations and other trips without taking special steps to protect their homes.

Tell delivery men in person when to discontinue service, instruct the post office to hold your mail until you return, ask the telephone company to switch your calls to the home of a close friend or relative. Don't tell strangers (for example, a gas-station attendant) that you're leaving town; do notify your local police precinct that you plan to be away.

Put jewelry and other valuables in a safety deposit box when you know you're going to be out of town. Have furs put in storage or take them to the home of a close friend or relative.

WHAT TO DO IF YOU'RE BURGLARIZED

If you are at home and awakened by an intruder, do not try to apprehend him. When he has gone, call the police immediately.

Do not touch anything until the police arrive. Leave everything exactly as the housebreaker left it.

If you find your home has been broken into while you were out, do not enter the house; rush immediately to the nearest phone and call for police assistance.

Whenever you come home, make it a habit to look for signs that your house may have been entered—forcibly or otherwise—a door that is slightly ajar, an open window, etc.

Fight with a housebreaker only if he attacks you (or if you're certain he is moving to attack you).

APARTMENTS

Extra locks on doors.

Duplicate keys out to many—get new locks; keys in general (house, auto, apartment; don't have your address on them). (Better to have house and car keys separate.)

Windows—lock, especially first floor—open on fire escape, terrace balcony, or garden.

Peephole in door.

Always lock door, even to go to get mail—to the incinerator, etc.

Don't use full name on door or lobby mailbox.

SAFETY IN YOUR CAR—BASIC SAFEGUARDS

Every time you get into your car, follow this simple, but important, procedure: lock all doors; roll up all the windows, except those you need open for ventilation.

If you own a convertible, use good sense about driving with the top down. For example, a woman out alone at night should never keep the top down. Too, night or day, it is wise to put up the top when driving in a bad, could-be-dangerous neighborhood.

Keep alert when you're driving. If a car seems to be following you, detour immediately to a more heavily traveled street. Look for help at a gas station.

Never pick up hitchhikers, women as well as men, teenagers as well as adults. If a motorist flags you to ask for help, be wary as you pull to a stop.

Don't get out of your car (make him, or her, walk over to you); roll your window down just enough so you can hear. If the motorist wishes to borrow a tool, pass the key to your trunk—not your entire key chain—through the window. Do not get out

of the car yourself. As innocent as a motorist in distress may appear, remember that getting help on the road is a favorite gambit of muggers and thieves. Promise to stop at the next gas station or garage and send help back.

WHEN YOUR CAR IS PARKED

Always lock your car—to protect any valuables—to prevent someone from getting into it and hiding in the back seat.

Don't keep an extra ignition or trunk key "hidden" anywhere in your car. Even amateur thieves know to look for duplicate keys in the ashtray, under the rug or rubber floor mat, on the back of a sun visor, in the glove or armrest compartment.

OBSCENE TELEPHONE CALLS

Listing in directory—plain; don't list on personal stationery that you might scribble notes on. Hang up—don't listen.

Blow whistle.

Don't be giving out information on the phone.

PICKPOCKETS AND PURSE SNATCHERS

Keep a separate list—at home—of the serial number of credit cards, hospitalization insurance, your driver's license, social security card, automobile registration, charge plates.

Never carry large amounts of cash on your person.

Don't display large bills in public.

Don't ever put down your purse on the counter of a store, leave it in a supermarket *shopping cart*, put it on the floor of a movie theater, place it on an empty seat alongside you on a bus. In short, keep your hands firmly on your handbag whenever you are in a public place.

In an office—do not leave your purse on your desk. We have what are known as sneak thieves who prey on office buildings and every one of them knows that most secretaries keep their handbags in the lower right hand drawer of their desks.

When you walk down the street, grasp the handle of your bag firmly, tuck it tightly under your arm.

CONCLUSION

All of these are general suggestions. Each individual will respond differently. No one really knows what they may do if attacked. Isn't it ironic to be telling law-abiding citizens don't, don't, etc., when basically you should feel free to engage in any of your normal activities without any fear whatsoever.

The President has indicated that he wants the police of the District of Columbia to be the pride of and the example for the Nation. He also wants everyone to be able to walk any street, enjoy any park, drive on any highway, and live in any community at any time of the day or night without fear of being harmed.

I am sure it will be much easier to accomplish his first aim than it will the second, but I am sure you will, and I know I will, pray that he will be successful in both.

HISTORIC "1,000-YEAR-OLD MAGNOLIA" IN BIG THICKET IS DEAD—MESSAGE OF DEAD TREE IS FOR A NATIONAL BIG THICKET PARK

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, recently a historic tragedy struck the Big Thicket area when one of the most notable trees of east Texas, a venerable giant known as the 1,000-year-old magnolia died unexpectedly.

Unfortunately this tree died mysteriously at the time when the Department of the Interior was studying the Big Thicket area so that a report could be made pursuant to my intention to introduce suitable legislation to preserve the Big Thicket area as a natural area for this and future generations.

The death of this tree lends emphasis to my efforts to have this area permanently preserved for the future; if one tree has died mysteriously, there is a danger that more giant trees in the area will die if some course of action is not followed in the immediate future to preserve and protect the Big Thicket area.

I ask unanimous consent that an account of the death of this tree in the Kountze, Tex., Pine Needle of March 17, 1966, entitled "Famed Tree Dies Suddenly" be printed at this point in the RECORD, along with an editorial from the Houston Chronicle of Wednesday, March 16, 1966, entitled "Message of a Dead Tree" emphasizing the urgency of some measure to protect and preserve this historic area.

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

[From the Pine Needle, Hardin County, Kountze, Tex., Mar. 17, 1966]

BIG THICKET FAMED TREE DIES SUDDENLY

(By Louis Hofferbert, Chronicle Reporter)

One of the notable trees of east Texas, a venerable giant known as the "1,000-year-old magnolia," is dead.

It died unexpectedly, swiftly, mysteriously.

There are indications that it was killed deliberately by systematic injection of a metallic poison, possibly lead arsenate.

Its death removes one of the prize attractions of the Big Thicket, now under study by Department of Interior experts as a possible national park.

IRONIC DISCOVERY

By coincidence, its death was discovered because U.S. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, who will tour the Big Thicket early next month, had asked particularly that a visit to the giant magnolia be included in his itinerary. He will be taken to see the ragged remnants instead.

Dempsie Henley, mayor of Liberty and president of the Big Thicket Association, said today he is convinced that historic magnolia was killed by poison, but added that he is unable to conceive of a motive.

The giant tree, also known as the county line magnolia and as the three-pronged magnolia, stands at the intersection of Liberty, Polk, and Hardin Counties. It is deep in the "tight-eye" heart of the Big Thicket, several miles northeast of the tiny community of Fuqua, and is an area so isolated that the tree is rarely seen except by naturalists, surveyors, and timber cruisers.

EXACT AGE UNKNOWN

It is (or was) more than 100 feet high, with a main trunk more than 4 feet in diameter at the base. This trunk divides into three "prongs," each leaning toward a different county.

Its age is not known exactly, but has been estimated at 500 to 1000 years. It has been referred to as the "1000-year-old magnolia" for more than 100 years. It was cited as a "witness tree" when the line was surveyed in 1846 to create Polk County from the northern section of Liberty County.

And 11 years later, in 1857, when Hardin County was created from parts of Liberty and Jefferson Counties, the survey for the Liberty-Hardin line was started at the giant tree.

It does not stand precisely on the three-county corner. It is about 30 feet into Liberty County, with a huge blaze in the shape of a cross on its trunk, pointing toward the ancient heart pine stake and the more modern iron pin that mark the exact intersection.

Henley told today how the mysterious death of the old tree was discovered:

"Last week I received notice that Justice Douglas had asked to see the tree. To be sure we would not miss it, I went into the Big Thicket and searched out the tree. I was astounded to find it completely dead, with every appearance of having been dead for several years.

"But I knew it could not have been dead long. We made a movie in the Big Thicket little more than a year ago, and the magnolia was vigorous and in perfect condition at that time."

Convinced the tree did not die naturally, Henley returned to it last weekend with Lance Rosier of Saratoga, the Big Thicket naturalist, and Bruce A. Macko, of Cleveland, ranger in charge of the Big Thicket district of the U.S. Forest Service. Both are recognized experts on trees of east Texas.

The party went by jeep as far as possible, then on foot through the tangle of underbrush to find the tree. Its appearance was an incredible contrast to the pictures made only a few months ago.

BARE, LIMBS FALLING

The tree was bare, its three prongs shedding branches by their own weight. The ground was littered with dead limbs and Spanish moss, the tops were broken out until the prongs were no more than 75 to 80 feet high. There is every indication that the first strong wind will bring the whole tree down.

Deterioration of the tree fiber is astonishing. It is soft and pithy, with the appearance of a tree dead for at least five or six years.

Rosier examined the base carefully and pointed to a series of small holes.

"These, I think, are drill marks," he said. "It appears that some poison has been forced into the tree. I would guess lead arsenate."

Rosier said the poison might account for the unusually rapid breakdown of the wood fiber, creating the illusion of long decay.

"A tree like this would not die all at once," Rosier said. "If its death was natural, it would have been slow. Each year over a long period the tree would show a little less green. More and more dead limbs would have been observed until finally it would fail some year to put out any new leaves. Then it would be dead.

"But this tree was vigorous and fully leafed a short time ago, as the movies prove. My opinion is that it was deliberately poisoned."

Henley said that "as far as I am concerned, these experts have removed any doubt that the tree was killed deliberately. But the motive for such a thing is an absolute mystery."

He added that "commonsense tells us nobody wandered that far into the woods and poisoned a tree at random. So the poisoner had to know where the tree was, and to have a reason for wanting it destroyed."

Henley said there is some local opposition to the plan for a national park in the Big Thicket, but that it is "pretty far fetched" to think this opposition would lead to such vandalism.

LOSS GREAT

"But you cannot escape the fact that killing the magnolia has taken away a major attraction of the area," he said. "It points up the need to hasten our plans to preserve the special features of the Big Thicket, and at the same time raises some fear as to other notable trees of the area."

Henley listed as possible objects of sabotage the holly tree near Hardin recognized as the world's largest, the huge oaks at the Sam Houston homestead north of Liberty and on the Henley ranch near Clark, the world's largest dogwood near Woodville, and

a gigantic but little known cypress in the Neches River bottomland near Fred.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Mar. 16, 1966]

MESSAGE OF A DEAD TREE

The unexpected and unexplained death of a notable magnolia tree in the depths of the Big Thicket is more than a simple forest tragedy. Whether the giant tree, marking the common corner of three counties, was taken by age or was deliberately killed, as there is some reason to believe, is less important than the fact that another priceless and irreplacable bit of "old" Texas is gone.

Whatever the cause of its death, such a historic tree should not have been allowed to die. Moreover, other famous trees of east Texas should not be allowed to die, either of neglect or sabotage. The death of one points up the danger to others and again emphasizes the need for action now, if many natural attractions of east Texas are to be saved for future generations.

Efforts to establish a national park in the Big Thicket have been carried on for many years. There is now some hope for success, possibly even an entirely new concept in national park planning, and all Texans should support the movement.

The various historic trees, including several largest in the world of their species, make up only one of the many facets of natural history in the Big Thicket that should be preserved. Its wildlife in terms of flowers, shrubs, birds, insects, mosses and many others is astonishingly diversified. Some of it is unique, found nowhere else in Texas.

These special features make the Big Thicket one of the few spots in the United States that remain suitable for national park status. It will not remain so very long. It is being steadily eroded; one by one of its most valuable features are disappearing. Once it embraced millions of acres, now only a quarter of a million. Once virtually a trackless wilderness, it no longer qualifies under the National Wilderness Act because no single area of 5,000 acres remains unspoiled.

However, there still is much of the Big Thicket that can be saved, and it should be saved. Like the giant magnolia, once gone it can never be recalled.

As nothing else could, the death of this notable tree reminds us dramatically that the Big Thicket, unless it gets help from us, will have no tomorrow.

THE STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President I am deeply concerned about the administration's proposal to vitiate the national defense student loan—NDSL—program and the consequent effect upon needy students who are dependent upon those loans to complete their education.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled the "Loan Crisis," which appeared in the Pit News of the University of Pittsburgh be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE LOAN CRISIS

A travesty is being committed against American education by the failure to continue the national defense student loan (NDSL) program in the Johnson's administration's 1967 fiscal budget.

Since the National Defense Education Act established the loan program in 1959, NDSL has provided innumerable people the opportunity of a college education. Students who did not have the immediate financial resources, but possessed good academic potential, could borrow money from the Federal Government and pay it back at low interest rates over a reasonable period of time. University students have benefited by more than $1 million per year over the past 5 years.

If the proposed 1967 fiscal budget remains unchanged, 50 State legislatures and innumerable State banking and loan agencies with many other areas for profitable investment will have to be convinced of FIL's profitability before September.

If Congress fails to reinstate the $180 million National Defense Education Act program, we fear that students will be fair game for many murderous loan agencies with high interest rates. While the State legislatures and banking and loan groups are being told about FIL, students may be forced to go to such loan agencies to secure their education.

March 15 is the deadline for Congress to act on the Johnson budget. We believe Congress has no alternative but to reinstate the $180 million National Defense Education Act program. We heartily urge that the following action be taken to speed revision of the Johnson budget and reinstatement of the National Defense Education Act program:

A pro-National Defense Education Act letter writing campaign to all legislators in Washington, D.C., by all students, faculty, parents, and administrators who believe in higher education. Out-of-State students at the university should write to their home State Senators and Representatives and urge their parents to take similar action. Pennsylvanians should write their local representatives and Hon. JOSEPH CLARK, U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.; Hon. HUGH SCOTT, U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Student government and faculty senate resolutions urging the reinstatement of National Defense Education Act in the national budget, with copies being sent to all U.S. Senators and to local newspapers.

A personal visit to Harrisburg by Mr. Critchfield and acting chancellor David Kurtzman expressing their support of the National Defense Education Act.

A strong, continuous exercise of public opinion in favor of the National Defense Education Act's reinstatement is the only way to insure congressional revision of the Johnson budget. Everyone at the university should act now to support these measures if he wants and supports education.

TRUTH IN PACKAGING

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] has performed a valuable service in bringing before the country some of the unfortunate practices which exist in packaging and labeling, and has sought to correct those practices through his truth-in-packaging bill, S. 985, which is now before the Committee on Commerce of the Senate. President Johnson this week has called for a strong fair packaging bill in his excellent consumer message.

The respected weekly, Commonweal, concisely summarizes the problem and recent developments in an editorial in its issue of March 11. After telling of the results of a study conducted by Eastern Michigan University, and describing some of the unfortunate practices, the editorial points to the very substantial money savings which rational packaging would make possible. The editorial concludes as follows:

Senator HART has held hearings on truth in packaging for years, during which time the food and household goods companies have made virtually no efforts to put their own house in order. His bill should be passed.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be inserted in the RECORD.

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

PACKAGED TRUTH

In a recent study conducted by Eastern Michigan University, 33 college-educated housewives were asked to buy the most economical package (largest quantity for the price) for each of 20 products on sale at a selected supermarket. The women made 660 separate buying decisions, of which 284 were wrong. That is, in better than 2 out of 5 cases, fairly well educated women were unable to unravel the tangle of misleading claims in packaging. As a result they paid 11 percent more for their shopping than they had to, a margin which can be chalked up to the gouging of tricky packagers.

The shabby practices by now are well known: odd number weights, often fractional, that make calculation of real value difficult; "cents off" offers that are sometimes fraudulent; deceptive and overlarge air space packaging; and the abuse of ordinary language (one manufacturer of loose-leaf filler promises 300 pages for 59 cents, but delivers only 150 sheets—both sides of a sheet are counted as pages). The most common products come in a bewildering variety of weights—a check of one market showed 28 different weights in a section of detergent products. In some cases, contrary to claims about the large economy size, housewives were actually paying more per ounce on larger sizes than on smaller noneconomy sizes. What we need here is a rational system of weights and measures to serve the consumer and make it possible for him to approach the A. & P. without a slide rule.

The President's consumer counsel, Mrs. Esther Peterson, has said that the increase in the cost-of-living index "is insignificant compared to the savings that appear possible through more rational packaging." To organized labor, whose gain in collective bargaining often amounts to a raise of 1 or 2 percent, she pointed out that "what is won at the bargaining table can easily be lost at the bargaining counter."

In his state of the Union address, President Johnson asked Congress to "act to prevent the deception of the American consumer, requiring all packages to state clearly and truthfully their contents." The reference is to the bill prepared for that purpose by Senator PHILIP HART, of Michigan. Senator HART has held hearings on truth in packaging for 4 years, during which time the food and household goods companies have made virtually no efforts to put their own house in order. His bill should be passed.

PROPOSED CUT IN IMPACTED AREAS AID

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am shocked and astounded to learn that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is about to ask Congress to slash the amounts available to school districts by Federal activities in many parts of the country to meet the burdens imposed on local school systems.

For my own State of Maryland these budget cuts would exceed $7 million—a cut of almost 40 percent. Nationwide the cuts HEW is requesting amount to more than $200 million—almost two-thirds of the entire program of Federal aid to federally impacted school areas under Public Laws 874 and 815.

Through these two laws Congress has acted to meet the needs of local school districts in which either the presence of Federal employees overcrowds the local school facilities or the existence of Federal reservations in a school district deprives the school district of a sufficient tax base to meet its school needs.

These are not new laws. Both Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 were enacted in 1950. Both have been amended and extended several times. School districts all across the country have come to rely on the funds these two laws provide to help meet the school needs created by the activities of the Federal Government.

School officials from all across my State have contacted me to express their deep concern about the affect this drastic cut HEW has requested will have on their school construction and operation plans.

I want to announce right now my strenuous opposition to these drastic budget cuts and my intention to see that the federally created school problems of Maryland are adequately met by Federal assistance.

GOOD RADIO PROGRAMING HAS PUBLIC SUPPORT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in recent years there has been much criticism of the quality of programs broadcast by radio and television stations of America. Much of this comment has been justified, and should result in better programing.

In the Midwest, those who listen to radio station KMOX of St. Louis believe that Robert Hyland, general manager of that station and vice president of CBS radio, is daily solving the problem of how to provide more interesting and worthwhile programs for the hundreds of thousands of listeners to that station.

Through dynamic leadership in electronic communications and for his many services to his community, Bob Hyland has won many awards and honors, professional and civic. The degree of public support for the type of information and public participation programs offered at KMOX is worthy of consideration.

Because of the great interest in this subject all over the United States and particularly in the Congress, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Saturday-Sunday issue of March 19–20, entitled "The Man Behind the Voice of St. Louis" be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE MAN BEHIND THE VOICE OF ST. LOUIS

(By Ted Schafers, Globe-Democrat public affairs editor)

Seven years ago many people in the broadcasting business thought that Robert Hyland, general manager of radio station KMOX and vice president of CBS radio, had a short-circuit in his airwaves.

This was when Mr. Hyland announced that all weekday afternoon musical record programs on KMOX were being dropped for a new format of "information" shows with audience participation.

Scoffers labeled the move as a temporary publicity gimmick by KMOX designed to stand out from the bedlam of rock 'n' roll disc jockeys, radio contests, and teen platter parties, then saturating the air waves.

Bob Hyland knew that his novel experiment involved risks. But it had been well planned and supported by several years of intensive research of what his audiences indicated they wanted. He knew that success would put KMOX ahead of the crowd, not only locally but nationally.

The new type of show succeeded beyond his fondest dreams. Not only has KMOX become the most successful radio station in the CBS network but audience ratings repeatedly have given it the highest of any radio station in the Nation.

Mr. Hyland shows up at his desk every morning 7 days a week at 6 a.m. He has neither eaten breakfast at his home nor taken a single vacation since taking charge of KMOX 11 years ago.

That kind of pace would seem to tire any man but it apparently doesn't tire Mr. Hyland.

If you want to talk about the radio business or KMOX's participation in world and community affairs through "At Your Service" programing, you will find this attractive, personable, dynamic man ready to do so at any time.

But getting Bob Hyland to talk about his role in making himself a local and national personality is another story.

So we went to St. Louis business, political, labor, and community leaders for the story. Here is what they had to say:

James P. Hickok, board chairman of the First National Bank in St. Louis and head of the Civic Center Redevelopment Corp., whose own civic accomplishments won him the 1965 Globe-Democrat Man of the Year Award, said:

"Bob Hyland not only gives greatly of himself to every worthwhile project, but throws the resources of his station behind them. He is a great human being, never pushes but persuades. One of my greatest fears is that someday St. Louis will lose him to some national post."

PAEANS FROM LEADERS

"A community to be great must have assets and resources of many kinds. I happen to believe that Bob Hyland is one of the great human assets of St. Louis," says August A. Busch, Jr., president and board chairman of Anheuser-Busch, Inc., and the St. Louis Cardinal baseball team.

"It's no accident that Bob Hyland is asked to become involved in almost every project of major importance to the St. Louis community. It's no accident that he is held in such high esteem by so many different segments and groups in this community.

"He is always outspoken and forthright, a quality which in many persons, is a sure-fire formula for making enemies. In the case of Bob Hyland, however, there usually is only respect for his integrity and his point of view."

David R. Calhoun, president of St. Louis Union Trust Co., and another of the city's top civic leaders, is equally effusive when he speaks of Mr. Hyland.

"Bob Hyland's contributions to the civic life of St. Louis," Mr. Calhoun says, "have been tremendous. Far too little of his work is publicly known because he shuns personal limelight."

Very Rev. Paul C. Reinert, S.J., president of St. Louis University, is another admirer of Mr. Hyland. "I have been very favorably impressed with the efforts initiated by Bob Hyland in trying to make St. Louis a real community by providing open forums of various kinds in which opinions can be presented and all possible answers evaluated," says Father Reinert. "The 'At Your Service' programing he initiated has been a tremendous contribution in this area."

William (Bill) Bidwell, vice president of the St. Louis football Cardinals, feels much the same way. "Bob," says the football executive, "is one of St. Louis' most outstanding men, a great spokesman for our city. He works constantly to promote the community's interest and radiates confidence in its future."

Former Mayor Raymond R. Tucker thinks Mr. Hyland has contributed greatly to the spiritual, cultural, and commercial development of St. Louis. "I've had the privilege of knowing Bob for years," says Mr. Tucker. "St. Louis is fortunate in having him as a citizen."

A leading public relations counselor whose advice has been sought by many major St. Louis companies and organizations for many years, said recently:

"Hyland never fails to amaze me. He seems to be involved in almost everything. He never seems tired. He is available regardless of what hour you call. It has gotten so that nothing is started of a civic or charitable nature here anymore without someone in the meeting saying: 'We better ask Bob Hyland about this before we go ahead.' "

A DEVOTED CIVIC LEADER

Two leading labor leaders also were quick to praise Mr. Hyland.

Harold J. Gibbons, president of the Teamsters Joint Council, which represents 40,000 members, had this to say:

"He (Hyland) has always used his persuasive personality and radio facilities to bring about a better understanding of the important issues facing people today."

Joseph Clark, president of the St. Louis Labor Council agreed, was just as complimentary:

"Bob Hyland has always been a perfect gentleman," he said. "Bob has a passionate interest in seeing that all issues are fairly presented and his amazing energies certainly help St. Louis."

Mayor Alfonso J. Cervantes confessed it was difficult to describe adequately a man of so many capabilities as Bob Hyland.

"He is a dynamic doer whose contributions to his city, his station and his industry are too numerous to mention," was what the mayor said.

"At Your Service" programing is one of the major keys to Bob Hyland's success at KMOX. In the pargon of radio it is called "talk" format. It is used to air the problems of the day in political, civic or economic fields and on every conceivable topic affecting the daily lives of listeners.

But those who have watched and marveled at the amazing success of this formula know that this just didn't happen without a great deal of planning.

Promptly at 7 o'clock each morning Bob Hyland summons his staff to review the program strategy of the day.

"We work something like an electronic newspaper—city desk style, reviewing National, State and local figures in the news and digging up fresh surprises for our listeners," said Mr. Hyland.

"Keeping your audience interested, your program fresh and retaining a high degree of believability in everything you broadcast requires constant attention—like a day-old baby."

Since its initiation in 1960, KMOX's "At Your Service" programing has been extended until now it comprises 54 hours per week, broadcasting from 7 to 9 a.m. and from noon to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday; 9 a.m. to noon on Saturday and 8 a.m. to noon on Sundays.

TWENTY THOUSAND PHONE CALLS

Success brings imitators. All six other CBS-owned radio stations now follow Mr.

Hyland's format. So do nearly 1,000 other radio stations in the United States, Canada, Mexico, Europe, Japan, and Australia.

Some have gone heavily into panel discussions while others telephone people in their homes and discuss problems of the day. But none exercises the high degree of control insisted upon by Mr. Hyland and that is regarded the key to its amazing success here.

"Ask your doctor, lawyer, priest, minister, rabbi, mayor, Governor, police chief, reporter, get snickers from some rivals but the audience ratings prove their popularity. Special guests range from public officials or individuals involved in highly controversial subjects to timely topics on everyday problems.

When two Fontbonne College nuns, Sisters Ernest Marie and Thomas Marguerite, went to Selma, Ala., early last year to lead a civil rights march, they accepted Mr. Hyland's offer to explain their mission and answer questions on KMOX. A record 20,000 phone calls swamped all lines during the 5 hours they submitted to listener questioning.

Fifteen special lines have been installed to handle the telephone inquiries. Serving as moderators are KMOX staffers Rex Davis, Bob Hardy, Jack Buck, Jim Butler, and Roy McCarthy, whose voices in special news programs and sports broadcasts have been favorites for years.

Mr. Hyland acknowledges the danger of some telephone caller sneaking in a vulgar or libelous statement, but points out this is controlled by a 4-second delay in the time the statement is made and it is broadcast over the airwaves.

Asked if he does not worry that listeners may not tire of "talk" programing, he replied:

"Not if properly presented, and balanced with other offerings, such as the best in sports, hard news presentations, periods of music, and the best of religious subjects.

"The important thing is never to underestimate your audience or its desire to know. This thirst for knowledge, information, personal growth, and civic activity has never been greater. We program with a purpose of educating, informing, and serving as a clearinghouse for ideas. To become a voice of, by, and for the community in whatever type of programing we offer," he said.

FRIEND OF BASEBALL PLAYERS

Mr. Hyland's community activities read like a directory of every worthwhile organization in St. Louis. The writer stopped counting after passing more than 80 in which he is either an officer, board member, or holder of some important job by reason of past service.

He is president of the Knights of the Cauliflower Ear, president of the newly organized Stadium Club, second vice president of the Municipal Theater Association; cochairman of the Repertory Committee and the Bicentennial Committee, a member of the board of the Jefferson National Expansion Association, Cardinal Glennon Hospital, St. Louis Symphony Society, and past president of the Advertising Club of St. Louis.

Bob Hyland is a personal friend of hundreds of major league baseball players. His father, Dr. Robert F. Hyland, Sr., for many years was team physician for the Cardinals and his son began hanging around the dugouts since he was in knee pants.

When Bob Hyland decided he wasn't cut out to be a professional baseball player he made up his mind to become a doctor like his dad, "but I didn't have the right equipment," he said. The kind of "equipment" he did possess led him into radio.

Radio always fascinated him. While attending St. Louis University he got started in programing on station WEW, while still finding time to be sports editor of the college newspaper, cocaptain of the baseball team and president of his junior and senior class.

After graduation he went to station WTAD at Quincy, Ill., where he worked for $25 a week.

There he did everything "but sweep the floors." He returned to St. Louis to work for WEW after he found out that the girl he decided to marry had too many other suitors.

"It was tough enough living on $25 a week without driving home each weekend to restake my claim," he recalls with a smile.

With the outbreak of World War II, Bob Hyland was commissioned an ensign in the Navy and returned to St. Louis after the war to work at KXOK for a time. Then he left a good job to join WBBM in Chicago, "because I had always wanted to become associated with CBS."

He made such an excellent record there that he was sent to St. Louis in 1952 as assistant sales manager of KMOX. Later he was promoted to the two top jobs he holds today.

How Mr. Hyland accepted his challenges is illustrated in the number of "firsts" he has helped his station achieve.

KMOX was the first St. Louis radio station and first CBS-owned facility to editorialize. This was in 1958.

He masterminded KMOX's successful campaign to be the first radio station to gain access to the Missouri Legislature where an entire session was broadcast. KMOX followed this with another "first." It pioneered live broadcast of the board of aldermen meeting in St. Louis.

Tall and handsome, Mr. Hyland carries his 180 pounds well on a 6-foot-2-inch frame. He lives with his wife, the former Patricia Ann Soule, their 2½-year-old son, Matthew, and infant daughter, Molly. His two older children, sons of the late Martha Ann Claiborne Hyland, are Robert Hyland III, a recent graduate of the University of Missouri, and Claiborne Hyland, a student at Lake Forest College near Chicago.

A LIGHT SLEEPER?

Bob Hyland's 12- to 16-hour schedules permit little time for relaxation. His only hobbies are walking and collecting Steuben glass animals.

Members of his staff of about 50 permanent employees use such terms as "driver," "firm," and "demanding" when speaking of the boss. But all of them say he is fair at all times and extremely concerned about their welfare.

News Director Rex Davis and Farm News Director Ted Magner have completed more than 20 years at KMOX, "of which they have been closely associated with Mr. Hyland. Jack Buck, Harry Caray, Globe-Democrat Executive Sports Editor Bob Burnes, and Harry Fender have been familiar personalities for more than 10 years, as has John McCormack who takes over after midnight when Mr. Hyland is supposed to be asleep.

However, Mr. Hyland startled his engineers not long ago by commenting on a "30-second miss at 3 a.m."

Some of his staff claim he can rattle off "1,000 telephone numbers without looking at a phone book."

KMOX, under Mr. Hyland, has won so many awards that the walls of his outer office has run out of space to display them.

One he especially prizes is the University of Missouri Honor Award for distinguished services to journalism. When KMOX received this award in 1963 it was the first time a radio station had received it in 54 years.

Some claim that Mr. Hyland's revolutionary and successful programing was born of a desperation to keep alive a media threatened by television. It is no secret that television is a word rarely mentioned on KMOX.

But people who know Bob Hyland well say he has a deeper purpose than material success for his radio station.

It is reflected, they say, in his continuing drive to raise the information levels of his radio audiences.

"If our city, State, and Nation are to prosper," says Mr. Hyland, "in fact if mankind is to survive, that survival may well depend more on communicators, than on engineers, physicists and technicians in laboratories."

Bob Hyland works hard to fulfill radio's role in this crusade and has found out it has made him the radio "voice of St. Louis."

NEW POLICE COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK CENTERED IN PHOENIX, ARIZ.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, a dramatic new weapon against crime has been added to the resources of local law-enforcement personnel throughout the Nation.

A new fully automatic teletypewriter network known as LETS—for Law Enforcement Teletypewriter Service—will soon link local and State police authorities much closer together in time. Messages that once required hours will shortly take only minutes.

I am proud that the headquarters for this new communications service is located in Phoenix, Ariz., and further, that among the dedicated law-enforcement officers who helped develop this new high-speed network is G. O. Hathaway, for many years the superintendent of the Arizona Highway Patrol.

The service is described in detail in an article published in the March 1966 issue of the Police Chief, official magazine of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. I want to commend the IACP, the Bell System, and all those who helped put this new system together, and in order that LETS may receive the wider publicity which it merits, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

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

NEW POLICE TELETYPEWRITER NETWORK

Law-enforcement communications is taking another dramatic step forward this year when a new, fully automatic teletypewriter network is placed in operation to permit closer coordination between law enforcement agencies across the country.

The new teletypewriter network will link police authorities throughout the United States by a unified communications system that will enable message time between participating agencies to be reduced from days and hours to just minutes.

Known as Law Enforcement Teletypewriter Service (LETS), the network was developed by Bell System in cooperation with local and State police authorities to provide better communications between law enforcement agencies. The IACP Communications Committee also contributed to its development.

The increasing mobility of today's law breakers, coupled with the Nation's growing crime rate, created a greater awareness for the need of fast, efficient communications between State and municipal law enforcement agencies, reports Bell System. Participation in this new network will enable police officials to operate more effectively by having an extensive, direct communications service at their disposal.

The type of information to be transmitted via LETS includes bulletins on stolen property or missing persons, description of criminals and information on crimes, such as burglary or robbery, etc., automobile registration and drivers' license checks, details on hit and run and other automobile accidents, as well as administrative messages.

Headquarters for the network will be located in Phoenix, Ariz. This control center will be designed to automatically route messages and maintain a speedy, efficient flow of LETS traffic. It will include switching equipment capable of sending a single message simultaneously to multiple addressees, holding a message until a busy line becomes available for traffic and giving transmission precedence to priority messages.

Another feature of the LETS network will be the fully automatic police teletypewriter which will enable all stations to communicate with a minimum of human effort. This eliminates the need for an attendant at either transmitting or receiving locations to stand by for message pickup and delivery, enabling more efficient use of personnel.

The LETS network also will provide instant all-station broadcast of urgent messages, secrecy in transmission, 24-hour operation, and reduction in the chance for human error. In addition, it will provide selective station calling to enable law enforcement agencies to pinpoint receiving stations.

According to the Bell System recognizing the need for fast, efficient, written communications among law enforcement agencies in the United States led to the first LETS systems. By the mid-1950's a number of intrastate systems were in use. These developed into interstate arrangements which aided law officers in keeping ahead of criminals using fast transportation to outdistance communications. With circulars concerning stolen cars and other criminal activities still requiring 2 or 3 days for distribution to nearby States, the next logical step was expansion of LETS to regional networks.

The new LETS network will join these regional communications systems to provide police with a completely automatic nationwide law enforcement network.

PROPOSED SALE OF STEEL COMPLEX TO RED CHINA

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I was extremely dismayed to learn that the West German Government has approved the plans of a French-German group to sell a $140 million steel complex to Red China.

It is also my understanding that the French Government is expected to approve these plans by the end of the week.

It is common knowledge that Communist China is supplying tons of equipment to its North Vietnamese allies—equipment which is being used against our own American soldiers. Construction of such a large steel complex in Red China will directly enhance Peiping's ability to threaten its neighbors in southeast Asia and to supply weapons to its henchmen in North Vietnam.

This steel mill will not materially contribute to better relations between China and the free world and could be detrimental to the chances for peace in southeast Asia.

Mr. President, I strongly suggest that West Germany and France use their productive capacity to supply equipment to the forces of freedom in Vietnam, and not to the enemy. It is high time that nations like West Germany and France realize that their peace and security—as well as ours—are at stake in southeast Asia.

My good friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], has just returned from a special mission to West Germany and finds approval of this steel complex an incredible development.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator MUSKIE's comments on this proposal be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE ON THE APPROVAL BY WEST GERMANY OF A GERMAN-FRENCH CONSORTIUM TO BUILD A STEEL COMPLEX FOR COMMUNIST CHINA, MARCH 18, 1966

Last week I returned from a presidential factfinding mission in West Germany. In Germany, I met with several high-ranking government leaders, including Chancellor Erhard. They expressed strong support for American policy in Vietnam.

For this reason, I find the approval by the West German Government of the decision by a German-French consortium to build a $140-million steel complex for the Chinese Communist Government, an incredible development.

Such a plant is clearly related to the war-making capacity of the Chinese Government, to its ability to produce armaments and to its capacity to supply the North Vietnamese Government with arms.

The construction of the steel mill cannot contribute to the interests of the free world in reaching an honorable and peaceful solution to the Vietnam crisis.

I recognize that the French Government has no interest in coordinating their actions with us, but the consortium agreement is not consistent with the expressions of sympathy and support for U.S. policies in Vietnam and southeast Asia which I received from German officials and citizens during my recent trip to that country.

The timing of the West German Government's decision to approve the steel deal could not be worse. It suggests that short-term economic gains are more important to the West German Government than support of our policies in Vietnam.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, West Germany's decision to allow construction of a steel complex in Red China is particularly interesting in light of other West German sales of arms and strategic commodities. Recently I became aware of a proposal by West Germany to sell Hispano-Suiza 20-millimeter automatic weapons to the U.S. Department of Defense for use by our Army. American producers, such as the Springfield Armory in Springfield, Mass., can produce competitive weapons.

If the West Germans want to get into the business of exporting strategic commodities, Mr. President, then I think that they should take a good hard look at who their customers are. No nation which is arming our declared enemies should expect this Nation to be a willing customer.

I am today drafting letters to President Lyndon B. Johnson and Secretary of State Dean Rusk urging them to exert our influence with the West German Government and any influence we still have with the French Government to bring about a reversal of this deplorable act. I will urge the President and the Secretary of State to take stern measures against these Governments if they decide to go ahead with their plans to allow construction of this steel complex.

A LESSON DRAWN FROM MEXICAN-AMERICAN RELATIONS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post is an article by Walter Lippmann on Mexico, which exhibits the wisdom, thoughtfulness, and comprehension that are characteristic of that distinguished columnist.

Mr. Lippmann reviews the history of Mexican-American relations and points out that after the Mexican revolution, while the Wilson administration had intervened during its violent phase on two occasions—in the bombardment and seizure of Vera Cruz in 1914 and in the pursuit of Pancho Villa in 1916—subsequent administrations showed restraint in the face of great pressure from various vested U.S. interests to intervene and impose our will by force of arms upon the Mexican people, and did not yield to that pressure.

Walter Lippmann quite properly pays tribute to Ambassador Dwight Morrow, who reversed the policy previously followed, first by Woodrow Wilson's interventions; second, through the nonrecognition of the Obregon government by the Harding administration; and, third, by sending—after recognition—a totally uncomprehending Ambassador who was completely out of sympathy with the Mexican revolution.

Dwight Morrow, who followed this period of interference in Mexico's affairs, being a member of a Wall Street firm, had credentials in the eyes of American business which could not be challenged, and managed, through sympathy and understanding of Mexico's problems, to change U.S. policy. But an even greater service was rendered subsequently by another American Ambassador, Josephus Daniels, in a more difficult period. This was after President Lazaro Cardenas had expropriated the holdings of American oil companies, which thereupon carried on an active campaign for military intervention. It probably would have succeeded but for Josephus Daniels and his close personal relationship with President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The claims of the oil companies were highly extravagant and inflated, but they were repaid for their actual investment and Mexico established a sound policy of control of its own natural resources by legitimate means.

The result of the Mexican revolution is visible today in Mexico's stability, and in its progress toward realization of the purposes of its political and social revolution, begun in 1911.

The Mexican revolution continues as evolution and is still far from its hoped for goals, but the relations between our two countries are better than they ever have been, and are a contributing factor to the fulfillment of Mexico's aspirations.

What is clearly implicit in Walter Lippmann's fine article is that we ought

to display a wisdom similar to that of the Roosevelt administration in place of our contemporary military ventures.

I ask unanimous consent that the article "Mexico Revisited" be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

MEXICO REVISITED

(By Walter Lippmann)

During the past fortnight I have been in Mexico, which I last saw nearly 40 years ago. At that time the Mexican revolution had been underway for some 15 years. The United States had invaded Mexico twice, once by sea at Vera Cruz to avenge an insult to the flag and once by land in a punitive expedition commanded by General Pershing. He was in pursuit of the guerrilla fighter Pancho Villa, who was indistinguishable from a bandit, had raided Columbus, N. Mex., and had killed a score of Americans.

In the twenties there was a mounting agitation in this country to occupy Mexico and suppress the revolution. It was a bloody revolution, replete with atrocities, ambushes, guerrilla raids, kidnapings, executions, looting, burning, the rape of nuns and the sacrilegious destruction of churches. The revolution was a class war against the landlords, Mexican and foreign, and there was expropriation of foreign enterprise and of oil and mineral concessions. Moreover, during the First World War, the Mexican revolution sided with Germany, and was accused of conspiring with the Kaiser's government to regain the American Southwest in the event of a German victory.

The provocation to the United States to intervene was very great, and very powerful business interests and church interests were demanding intervention. Yet, except for the two short-lived episodes at Vera Cruz and under General Pershing, the U.S. Government held its hand and did not involve itself in the task of occupying and governing Mexico, an operation which at the time was said to call for half a million men. In 1916 intervention was made impossible by our involvement in the European war. But by the middle twenties, our hands were free and large masses of trained veterans were available.

The President at this critical time was Calvin Coolidge, a man who had no pretensions to greatness but who had the great virtue of humility—and was lucky. He was particularly lucky in having as his closest adviser Dwight Morrow, an old friend from Amherst College, a lawyer, a profound student of English political history, and a partner in the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co. Dwight Morrow persuaded Coolidge that the right course was to avoid intervention and to negotiate a settlement with the Mexican revolution. The President sent Morrow to Mexico City as his Ambassador.

Shortly after that, Morrow invited me to visit him in Mexico City, and for a while I watched him negotiating the oil and mineral and land problems with the revolutionary President, Gen. Plutarco Calles, and on the side—with an assist from the Vatican—mediating the conflict between the revolution and the Catholic Church. To make a gesture of good will to the Mexican Government, Morrow persuaded Lindbergh—for whom at the time he was acting as a financial adviser—to fly his plane to Mexico City. He did not anticipate that after the visit Lindbergh would marry his daughter.

Revisiting Mexico last week, I could not help seeing it as a monument to the wisdom and restraint of a great power which resisted all manner of provocation and temptation. The settlement which Coolidge and Morrow made with the Mexican Revolution has paid handsome dividends, and the country which was racked with violence and disorder is today a remarkable example of stability and enterprise which are generating Mexico's own economic development.

The party which governs Mexico today descends directly from the revolutionary leaders, from Madero, Carranza, Obregon, and Calles, and, so far as one can see there is now internal peace. The Mexican peso has been stable for 12 years, and it is now, or is very close to being, one of the hard currencies of the non-Communist world. While Mexico still has a long way to go before it conquers the universally difficult problem of rural poverty, its industrial development is spectacular.

The biggest dividend of all is that we have for a neighbor a strong country which is at once independent and yet our friend. This may come to have great significance in middle America—in the Caribbean region from the Texas border to Panama. For the existence of a Latin country of the stature and caliber of Mexico opens up the prospect of a regional understanding and organization in what—as would be apparent if there were a military intrusion by a non-American power—is in the last analysis a sphere of vital U.S. interest.

Some Mexicans think that the time may not be too far off when all this will begin to show in the relations between Cuba and the rest of middle America. Mexico, as we know, has never broken relations with Cuba, and there is an operating airline between Mexico City and Havana. The Mexican regulate the traffic strictly but it is kept open for official intercourse. The Mexicans say that they are maintaining a "bridge," and they say further that there are accumulating signs that Castro, whose regime is working so badly, is beginning to act like a desperate man.

If only, say the Mexicans, he were deprived of the support which comes from being surrounded by enemies, if only he had to face his own people directly, we would probably find that the Cubans are tiring of him. So, the Mexicans say, we are keeping open the bridge, and we hope you understand why.

THE RACE BETWEEN FOOD AND POPULATION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on March 7, Secretary of State Dean Rusk submitted a statement to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry emphasizing the serious problem which the underdeveloped nations of the world face in dealing with their food and population crisis. In clear and unequivocal language, Secretary Rusk pointed out:

> We cannot realistically face the food crisis without simultaneously looking at the population problem. In country after country, impressive increases in food production have been offset by population growth.

Mr. President, this statement is a welcome affirmation from the highest official in our Government concerned with foreign policy that rapid population growth is jeopardizing both economic development and international security in many areas of the world. As Secretary Rusk stated:

> The race between food and population is a critical one.

Although the subject may not make a headline every day in the press, our handling of it will, as the Secretary emphasized, "have a significant impact upon our own and future generations."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include following my remarks in the RECORD, the text of the statement by the Secretary of State before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on Monday, March 7, 1966.

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

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK, SECRETARY OF STATE, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, MARCH 7, 1966

I appreciate this opportunity to discuss with you this morning the problem of food and population—a problem which has been receiving high priority from all of us in the executive branch who are concerned with matters of international well being. It is a subject which doesn't make the headlines that Vietnam does day after day. Nevertheless, it is of very great importance. Our handling of it will have a significant impact upon our own and future generations.

The root of the problem is clear enough: In many parts of the world, food production is beginning to lag behind population growth. As Secretary Freeman has said, "The less developed world is losing the capacity to feed itself."

The problem of growing enough food to meet the need is not new. What is new is the dimension the problem has assumed as we look at the next decade. With the continuing and sudden sharp rise of population throughout much of the world, this food crisis demands urgent attention. Fortunately, there is a growing world recognition of this problem, which may in itself be the first step toward its elimination. It has prompted activity within the highest councils of this Government—reflected by the President's recent message to the Congress on food for freedom, as well as related legislation which has been referred to this committee.

Before World War II, the developing nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America were exporting sizable quantities of grain to the more economically advanced nations. In the 1930's, for example, Latin America exported more grain than any other region of the world. Today, for the most part, the laden grain ships are sailing in the opposite direction—and nearly three times as many are required to do the job. As an illustration, more than 30 million tons of grain probably will be shipped this year from the industrialized to the nonindustrialized countries. This amount is more than double the magnitude of annual shipments of the 1950's, and an increase of more than 50 percent just in the past 5 years. And even with these enormous imports—much of them in the form of food aid—and with some developing countries already straining their port capacity, there are many countries in which the food intake per individual was less this year than last year, less last year than the year before. Unless this disturbing trend can be reversed, it will soon have profoundly deteriorating effects. There is a very real relationship between hunger and political instability. There is also a very real relationship between the ability to meet elementary human needs and economic and social development. In coming years, the problem we discuss today, unless curbed, could become a serious obstacle to important foreign policy goals of the United States.

What can be done? Throughout history, t' e hungry man often solved his problem—when it was solved—in one of two ways. He either cultivated new lands or migrated to a region of the world with greater opportunities. The latter alternative no longer exists today as it did in the past. Although less than a tenth of the earth's land surface currently produces crops, the new supply of potentially productive land is severely limited. The only other alternative was

starvation, an alternative which is unacceptable in today's world.

In what other direction can we turn? First, we cannot realistically face the food crisis without simultaneously looking at the population problem. In country after country, impressive increases in food production have been offset by population growth. However, a number of countries have come to recognize that the food problem cannot be solved without addressing themselves to both sides of the food/population equation. The race between food and population is a critical one.

Nevertheless, even with the most optimistic of achievements in family planning, we realistically face the fact that such measures cannot prevent the serious threat of hunger in the next decade.

With limited land availability, our best hope is to obtain more food from lands already under cultivation, and from the sea. We have known for a number of years that better seeds, fertilizers, flood control, irrigation, pesticides and other miracles of technology can multiply food production many times. However, the benefits of such techniques have largely been confined to the already-rich nations. In the United States and Canada, for example, yield per acre in the last quarter century has been increased over 100 percent—compared with only 8 percent in the less developed world. Secretary Freeman often describes his grandfather's farm which operated in the days when the American farmer could feed himself and three others. In contrast, the American farmer today feeds himself and 32 others. The prime reason is modern technology which enables the American farmer to grow six times as much corn on an acre of land as does a farmer in India.

How do you best encourage such an increase? How do you best transfer a technology which we know exists and can work? How do you encourage the needy countries to face up to this problem and solve it with their own resources? How can we make the most effective and, at the same time, the most economical contribution to such an effort?

These are the questions to which the administration has addressed itself. No one has been more aware of the gravity of the situation than the President, and his deep, personal concern is reflected in the legislation which is now before your committee.

Last year, President Johnson requested a thorough analysis of the situation, and the bill we are discussing today is the culmination of more than a year's intensive study by the executive branch. It adds a new dimension to an effort which has been evolving over the past two decades.

The bill gives recognition to the importance of food as an integral factor in a country's life and growth.

The bill recognizes the gravity of the food problem, certainly the most critical many countries will be facing over the next decade.

The bill correctly suggests that the only solution to the food problem will be through the increased agricultural production of the developing countries themselves, and that we should make efforts to assist that process.

The bill proposes that our own agricultural effort be directed not only to domestic needs, but also to our participation in overseas requirements through both commercial and assistance channels.

Mr. Chairman, there are four aspects of this legislation to which I would like to direct your special attention.

First, is the emphasis placed on self-help. There is little question that the final resolution of the world food problem must come from the developing nations themselves. Yet, in many ways, agriculture has been the weakest rung in the ladder to development. In many countries it has been short changed, time and again, in favor of more glamorous industrial projects. Today, a new philosophy is emerging. Now there is a growing recognition that a strong agricultural base is a prerequisite to development. The concept of self-help is inherent in this legislation, and any food assistance on our part will be directly related to the extent of these efforts. We will carefully assess the self-help efforts by the recipient countries to assure that they are doing everything possible to increase their own productive capacity.

The second point I would like to call to your attention is the transition from sales for local currencies to sales on dollar credit terms. Some criticism has been leveled over the years—perhaps some of it justified—that certain recipients of our food aid had assumed that our food assistance would continue indefinitely, and thus encouraging them to neglect their own agriculture for other priorities. Some may have felt they were doing us a favor by taking our so-called surplus problem off our hands. With this new provision, and the fact of our disappearing surpluses, food will be provided on the same terms as development loans—and will highlight the fact that food aid has the same value as aid in other forms.

Third, I would like to point out the emphasis of this legislation on combating malnutrition. This is a new dimension to the food problem, which was barely recognized in the early days of Public Law 480. Scientific findings of the past few years emphasize the fact that the kind of food we eat is often more important than how much we eat. We now realize that protein malnutrition, especially among young children, can result in both physical and mental retardation. Indeed, as the President has said on a number of occasions, the problem of malnutrition could well become one of the basic obstacles to the entire development process. At a conference of the National Academy of Sciences, it was pointed out that our approach to this aspect of the food problem could have a direct effect "on what our civilization looks like, acts like, and thinks like in 1984."

Fourth, and perhaps the most dramatic element in this new program, is the concept of growing to meet the need. This is a positive and logical extension of previous food aid efforts. It provides a link between domestic farm programs and overseas commercial and assistance requirements which cannot help but make a more effective use of our magnificent agricultural capacity.

I do not pretend to possess expertise in a field which you gentlemen have studied for many years. However, in addition to the foreign policy implications which I know are very serious, the domestic economic benefits of the Food for Freedom Act are readily apparent to me. Time and again, we see evidence that the developing nations are important potential customers. As their economies grow, their dollar purchases increase. What we're really suggesting, aside from the obvious humanitarian and foreign policy features of the legislation presented here, is that we are helping to build bigger dollar markets more quickly. Food is a stimulus which can help, and has helped, to expedite the arduous development process.

I would like to stress, Mr. Chairman, that our food aid program has been a valuable foreign policy tool because it is directed toward positive changes—strengthening democratic governments, promoting political stability, encouraging economic stability, assisting national development. Our food has been and will continue to be used in the cause of peace. On certain occasions our donation programs, especially child-feeding programs, have continued in countries when all other forms of formal relationships were ruptured.

Our pattern of operation necessarily is different in different countries. The quid pro quo, for example, often is different as relationships with countries differ. But what I want to emphasize is that our food programs are important components of our overall bilateral relationships. In each case, as we negotiate agreements, we consider the U.S. national interest, just as the other country considers its national interest.

The legislation before you is based on two American traits—a compassion for fellow human beings in need, and a technical skill and productivity in agriculture which must surely be considered as one of the great success stories of modern history. These two threads of American greatness were woven together by this committee during the 83d Congress more than 10 years ago, with the enactment of Public Law 480. As you well know, the evolution of the bipartisan food-for-peace program over the years has made it one of the most successful and imaginative of our overseas assistance programs.

The achievements of food for peace have been many, and we have learned much during the decade of Public Law 480. The new legislation takes advantage of this experience. It is adapted to the needs and conditions of today.

President Johnson has proposed that "* * * the United States lead the world in a war against hunger." I view the legislation being studied by your committee as supporting this goal.

As I said at the outset, we are dealing with a problem of immense proportions. From my desk at the State Department, where rarely a day passes in which I am not involved in some food-related issue, it looms as one of the major problems our Nation will be facing during the coming decades. A major attack on the problem today can prevent serious political, economic and social turmoil in many countries within a very few years.

I recommend to you the attack on hunger as proposed in the Food for Freedom Act and its companion legislation as being in the best interests of the foreign policy of the United States.

HOUSTON ORGANIZATIONS HONOR CONGRESSMAN ALBERT THOMAS THROUGH RESOLUTIONS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the recent death of Congressman Albert Thomas was a great loss to us here in Washington, but even more so to the area which he represented. The feeling for Albert Thomas that was held by the people of Houston is as close as any constituency can have for their Congressman.

To illustrate their respect, admiration, and devotion to this great man, I ask unanimous consent that resolutions passed by the Houston Democratic Women's Club and the Houston Area Federal Business Association be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with the names affixed thereto.

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

RESOLUTION OF HOUSTON DEMOCRATIC WOMEN'S CLUB

Whereas Hon. Albert Thomas, since first entering the House of Representatives in 1937 from the Eighth Congressional District of Texas, has given leadership which has brought distinction to him and to the Democratic Party, which he has faithfully represented, and benefit and recognition to his constituency; and

Whereas he has been among the men, few in number, but irresistible in purpose, upon whom have rested the responsibility and burden of guiding our Nation in times of peace

and war, from the past into the limitless expanse of space, and has been one of the most prominent individual members of the U.S. Congress to support and guide the Nation's vast and growing space program; and

Whereas however hard-pressed by official duties, Albert Thomas has always found the time and the energy to be of help to any individual citizen who has come to him with a problem of any kind, and has given unstintingly of his time and his position always to be available to any constituent who has sought his counsel, and has truly proved himself a friend to every citizen; and

Whereas Albert Thomas, throughout his tenure covering 15 terms in the House of Representatives, has been an outstanding member of the Democratic Party, has given that party wise leadership and faithful support at all times, and has worked in and through the party to accomplish progress for the entire Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Houston Democratic Women's Club do express its admiration and respect for Albert Thomas, and state for all posterity its acknowledgment of the debt every American owes this man on behalf of public service and the general public good, that future generations may study and emulate the life and record of this great American patriot.

Passed March 17, 1966.

Mrs. IRL F. KENNERLY,
President.
Mrs. A. RALPH ZOBEL,
First Vice President.
Mrs. C. A. NEAL PICKETT,
Second Vice President.
Mrs. IRA D. SYKES,
Founder.
Mrs. C. P. WOOD,
Miss ADELE MANSELL
Miss BIRNICE MANSELL,
Resolutions Committee.

Attest:

Mrs. C. E. OLSEN,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION BY HOUSTON AREA FEDERAL BUSINESS ASSOCIATION

Whereas the long continuity of leadership in both Houses of the U.S. Congress exercised by statesmen to whom the highest honor is the performance of service for the public welfare, has given our Nation the strength and the vision to surmount the dangers and obstacles in both internal and international affairs that have caused other democracies to falter and fail; and

Whereas the American people have been particularly fortunate in having in the national legislative branch men who through the years have given wisdom to policy and vision to action and guided the ship of state through dangerous waters to a successful completion of each voyage; and

Whereas among the beloved Representatives in Washington who have rendered long and effective service to the American people, none is more outstanding or distinguished, and none will be more sorely missed, than Albert Thomas, of the Eighth District of Texas, he who has given such faithful attention to his duty and who, despite the heavy burden of leadership he has always carried, has labored vigorously and faithfully on behalf of the men and women engaged in various aspects of the Federal service throughout the land; and

Whereas since first going to Congress in 1937, Albert Thomas has been an outstanding figure among American statesmen, and his compassion for humanity, his strength of character, and his devotion to the best interests of the American people, have bequeathed his countrymen a legacy of service that will set an inspiring standard of leadership through the years ahead; and

Whereas no Member of the House of Representatives has striven more diligently on behalf of Federal officials and employees than Congressman Thomas, and none has accomplished more for their benefit and security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Houston Area Federal Business Association do express its admiration for Albert Thomas and his incomparable record in the public service, and do extend to his loved ones its deepest sympathy, sustained in the knowledge that his broad and helpful influence will always be felt in American statecraft and national leadership.

In witness whereof, we have caused our names hereunto to be affixed, this 16th day of February, A.D., 1966:

NEAL PICKETT, *President.*
CLAUDE M. MCLARTY,
First Vice President.
JOHN W. CLAIRBORNE, Jr., M.D.,
Second Vice President.
WESLEY L. HJORNEVIK,
Third Vice President.
SAM D. W. LOW,
Executive Committee.
Mrs. VIRGINIA M. SLATE,
Secretary-Treasurer.

JUDGE MORRIS OF DELAWARE DIES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, a distinguished Delawarean, former U.S. District Court Judge Hugh Martin Morris, has died at the age of 87. Funeral services are being held today in Wilmington, Del.

Judge Morris' long career spanned notable achievements as a Federal judge, a corporation lawyer, and president of the University of Delaware's board of trustees.

Despite failing health in recent years, he never retired from the practice of law and continued to report for duty whenever he felt able at Morris, Nichols, Arsht & Tunnell in the Du Pont Building.

The Wilmington Evening Journal of March 21, 1966, carries an editorial on Judge Morris which notes that he "personified the best old-fashioned traditions of his native Sussex County."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JUDGE HUGH MARTIN MORRIS

Hugh Martin Morris has died at 87 after a long professional career as a respected lawyer who also rendered distinguished service as a Federal judge. Though he never went to law school or studied engineering, his decisions on patent law from the bench are regarded as classics in their field. He never held a teaching position on a college faculty—but he often showed signs of being a frustrated academician.

The truth is that Judge Morris was a complex man of greater civic stature and usefulness than even the most regular newspaper reader might have suspected. In many winning ways of friendly interest in people—including many much younger ones—he personified the best old-fashioned traditions of his native Sussex County.

Judge Morris liked to reminisce about his boyhood on the family place called "Morris' Pleasure" from colonial days. It was there, working in the fields, that he heard the whistle of the Delaware Road trains. To him it sounded like "Hugh-ee-eee. Hugh-ee-ee." echoing from one pine woods to another. He answered the call of the little city of Wilmington and broader horizons. But he could never get away from the land. For many later years his abode was that handsome old house and large farm of his on Polly Drummond Hill near Newark.

Born and bred as he was, Hugh Morris could never have avoided a strong interest in politics. In 1934 he could have had the nomination for U.S. Senator by acclamation in the Democratic convention. He recalled that while cheers resounded, he hid in a cloakroom with the wet umbrellas until it was safe to come out again.

Having turned down the chance of a senatorship in favor of the rewards of a flourishing practice, he still had to find some way to do a public service. Says John A. Perkins, of the University of Delaware: "In my own view the start of the change from a little college to a university can be dated from the time Hugh Morris and Rodney Sharp went on the board of trustees many years ago. As president of the board, Judge Morris just couldn't dream big enough to match his aspirations for this school. At budget time he always went down to the legislature with me. He could speak his mind in ways I couldn't. He simply called on the members to have the same kind of Delaware pride he had in the university."

There is much truth, accordingly, in what George Tyler Coulson, a long-time law partner, observes about Judge Morris: "One clear measure of his public service is the growth of the University of Delaware in size, influence, and program including graduate work and research."

A complex man was Hugh Morris, true enough. He was also one of his generation's best in Delaware or anywhere else.

THE CONFIRMATION OF THE NOMINATION OF R. D. PENNEWELL TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BOARD

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, yesterday's confirmation of the appointment of Mr. R. D. Pennewell to a 6-year term on the Federal Farm Credit Board places an eminently qualified individual with a wide background in agriculture on this important body.

In addition to assurances that he will exert all of the effort and spend all of the time necessary in behalf of the farm people, he has an outstanding record in the agricultural field. He has been associated with the agricultural industry his entire lifetime, and presently owns and operates the Flo-Ray Farms, a 700-acre dairy farm at Palmyra, Mo.

He is now serving his fourth 3-year term on the Farm Credit Board of the Sixth District, of which he is vice president. He has served as president of the Missouri Rural Electrical Cooperative since its beginning in 1936. This was the first electric cooperative to organize in the State of Missouri.

Mr. Pennewell has also been president of Northwest Missouri Electric Power Cooperative since 1948. This was the first power cooperative to operate in the State of Missouri and is comprised of eight member cooperatives—five in Missouri and three in the State of Iowa.

He has also been secretary-treasurer of the Associated Electric Cooperative in Springfield, Mo., since its beginning in 1961.

Mr. Pennewell is now serving as a director of the Sanitary Milk Producers of St. Louis, Mo., and was president for 12 years. He is also director of the St. Louis Dairy Council.

Other services to agriculture include chairmanship of the livestock disease

committee of the Department of Agriculture for the State of Missouri; service on the National Milk Producers Executive Committee, Washington, D.C., for 12 years; directorship of the Hannibal Production Credit Association for 25 years; and presently serving as finance chairman in the State of Missouri for the American Institute of Cooperation.

Mr. President, it is indeed a pleasure to see Mr. R. D. Pennewell confirmed as a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board.

IN PRAISE OF TEXAS WESTERN UNIVERSITY

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to point with pride to the achievements of a Texas basketball team over the weekend, that of Texas Western University of El Paso.

This team in the best tradition of Texas entered the NCAA basketball tournament and with great poise and performance emerged victorious in one battle after another. Over the weekend, as is now well known throughout the sports world, this team from the western part of Texas won the national championship in its first attempt at that great honor. I wish to lend my voice in praise of the exploits of this team and wish for the Senate to take note of this great day for Texas Western University.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Poise Lifts Texas Western From Ranks of Unknown," written by Steve Guback and published in the Evening Star of March 21, 1966, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

POISE LIFTS TEXAS WESTERN FROM RANKS OF UNKNOWN

(By Steve Guback)

Texas Western's basketball team switched from hot jazz in the afternoon to cool play at night and won the 1966 NCAA national championship.

"They have a lot of pride and not once this season—and not tonight—did we ever lose our poise," said Coach Don Haskins after his underrated Miners upset mighty Kentucky 72–65 in the NCAA's grand finale Saturday night at Cole Field House.

Kentucky's shooting was expected to be the difference—and it was, but in an unexpected way.

"Shooting has carried us all season, but that is exactly what hurt us tonight," said Coach Adolph Rupp of Kentucky, fingering a sheet of some slightly amazing statistics.

KENTUCKY SHOOTING OFF

Kentucky got off 70 shots to Texas Western's 49, but the usually sharp Wildcat sharpshooters were far off form. Jittery Kentucky hit a subpar 38.6 percent, far below its remarkable 49 percent season-long average. Time and again the Wildcats blew easy close-in shots.

Texas Western, meanwhile, played it cool.

In the afternoon, they moped around their College Park motel listening to some hot jazz.

"That was to ease our minds," said guard Orsten Artis.

Then at night, the Miners came out and played the game of their lives. They hit 45 percent of their shots from the floor and sank a phenomenal 28 of 34 free throws, far above their regular-season foul-shooting average.

"That might have been our best defensive game of the year," Haskins pointed out. "We realized we had to stop their breaking game. We told the team what they would have to do—play defense. We felt it would be our defense and not our offense which would win for us. It got us here.

NO. 3 GOOD SPOT

This was the third time in 7 years that the No. 3 ranked team nationally won the NCAA championship, when the Nos. 1 and 2 ranked teams were also in the final round of four.

Ohio State did it in 1960, when Cincinnati and defending champion California were ranked one-two. So did Loyola of Chicago in 1963, when Cincinnati and Duke were rated one-two in the final round of four.

For a title game, it really wasn't much of a thriller. There was some tenseness to be sure, but a couple of spectacular steals by 5-foot-10 Bobby Joe Hill, who zeroed in for easy layups, gave Texas Western an early 14–9 lead and the Miners never looked back. Kentucky, down by as many as eight points in the first half, closed to one on three occasions in the second half, but never could go ahead.

With 3:22 remaining, Texas Western led by 11 and its noisy, jubilant band of rooters began warming up their chant: "We're No. 1, We're No. 1," which lasted well into the long night.

CHAMBERS MOST VALUABLE

Hill, the game's top scorer with 20 points, made the all-tournament team, along with recordbreaking Jerry Chambers of Utah, selected the tournament's outstanding player. Rounding out the five were Pat Riley and Louie Dampier of Kentucky, both 19-point men in the finals, and Jack Marin, of Duke.

The victory was Texas Western's 28th in 29 games. The lone loss was to Seattle, 74 to 72, in the Miners' last game of the regular season. Texas Western earlier had beaten Seattle by 11.

"We played just as we have all year," said Haskins, the husky 35-year-old coach who was driving a bus and coaching a girls basketball team just 10 years ago. "We may have prayed a little more, but we didn't do anything different. We didn't even have a chalk talk before the game."

For Haskins and the small, 7,500-student college in El Paso, the title triumph will put them on the map. Haskins figures one thing for sure—it will help his recruiting.

"And we're really going to go out and recruit," he said.

The Miners lose two starters, Artis and Forward Harry Flournoy, plus Reserve Forward Jerry Armstrong. Haskins says his "worst" freshman team is moving up.

As Haskins put it so succinctly afterward no longer is Texas Western without a "name."

	Goals	Fouls	Total
Kentucky:			
Dampier	7	5	19
Conley	4	2	10
Jaracz	3	1	7
Riley	8	3	19
Kron	3	0	6
Berger	2	0	4
Tallet	0	0	0
LeMaster	0	0	0
Gamble	0	0	0
Total	27	11	65
Texas Western:			
Hill	7	6	20
Artis	5	5	15
Latten	5	6	16
Worsley	2	4	8
Flournoy	1	0	2
Cager	1	6	8
Shed	1	1	3
Total	22	28	72

NOTE.—Halftime: Texas Western, 34 to 31.

OUR WAR WITH RED CHINA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Anthony Harrigan, one of South Carolina's most noted writers on foreign affairs, published in the March 8 issue of National Review a most interesting and informative article entitled "Our War With Red China." I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

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

OUR WAR WITH RED CHINA

(An American editor, basing his view on strategic reality, history, and direct observation, argues that Red China is our enemy in the Vietnam war.)

(By Anthony Harrigan)

I. IN VIETNAM

Though Chinese Communist field armies in Yunnan and Kwangsi Provinces have not received marching orders from Marshal Lin Piao to move across Hanoi's territory into the highlands and coastal regions of South Vietnam, the real enemy facing the South Vietnamese and Americans in the southeast Asian war is Communist China. In warring by proxy, Peiping is resorting to ancient methods; and in North Vietnam, which is furnishing the proxy forces for the fight against the United States, Mao Tse-tung has a tributary state comparable in its supineness to the petty kingdoms that obeyed the will of the Chinese emperors of a thousand years ago.

It is in terms of Peiping's empire building that the South Vietnam war should be understood by the American people. If the United States is to define and attain its objective in the Vietnam war, it must bear in mind that Peiping is carrying out one of the epochal aggressive moves in history. The dimensions of the clash have yet to be spelled out to the U.S. public. The Johnson administration's statements on the Vietnam war do not begin to explain the historical necessity for an American presence on Asian battlefields. It is true that America wants to defend a small and brave nation, South Vietnam. It also is true that a defeat of the South Vietnamese by the Vietcong would have unpleasant effects on U.S. credibility as a great power. But these facts do not completely account for America's massive commitment of men and arms to the Asian struggle. The reason the United States is militarily engaged in Vietnam is that our country's survival is involved in the struggle. Communist China's thrust at the United States, through the agency of the Vietnam war, is as threatening as Japan's attack at Pearl Harbor a generation ago.

The directness of the Chinese Communist challenge cannot be doubted by reasonable men. Americans have the word of Peiping's Defense Minister who, on September 3, 1965, called for a people's war against the United States, saying: "Everything is divisible. And so is this colossus of U.S. imperialism. It can be split up and defeated. The peoples of Asia, Africa, Latin America, and other regions can destroy it piece by piece, some striking at its head and others at its feet."

The message is perfectly clear; Peiping aims at nothing less than the expunging of U.S. power in the world. The stated method is the use of a human wave strategy—the triumph of numbers over our technologically advanced tools of defense.

Now it is true that the U.S. public has yet to experience the shock of recognition of Red China's fury in the Vietnam war. This is not surprising, for it has been a war of skirmishes that has continued by fits and starts. As yet there has been no spectacular direct Chinese action comparable to the Yalu

River crossing in the Korean war. The conflict has been bloody but piecemeal. It has been more like a particularly nasty frontier war, rather than an earth-shaking clash in which the destinies of great nations are involved. Peiping has planned it that way, for Americans would respond instantly and completely to another Pearl Harbor situation, whereas they still find a protracted struggle difficult to understand.

The Peiping regime believes its own propaganda to the effect that the United States is a paper tiger. Its expectation is that the American people have no stomach for a protracted conflict, and tire easily. Nibble by nibble, Red China hopes to swallow the portions of Asia that are under U.S. protection. If the nibbling process proves too time-consuming, then the Chinese Communists stand ready to launch human waves at the American and allied forces, confident that we are psychologically unprepared to deal with massed humanity used as a national weapon.

Much of the surface evidence helps Peiping reach the conclusions it wants to reach. Pacifism is a strong current among many left-oriented American intellectuals. Official indecision in Washington (as exemplified by the bombing pause) lends substance to Red China's belief that the American people want to escape struggle and will go to any length to avoid a test of stamina.

Yet these surface manifestations of weakness are illusory. In other times, other nations have similarly miscalculated the American spirit. If Hitler's ghost could speak, it could tell Mao Tse-tung how wrong he is to write off the American will to win once the survival issue is comprehended.

If Peiping's political analysts were to review America's 20th century history, with an objective eye appraising this Nation's growth and development, they would be compelled to cite the expansiveness of the American national dream. The century opened with Americans engaged in the Philippines. About that same time, U.S. troops were marching with Japanese and other Western forces to rescue Americans besieged in the capital of Imperial China. Throughout the 1920's, the United States helped police China in a period of revolutionary conflict and warlord rule. In 1930, Japan emerged as the chief source of danger in Asia. Four years of total war in the Far East ended with the nuclear humbling of Japan. This was followed by the fragmentation of the Japanese Empire and the reconstruction of Japan's political life on a new basis. Then followed the brief, bitter, but inconclusive clash with Communist China in Korea; the safeguarding of Formosa and the free Chinese offshore islands; and lately the approach toward a fresh confrontation with Peiping on the Asian mainland. In the 1950's the United States made a tremendously significant decision when it physically drew closer to the Asian world by admitting to statehood Hawaii, an island group in the central Pacific, and Alaska, a territory that extends into northern Asia.

It is extremely unlikely that the United States will withdraw from Asia and the Pacific world as Red China demands. The United States has strong ties to Japan, emotional as well as economic and military. Australia is recognized as vital to American security. Twenty-one years after the end of World War II, the United States is more than ever a Pacific power. Already there is talk that the South Pacific islands under American administration may in time become America's 51st State.

Thus the United States can be said to belong in Asia and have a developing role in that part of the globe. As a result of this, the logic of American history conflicts with the logic of the history of Communist China. One of the two nations cannot fulfill the destiny it desires. If Americans look ahead, they can see a bridge of civilization and mutual interest—or more than one bridge—linking the United States and Australia, and the United States and Japan. Australia is a strategic reserve for the free world—a potential new America in the Southern Hemisphere for people of our civilization. Our national destiny lies in the Pacific world, as much as in the Atlantic; and it is this destiny that will be vitally affected by the outcome of the war in Vietnam.

China then and now

Red China has begun a contest in Vietnam, the end of which it may regret. The end—let us admit—must be much more than a mere containing of the Chinese Communist regime. Our struggle, if it is to be effective, must have a much larger strategic objective—nothing less than the arresting of Peiping's expansionism and the fragmenting of the Red Chinese national state. Red China has a grand design: a new China across the seas in Australia and New Zealand, the return of all south Asia (including the Philippines, Indonesia, and India) to the ancient status of tributary states or territories, and the penetration of East Africa by Chinese agents and settlers, thereby fulfilling the dream of Cheng Ho, the eunuch admiral who led imperial fleets across the Indian Ocean in the 15th century.

The Chinese empire in that century did not appreciate its strategic opportunity. China had the technical ability in its naval forces to round the Cape of Good Hope and create bases on or near Europe, precisely as the European voyagers did in Africa and the New World. The Chinese empire in that period could have encircled Europe, as Mao Tse-tung today proposes to surround the advanced nations by means of revolutionary control of the world countryside. But in the 15th century a land party ruled in the imperial capital. The Chinese fleets were ordered back to their ports.

Mao Tse-tung has the ambition and the dream lacked by the Chinese emperors of half a millenium ago. He has marshaled his country's strength and intends to deploy it against the only significant adversary Red China faces to the south and east—the United States. Northward Mao cannot march at this time. Though the Soviet Union occupies former territories of imperial China, the Kremlin has no intention of relaxing the Soviet hold on lands that provide a buffer against the hundreds of millions living to the south.

Whether Mao Tse-tung will succeed in his imperial ambition depends in large measure on the American will to resist and American understanding of the historical mission and challenge facing the United States. Weakness in the United States will be Mao's opportunity. Thus it is imperative that the U.S. forces be utilized in a manner compatible with the extent of the crisis.

At present, U.S. Armed Forces are deployed on the periphery of the Red Chinese Empire. They have not come into direct conflict with Mao's main forces, simply the proxy forces of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese regulars. The United States could spend many years and vast amounts of national treasure fighting the proxy armies. Peiping will be pleased if the United States wears itself out fighting Red Chinese auxiliaries. The odds would be against the United States in a long-range, marginal conflict. Such a struggle gives little scope to the technological superiority which is the strength of the United States. Indeed the United States has been fighting at a disadvantage in the Vietnam war by refraining from the use of powerful weapons in its arsenal. It has been fighting in the zone in which Peiping wants America to fight. While American aircraft have bombed various installations in North Vietnam, the aerial blows have not been directed at the most vital targets. Even if the United States hit the hardest possible blows at North Vietnam, it still would be striking only a tributary of the nation manipulating the entire Asian conflict. Obviously, in a war in Europe the United States could never hope to cripple the Soviet colossus by bombing Bulgaria.

Yet we are tangling with a Bulgaria of the Far East. Thus over a lengthy period we could fight and fight and never finish off the real enemy. This means the United States must reconsider ends and means if it is not to be the loser in the struggle for the future of Asia and the Pacific world.

Perhaps the United States is getting closer to a confrontation with the major enemy. A year ago, few Americans would have considered this possibility. The American people are deeply immersed in their normal pursuits at home. Coming to terms with a direct challenge to national existence is not an easy process. In Vietnam, American troops have had to master anti-insurgent warfare. New tactics and combat air vehicles have had to be developed to deal with Communist revolutionary war forces in the countryside.

Despite new U.S. tactics and weapons for Asian struggles, a direct confrontation with Red China should be recognized as an unprecedented challenge for the American people. As Red China is the most populous country on earth, it is an enormously formidable foe even in the nuclear age. The American Republic should look at the dangers with eyes wide open.

If a direct conflict with Red China should develop, the United States must be very sure of its goals. Time in which to consider goals may not be extensive. Already U.S. aircraft have dropped bombs close to the Red Chinese border. And many Americans must realize that it is possible the future will find bombs being dropped on the other side of the border. In fact it is not inconceivable that U.S. bombing mission in time might inch forward until they reached the gaseous diffusion plants near Lanchow close to the Yellow River—the heart of Red China's nuclear facilities.

A direct confrontation with Red China could develop slowly or swiftly, with conventional or nuclear weapons. It could grow out of a sea blockade or materialize in the form of an amphibious assault against Hainan, the giant island that serves as a forward base for Peiping in its design on southeast Asia. No one seriously considers a conventional land campaign across the width of mainland China. It is not out of the question, however, that a U.S. strategic plan aimed at humbling Red China might (after an aerial knockout blow against nuclear facilities, railroads, and industrial plants) include occupation of key ports and coastal cities. In these areas the representatives of the legitimate government of the Republic of China might be installed to exercise civil power. It was precisely such an opportunity that President Chiang Kai-shek noted in a speech December 22, 1965, in which he proposed the study of programs for civil administration in mainland zones after the return of free Chinese troops.

Clearly, the U.S. aim should not be to expunge China as a nation. Even if that were possible, it would only create a power vacuum that the Soviet Union would hasten to fill. But it is well within the capability and interest of the United States not only to curb Red China's warmaking capacity (absolutely destroying its nuclear production facilities), but to arrest and reverse the growth mechanism of the Chinese Communist society. In this connection, Prof. George E. Taylor, director of the Far Eastern and Russian Institute of the University of Washington, recently stated in the Virginia Quarterly

Review that "our future in Asia is to participate in what may well be a long and decisive period in the decline of communism as an ideology and a system of state power."

This objective is as yet not fully understood by the American public. It is a goal that will be bitterly opposed by those elements in the United States who prefer coexistence with humiliation—even at the risk of future annihilation by Red China—to a test of wills between our free society and the anthill society of Red China.

It should not be cockiness that impels the United States to a confrontation with Red China, no matter how much we appreciate the real strength of our Nation. A confrontation, insofar as it is a deliberate choice on the part of the United States, should be firmly rooted in understanding that a conflict must be under the conditions and at the time of our own choosing so as to be most advantageous to our country and our civilization. A direct confrontation can only be justified on the basis of compelling necessity to assure our national survival. To wait past the limit of safety, to wear out U.S. forces in peripheral warfare while Red China rubs American nerve raw by heavy casualties over a long period (and while Peiping builds up its nuclear delivery capability)—all this would involve endangering the United States to the point of risking its continued existence. Thus if the United States must fight a major battle for its survival every effort should be devoted to assuring the success of the American strikes against the vitals of its chief enemy. Any other course of action would involve frittering away U.S. strength.

Hopefully, the military decisions made by the President will be related to a rational, long-range political goal such as the fragmenting of Red China. Those who view such a task as impossible should bear in mind that many empires have been fragmented in the past. World War I dissolved the German and Austro-Hungarian empires. World War II led to the dismantlement of the British and French empires. If the Ukraine had been detached from the Soviet state immediately after the Russian Revolution, the Soviet empire today would not be such a disturber of the peace.

To think in such sweeping terms may trouble some Americans. But it takes only a moment to recall that the United States fragmented the Japanese Empire in 1945, occupied the home islands, subordinated the revered Emperor to an American military pro-consul, amputated Japanese overseas territories—and today Japan is a good friend of the United States, and content within its territorial limits. What was achieved in taking aggression out of the Japanese Empire of the 1930's and 1940's can be done with the Red Chinese Empire if the American people are convinced of the need to do it.

II. IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Peiping is engaged in what it calls a war of no boundaries. Even as the military clash in the Far East transcends the physical limits of individual Asian States, the war is also waged in the political dimension. One of the principal war theaters for the forces of communism is the United Nations organization. The U.N. building on the East River is as much a combat zone as the Mekong River in South Vietnam.

Fulfilling the dictum of Sun Tzu—"Uproar in the east, strike in the west"—Mao Tse-tung hopes to score a major diplomatic and psychological warfare victory in 1966 by having Red China admitted to the United Nations.

If this happens, the United States will suffer a political defeat that would be the equivalent of a staggering military setback. Opposition to Communist China's admission to the U.N. has been a central feature of American foreign policy since the Communists came to power in Peiping. If Communist China were admitted to the United Nations organization, the United States would suffer a tremendous loss of face. It would be a colossal humiliation for the American people that could not be redressed by any ordinary feat of arms.

From the loss of face would stem grave political consequences. The Asian world undoubtedly would regard Communist China's admission to the U.N. as evidence that Peiping stands for the wave of the future. There would be tremendous pressure inside Thailand, Malaysia, the Philippines, India and Japan to seek an accommodation with the government of Mao Tse-tung. In the same measure it would be a reversal for the free Chinese in Asia, who believe that the land and civilization of China in time will be rescued from the new barbarians now in power on the mainland. Admission of Red China would also give its regime the respectability and platform that it seeks. It would make possible subversion of U.N. agencies and troublemaking inside the United States itself. All in all it would symbolize a giant step forward, in the political dimension, for the aggressor state that is attempting to overrun the free nations of Asia.

It is incredible, of course, that supposedly responsible states should consider Communist China eligible for membership in the United Nations. Article IV of the U.N. Charter specifies that the organization is open only to peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present charter. Most certainly, Red China—which has made a total commitment to violence as a national way of life—does not meet this basic formal test. Nevertheless, many governments are ready to admit Red China, no matter how much of a moral shock such an action would give to those Asian nations that want to preserve their independence.

Peiping in the U.N.?

In asking themselves why Red China is able to rally such wide support at the very time its aggressiveness is so manifest, Americans should bear in mind that force often compels obedience through fear. It is Red China's military prowess, especially its extraordinary achievement in sending infantrymen across the world's most formidable natural barrier—the Himalayas—that has excited the fear which is at the root of many votes in Peiping's behalf.

The last go-round at the U.N. saw Red China again excluded from membership, but by the closest of votes. Next time, unless the United States takes unprecedented action, Peiping will probably be admitted. It will have driven a salient into the organization that is dedicated by the terms of its charter to peace and international order.

The turn of the tide in the U.N. in favor of Red China's admission stems from America's failure to conduct a political offensive against Peiping to back up the U.S. military effort in the Far East. It has been as though our representatives at the U.N. didn't realize that there was a war on in Vietnam—a war masterminded by Mao. American policy toward Communist China has been characterized by negative thinking. Our goal has been the limited one of isolating Peiping; and we haven't worked very hard at that. Our vast national power has not been employed to make it difficult for those states that have traded with Red China. We have sat back and done nothing while Canada, for example, sold vast quantities of wheat to the Chinese Communists, thereby enabling Peiping to feed its armies.

It is not surprising that U.S. policy has been so negative on the political front, for the partisans of Western withdrawal from Asia have been immensely active. Thus one finds Malcolm Caldwell writing last year in International Affairs (London) and referring to American aggression and Chinese restraint. Professor Caldwell expressed profound defeatism when he said that "America could take steps toward conceding the eventual necessity of accepting things as they are (in Asia) and not trying to shape them to her wishes." Walter Lippmann tirelessly repeats the same pseudo-realist refrain, and —a new convert to isolationism—attacks "globalist illusion." Prof. Hans Morgenthau proclaims the inevitability of Peiping's domination of all Asian lands and waters. The defeatists are in truth attempting to condition the American mind to the inevitability of Peiping's rape of Asia.

Among the intellectual scandals of our time is the strategic blindness and moral obtuseness of many writers and academicians who would dismiss Red China's appetite for aggression. Thus Prof. Harold S. Quigley, of the University of Minnesota, has dared to say: "In my judgment, Red China has not and does not now menace the national security of the United States."

Fortunately, the American people and the Congress have a keener awareness of the danger that Red China poses to the United States. If other nations refuse to recognize this danger, the United States must act in the interest of its own survival. It has to use the best political weapon available. This, like the atomic bomb, we have never used since the United Nations organization was created; it is, of course, the veto.

American reluctance to use the veto, which the Soviet Union has used on so many occasions, has made Americans almost forget that the right to the veto is a power we can legitimately exercise whenever we choose to do so. As one of the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, the United States may use the veto to prevent Red China from being admitted. The Security Council, after all, must approve the admission of every new member of the United Nations, no matter how the General Assembly votes.

The veto is a proper instrument for protecting the security interests of the United States and its allies in the struggle against Red China's war of political and military conquest. Its use would signal a tough new political line toward the Communists' warfare state in Asia. Certainly, if the United States is close to using its power in new ways in a direct military confrontation with Red China, then the time has come for a political confrontation. To open new military campaigns against Red China's forces in the Far East battlefield, and at the same time to let Peiping score a political victory in the U.N. would be an enormous folly. Indeed if the United States is not going to retire before Red China, but intends to fight for its interests, then it is necessary that the war be conducted with a full mixture of political and military arms. The veto can be the decisive weapon on the U.N. battlefield.

RHODESIA

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I rise to protest the continued American participation in the international efforts to topple the newly independent nation of Rhodesia by means of the unjustified economic sanctions presently being imposed against that friendly government. Never in the history of American diplomacy has the cooperation of the American Government been pledged to such an unworthy cause.

Many Americans who have been opposed to or disturbed by our ever deepening involvement in this tragic affair, as well as many others who have thus far supported our Rhodesian policy on the

naive assumption that these economic sanctions would suffice to topple the Smith government, are now alarmed by mounting reports to the effect that our State Department is seriously considering an American endorsement of or participation in a military move against that friendly, peaceful, non-Communist country. And I predict that our involvement in the internal affairs of that small nation will soon become a major source of national discontent as the truth and the facts surrounding our role in that tragic affair are more fully developed.

Mr. President, on November 11, 1965, the legally constituted Government of Rhodesia proclaimed its independence from Great Britain with a proclamation echoing the American Declaration of Independence.

As declared by the Rhodesian proclamation:

> Whereas in the course of human affairs history has shown that it may become necessary for a people to dissolve the political affiliations which have connected them with another people and to assume amongst other nations the separate and equal status to which they are entitled.

The State Department wasted little time in becoming involved in the internal affairs of the new nation of Rhodesia. On November 12, Ambassador Goldberg dramatically appeared before the United Nations Security Council to announce the following hostile steps being taken by our Government toward the Smith regime:

First. Recall of the U.S. Counsel General from Salisbury and the termination of status of five Rhodesian diplomats in Washington.

Second. Immediate imposition of a comprehensive embargo on the shipment of all arms and military equipment to Rhodesia.

Third. Withholding of Rhodesia's 1966 quota for importation of sugar into the United States, in violation of contractual obligations already incurred by American commercial interests.

Fourth. Suspension of action on all Rhodesian applications for loan or credit facilities.

Fifth. Warnings to American investors about the risks of capital investment in Rhodesia.

Sixth. Discouragement of private travel to Rhodesia by American citizens.

Subsequently, the U.S. Government has progressively imposed embargoes on American exports to Rhodesia culminating on February 26 with the issuance of a Commerce Department order the effect of which is, according to press reports, "to halt virtually all U.S. exports to Rhodesia." These steps have been taken despite the fact that trade between the United States and Rhodesia runs 2 to 1 in favor of America, at a level of approximately $21 million in American annual sales in Rhodesia as contrasted to $11 million in Rhodesian sales in the United States.

Control of Rhodesian imports into this country raises more difficult legal problems, but these have been circumvented by administrative pressure upon American importers of chrome, asbestos, lithium and tobacco. These steps have been taken despite the fact that America has traditionally relied upon Rhodesia for approximately 50 percent of our metallurgical chrome supply, and despite the fact that American tobacco merchants have substantial investments in Rhodesia which will be placed in jeopardy if these trade sanctions are continued.

Mr. President, article I, section 8, clause 3 of the American Constitution specifically enumerates that Congress shall have the exclusive power to "regulate commerce with foreign Nations." Within this past year the Congress, acting pursuant to the exclusive authority vested by the commerce clause, amended the Export Control Act of 1949 to provide that:

> The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States (A) to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States and (B) to encourage and request domestic concerns engaged in the export of articles, materials, supplies, or information, to refuse to take any action * * * which has the effect of furthering or supporting the restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any foreign country against another country friendly to the United States.

In view of the commerce clause of the Constitution and the foregoing section of the Export Control Act of 1949, I ask by what authority the administration has announced a system of discriminatory licensing of foreign imports from Rhodesia, while advising American business interests against the importation of goods from that friendly nation? This same question was asked by Representative GROSS and has yet to be answered by the administration or the congressional advocates of our present policies toward Rhodesia. As stated by Representative GROSS:

> No power is vested in the executive to block foreign trade except under laws which control trading with the enemy and Rhodesia has not been designated an enemy.

The Honorable David Lawrence, distinguished political observer and news commentator, in a learned and comprehensive analysis of our present participation in the economic boycott against the Smith government, raised some serious questions as to the constitutional and foreign policy precedents being set by our present course of action. In his column appearing in the Washington Evening Star of November 24, 1965, Mr. Lawrence observed:

> Unprecedented things are happening today in the conduct of the Government of the United States—but most people aren't paying any attention to it, and representatives of both parties in Congress are strangely silent.
>
> Nowhere in the Constitution, for instance, is the President given the right to decide for himself with what countries trade shall be conducted or what tariff duties shall be imposed—unless Congress specifically authorizes such broad powers by legislation.

Yet, over the past weekend, the United States voted in the Security Council of the United Nations to call on Britain to quell the rebellion in Rhodesia. Then Ambassador Arthur Goldberg announced various economic measures decided upon by this Government to carry out the purposes of the resolution. He declared that steps will be taken to tighten the economic squeeze on the Rhodesian secessionists and said that President Johnson had cancelled Rhodesia's 1966 sugar-import quota of 9,500 tons—a shipment which already was on the high seas en route to America. Goldberg added:

"The President has suspended Rhodesia's sugar quota for 1965 and has directed that this shipment will not be accepted. We will continue to consider urgently any other steps which will ensure that no action is taken to assist the illegal regime in Salisbury, Rhodesia. The writing is on the wall. The misguided rebels in Southern Rhodesia would do well to heed the voice of the Council and the voice of the vast majority of the nations of the world."

But coincidentally American boys are being killed or wounded in South Vietnam as a result of attacks by the troops of the North Vietnamese Government—a regime that is obtaining supplies and commodities through trading with many nations of the world. But nothing is being done here to cut off trade between the United States and such countries.

* * * * *

If the principle is accepted that the executive branch has absolute power in international affairs—despite the plain words of the Constitution that Congress shall have the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations"—then the United States will again and again find itself in an awkward position with respect to policies pursued internally by various countries in the world. The economic weapon can be a powerful one, and Congress unquestionably would grant authority when an embargo would protect directly the interests of the United States. It is unlikely, however, that authorization would be given to pass judgment upon the internal policies of any country and to set up yardsticks to determine whether any government is or is not truly representative of the wishes of the people.

* * * * *

To use the economic power of the United States to meddle in the political affairs of a country in another hemisphere is unprecedented. The acquiescence of many people in a policy which reveals an avowed purpose to intervene in the internal affairs of Rhodesia is inexplicable.

This arrogation of constitutional authority by these executive decrees banning trade with Rhodesia has not gone unnoticed by other newspaper columnists around the country. Mr. Lyle Wilson, UPI correspondent, observed in his column:

> It does seem to be a fact that President Johnson stumbled over the U.S. Constitution when he undertook to interrupt commerce between the United States and newly independent Rhodesia in Africa.
>
> There is not much if any constitutional or other authority for the President of the United States to undertake the regulation of foreign commerce. Article 1, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution asserts in language both plain and vigorous that:
>
> "The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

* * * * *

It is quite possible, of course, that global considerations dictate U.S. support of the British boycott against Rhodesia but that would not automatically make it constitutional.

A recent news dispatch from Salisbury, Rhodesia, reported that the British were fudging on their own boycott. A British

waiver of boycott restrictions was said to have enabled British concerns to import scarce chrome ore from Rhodesia after American firms had begun to boycott the Rhodesian ore. Chrome is scarce. Alternate supplies for the United States are in Turkey and the Soviet Union. But Turkey was reported to be unable to step up production to meet U.S. needs before August of next year.

Out of the Johnson administration action against trade with Rhodesia, arises need for two inquiries:

One by L.B.J. to determine the facts relating to chrome ore and a second by Congress to establish under what authority, if any, the President undertook to regulate U.S. commerce with Rhodesia. If no authority can be shown, the attempted regulation should cease.

This very serious assumption by the Executive branch of our government of a constitutional authority specifically vested in the Congress, was also the subject of a critical editorial appearing in the National Review Bulletin of December 21, 1965, wherein it stated:

But to cancel the contracted enterprises of private citizens (as in the case of the 9,500 tons of Rhodesian sugar in transit to a U.S. buyer), to seize bank deposits, to prohibit commercial and financial undertakings between U.S. citizens and Rhodesians white or black? Under what law exactly, under what provision of the Constitution, does the President decree such measures?

Oh, well, United States-Rhodesian trade doesn't amount to a damn anyway, so what's the sweat—at most, our actions have a symbolic significance. Indeed they do have a symbolic significance, and we will do well to try to understand just what they symbolize. Besides being symbol, moreover, they are, or become, precedent. Is this a precedent we really want to see established: that the President, without reference to law, to Congress or the courts, can on the single basis of his own reading of events, order us to break our contracts and tell us with whom we may or may not do business?

The illegal trade restrictions which have been sanctioned against the friendly people of Rhodesia by no other authority than administrative decree, as well as the publicly announced policy of our State Department to assist in toppling the Smith government, not only for the purpose of destroying the political institutions which they have wisely deemed best suited for their developing nation, but to impose upon them a system of government the primary objective of which being the furtherance of Anglo-American foreign policy objectives in Africa, is in direct contradiction to those principles enunciated in the state of the Union address of January 12, 1966, wherein are found the following statements:

We will work to strengthen economic cooperation, to reduce barriers to trade, and to improve international finance.

* * * * *

The fifth and most important principle of our foreign policy is support of national independence, the right of each people to govern themselves and to shape their own institutions.

For a peaceful world order will be possible only when each country walks the way that it has chosen to walk for itself.

It is also interesting to note that in the state of the Union address of December 2, 1823, another Chief Executive stated a policy which has become a basic principle of American diplomacy to the present date. That statement became known as the Monroe Doctrine, and reads as follows:

The political system of the allied powers is essentially different * * * from that of America. * * * We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered (Florida?) and shall not interfere. But with the Governments who have declared their independence * * * we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

For a country which has traditionally warned European powers against meddling in the affairs of the newly independent nations of this hemisphere, it seems somewhat ludicrous to say the least, that we should now find ourselves committed to a policy of overthrowing the government of an African nation and imposing upon it a political system of our own design. Our present ultimatum to the Rhodesian people becomes even more absurd when viewed in light of the rank hypocrisy with which our State Department applies a double standard around the world. It is highly improbable that more than a handful of the nations which have been created under the protective shield of our policy of self-determination have at any time in their history afforded their people the rights, the orderly legal processes, the economic opportunities or the political stability which is presently extended to the population of Rhodesia.

It is highly unfortunate, Mr. President, that at a time when we find ourselves so heavily committed to the defense of southeast Asia, Western Europe, and South America, we have embarked upon a course of action which threatens to involve our Nation in the problems of the troubled continent of Africa. I am sure the American people had hoped that our lesson in the Congo would cure our State Department's desire to assume responsibility for the peace and safety of these African nations.

As late as 1962, with the adoption of the recommendations of the Clay Committee on Foreign Aid, we adhered to the principle that the essential responsibility for guiding Africa's emerging nations rested with their former colonial sponsors. As stated by Washington columnist, John Bartlett:

The theory has been that the interest and experience of these countries in African life, plus the preoccupation of the United States with the rest of the developing world, causes this to be a logical assignment of responsibilities.

We have now departed from this wise policy and find ourselves pledged to a course of action which is frought with potential danger.

There is another ironic aspect of our participation in an economic boycott of the non-Communist nation of Rhodesia which likewise raises serious questions concerning our role in that sad affair. In the state of the Union address of January 12, we find this statement:

We follow this principle by building bridges to Eastern Europe. I will ask the Congress for authority to remove the special tariff restrictions which are a barrier to increasing trade between the East and the West.

The American people cannot understand the logic or the morality in the imposition of special trade restrictions as a barrier to trade with the non-Communist nation of Rhodesia on the one hand, while acting "to remove the special tariff restrictions which are a barrier to increasing trade between" this country and the Communist puppet states of Eastern Europe on the other.

Nor can the American people understand how our State Department spokesman in the United Nations can now pledge our country to a hostile policy of economic sanctions and possible military action against the non-Communist nation of Rhodesia, when these same professional diplomats urged our country to adhere to a policy of strict nonintervention when the reign of Communist tyranny gradually enshrouded the bludgeoned states of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Albania in direct violation of treaty obligations, and subsequently extended diplomatic recognition to these same blood-stained dictatorships.

As early as October 13, 1965, David Lawrence pointed out the hypocrisy of the double standard being applied against Rhodesia. In his column appearing in the Evening Star of that date, Mr. Lawrence commented:

An event of tremendous significance has just occurred in the United Nations. By a vote of 107 to 2, the General Assembly has called on Britain to refuse to accept a declaration of independence by Rhodesia, because the latter's present government will not grant a majority of the inhabitants self-rule but will continue to give a white minority the preponderant power.

* * * * *

Thus, for example, the populations of Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are overwhelmingly white, but their independence is impaired by an outside power which holds them in subjugation under Communist colonialism.

The fact that the General Assembly of the United Nations now is insisting on self-government for different nations throughout the world which have been ruled by outside powers is an encouraging sign. The captive nations in Eastern Europe, however, have never had the benefit of a United Nations resolution declaring that they should enjoy independence and be allowed to develop autonomously without interference from other governments. Certainly the United Nations has never advocated the use of "all possible force" to deal with this problem, as it has just recommended with respect to Rhodesia.

In the case of the satellite countries in Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union supposedly gave independence to this bloc of nations but nevertheless has managed to retain control through the apparatus of the Communist Party and often with military forces.

The Russians try to spread the impression every now and then that these Eastern European countries are independent and can make trade arrangements with other parts of the world. But the fact remains that they do not really have self-government.

* * * * *

The State Department here has indicated it will participate in economic sanctions whereby trade would be cut off and aid of various kinds would be interrupted if the Rhodesian leaders insist upon separating themselves from the British and going it alone.

But it will be asked, just why shouldn't Britain and other countries be willing to apply the same formula to Red China? For the Peiping regime has undertaken to prevent a majority of the people in South Vietnam from maintaining their independence.

How unbelievable it must be to the American people, to hear the delegates from such tribal states as Zambia demanding in the General Assembly of the U.N. that the standard of "one man, one vote" be imposed upon Rhodesia in order to assure majority rule, when that same nation supports the organization of the very forum from which they speak, where its 3½ million people cast the same vote as 179 million American citizens.

To consistently apply the standard by which we now judge the legitimacy of the Government of Rhodesia, would require severing our diplomatic relations with, and ending our economic aid to, all of the Communist countries, most of our allies, and would certainly require our withdrawal from the United Nations.

And what a strange paradox, Mr. President, that a country which continued to supply Red China during the Korean war, and refused to recognize America's boycott of Communist Cuba when our vital interests are at stake in the Caribbean, and which politely declines to forsake the benefits of its trade with Hanoi, even while American boys are fighting and dying on the battlefield, or to contribute one British pound or soldier to support our effort there, can now demand and obtain our immediate participation in, and economic support for, their boycott of the friendly, anti-Communist Government of Rhodesia.

The cruel irony of the situation becomes even more acute when we note the fact that the struggling nation of Rhodesia has offered military forces to fight in Vietnam.

Mr. Smith, whose message was read to a conference of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, said that the United States is, in his belief, embarked upon its present course of action in order that the backward peoples of the world "shall be free to choose between the compulsive doctrine of the Reds which demands subjugation to the state and of the Reds which demands subjugation to the state and freedom to live thir lives according to their desires. We in Rhodesia are involved in a death struggle with those same forces that seek to annihilate the very basis of our existence."

Mr. Smith said that he did not wish to be unduly cynical, but asked:

Is it not significant that the Socialist regime in Britain has balked at the idea of committing troops to fight our common enemy in Vietnam?

Mr. Smith's message dwelt on the problems faced by the emerging African nations in recent years. He said:

Unfortunately, Communist rule in the guise of military dictatorships is the pattern emerging right through Africa.

Astonishingly, the philosophy of the West seems to be: "If violence and mayhem is visited on black Africans by black Africans, that is as it should be, but if a white African presumes to protect his heritage against the black instruments of communism, then nothing suffices but his complete extinction.

Mr. Smith said that in World War II many Rhodesians fought under American commanders, and in later years Rhodesia sent a contingent of troops to Malaysia and had sincere hopes that their stand against communism would be recognized.

Mr. Smith said:

Today, we are holding the line in the battle against communism in Africa. In spite of this, my Government is prepared to offer to your President tangible help in your struggle against the Communists in Vietnam * * * what we ask in return is similar sympathy and understanding from the people of the United States in the justice of our cause.

Not only have the British shown an increasing reluctance to participate in enterprises which we judge to be of vital interest to the United States, but they have revealed a rather persistent inclination to call upon us to bail them out of their national crises and to shoulder a larger share in the defense of their commercial interests around the world. But perhaps we expect too much from a government which encourages its people to go into the jungles of Africa, to build a civilized nation with their toil and sweat, which accepts the benefits of their trade in time of peace and their sacrifices in time of war, and then elects to treat them as expendable, to sacrifice them to the insatiable demands of African demagogs who have brought only terror, despair, and chaos to their own people.

No, Mr. President, the families of those American boys in Vietnam are not amused at the ludicrous absurdity of our hostile policy toward a people who have offered to fight by their side, or our support for a nation which continues to trade with the very enemy which is now in the field against them.

To many American citizens, the Rhodesian issue brings into sharper focus the question as to the advisability of such a close association with an ally which has proven not only expensive but increasingly unreliable when the chips are down. The rank hypocrisy involved in the British request for American participation in its economic war against Rhodesia was very ably exposed in a recent article by the distinguished political commentator James J. Kilpatrick, appearing in the December 21, 1965, issue of the Washington Post. Commenting on Mr. Wilson's ridiculous explanation of as to why his country has refused to cooperate with the American sanctions against Cuba and North Vietnam, while asking American help against the non-Communist nation of Rhodesia, Mr. Kilpatrick caustically noted:

Consider, if you please, the matter of Cuba, it is passing strange, merely to touch upon one point, that Wilson should have chosen to disprove a parallel by first emphasizing the "illegal" nature of the Smith regime. One has difficulty in recalling when Fidel Castro was elected to anything. Nor is one especially impressed by Wilson's denunciation (in his speech to Commons on Dec. 10) of the "police state methods" instituted by Smith at Salisbury. No measures taken in Rhodesia since November 11 could compare with the oppressions and confications imposed by Castro in Cuba.

Yet there was much more. It was the official position of our own Government, long before that historic October of 1962, that Castro's Cuba presented a formidable threat to international security. As far back as May 1961, the House voted 401 to 2 to declare Cuba "a base and staging area for Communist subversion throughout the hemisphere." In the spring of 1962, Kennedy proclaimed a renewed embargo on U.S. trade with Cuba, and called upon our NATO Allies to support our position.

Our good friends in England could not have cared less about assisting the United States in the enforcement of sanctions thought vital to U.S. interests. Over the first 8 months of 1962, 432 non-Communist ships carried Communist cargoes to Cuba; the Greeks were first, with 97 of these; the British ranked second with 77.

In the fall of 1962 came the great confrontation, when the missiles were discovered and the world held its breath. Kennedy once more begged the British to clamp down on trade with Castro. On October 11, 1962, British shipowners voted unanimously to refuse.

Throughout this period, British tankers carried oil to Cuba. Canada sold wheat to Cuba by the millions of bushels. In the summer of 1963, Kennedy asked Britain to ban trade and travel to Cuba; Britain refused. In February 1964, the effects of continued British trade with Castro were so serious that the United States temporarily suspended military aid to Britain.

But hi, ho, parallels run awry. The U.S. Government supports Britain's sanctions against Rhodesia to the hilt—private contracts canceled, export restrictions imposed, funds frozen. And now, as the Prime Minister told the press conference, it is anticipated that U.S. planes will assist in an airlift of oil to Zambia.

The sole ambition of Ian Smith appears to be to cling to an island of Western stability in a flood of African nationalism. It would not seem an unworthy ambition. But our Government will join the gang in seeking to pull him loose. We will crush him; we will bring him to heel. And meanwhile, our good friends of the West continue to trade not only with Castro in Cuba but also with Ho Chi Minh in North Vietnam. In the world of presidents and prime ministers, one concludes, the theorems of geometry seldom apply; and parallel lines proceed elliptically instead.

Even more disturbing than the economic sanctions which have been decreed against the Rhodesian Government, are the increasing reports by reliable American and English news commentators to the effect that direct military action may soon be employed to bring down the government of Ian Smith. Typical of these reports was an article by Karl E. Mayer, foreign service correspondent for the Washington Post, appearing in the January 4 issue of that newspaper. The story carried a London dateline and stated as follows:

Despite public disclaimers, the British Government is reconsidering its view that force is ruled out in resolving the Rhodesian crisis.

Information from many quarters indicates that the British have moved away from a belief that economic sanctions alone would suffice to bring down the insurgent regime of Prime Minister Ian Smith.

It is admitted in official circles that Prime Minister Wilson was initially too sanguine about the efficacy of sanctions in altering Rhodesian opinion. He also overestimated his ability to contain the hostile African reaction to his strategy.

"HOW?" IS QUESTION NOW

The question today is less whether and more how force could be used to end the Rhodesian secession. One possibility follows these lines:

By March or April, the psychological moment may be ripe for a showdown, since economic sanctions will have begun to take real effect.

The showdown could come in the form of an appeal from Sir Humphrey Gibbs, whom Britain recognizes as the sole constitutional authority in the colony.

If Gibbs designated a new government in Rhodesia and called on the colony's armed forces to honor their pledge to the Queen and to support his decisions, a split among the military would probably occur.

The split could produce a state of civil disorder that would enable Wilson to intervene in Rhodesia without contradicting his repeated pledges against the use of force.

LOOPHOLE RETAINED

This is because Wilson has always allowed himself at least one major loophole—that force could be employed to maintain civil order in the colony.

Thus it is admitted that the purpose of the economic sanctions against Rhodesia is not to prevent a civil war within that country, but to cause one. In order to justify the use of military force against the peaceful people of Rhodesia, as demanded by the United Nations resolution, the English now find it necessary to provoke internal disorder in that country.

The report that direct intervention will be employed against Rhodesia if the economic sanctions have not toppled that Government by April, calls to mind that famous poem which described the result of the first military move against our young Nation in 1776; a campaign which was likewise undertaken in that same month:

By the rude bridge that arched the flood,
Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
Here once the embattled farmers stood,
And fired the shot heard round the world.

Mr. President, the American people are entitled to know what our policy will be when these embattled farmers are also forced to fire in defense of their nation's independence.

What will our policy be when we have plunged this tranquil land of peaceful farmers into the abyss of civil war and have succeeded in igniting the fires of racial conflict throughout Africa?

Once we have endorsed, sponsored, or participated in a military expedition against that small nation, what will our policy be if the crack troops of the South African army move across the border in response to their neighbors call for help?

What will our policy be when the conflict spreads without the borders of Rhodesia, when the entire continent of Africa is engulfed by the night of barbarism which has descended upon the Congo, Ghana, and other African nations?

In the Congo we brought pressure upon the Belgian Government to grant the same unqualified democracy to the people of that new nation, and thereby accepted joint responsibility for the tragic events that followed there. Now we insist that the same policy be followed in Rhodesia, and express surprise that the Rhodesians have elected to fight rather than submit to the chaos which accompanied the abortive transfer of authority to the so-called Nationalist leaders of that tragic land.

The disgusting spectacle of these United Nations delegates, including our own, crying out in self-righteous indignation for the use of force to insure a one-man, one-vote democracy in Rhodesia, is so incredibly hypocritical as to almost defy belief, particularly when exposed to the most casual investigation of the conditions existing in the accusing nations. As stated by Lloyd Shearer, in an article appearing in the March 13, 1966, issue of Parade, the Sunday newspaper magazine:

Most of Asia, most of South America, most of Africa and much of Europe—in fact, the great majority of the world's people—live more or less under totalitarian regimes, so that we may safely call our era the age of dictatorship and ask ourselves if most of the rest of the world wants or is ready for the sophisticated form of government known as democracy.

Referring to the present status of the new states of Africa, the article stated:

In Africa it is much the same story. Since 1957, 13 new countries have gained independence in West Africa. In 1957, 11 of those countries boasted at least 2 substantial political parties. Today, the reverse is true. Eleven have become single-party states.

The central political problem in post-independent Africa is how a government can rise above local and tribal differences to create a national loyalty. To deal with this problem Africa has produced the one-party state in which a strong central government is needed to hold the state together. Minorities have to be suppressed lest they challenge the central authority and disrupt the state. But politically this has meant that the party which found itself in power at the time of independence has brutally rooted out all opposition as a potentially subversive force. And the rulers of the various independence parties have become dictators more or less to guide the destiny of the nations with which they totally identify.

Yet, these are the conditions which the State Department, the British Foreign Office and the United Nations now attempt to force the Rhodesian government to emulate. We have heard so much propaganda about the success of our policy of "Africa for the Africans" as enunciated by Soapy Williams and company, I think it only fair that we note a few examples of how our abortive experiments in national independence have worked out in practice. The Washington Daily News of January 17, carried a story by Richard H. Boyce, Scripps-Howard staff writer, wherein he noted the conditions in a few of those countries which our State Department apparently considers to be showplaces of African democracy. Mr. Boyce states:

The Congo government fell to a military coup, and the weak new government is ill-prepared to deal with a hard-hit economy, widespread hunger and unemployment, and the constant threat of renewed rebellion in the bush.

Across the river in the former French Congo the government's life blood has been sapped by Chinese-linked Communists who dominate the country. Efforts to end this have begun, but feebly, and are not likely to succeed in 1966.

THEY SEE RED

In the past month, army leaders toppled governments in Dahomey, Upper Volta, and the Central African Republic.

In each case the excuse was "to save the nation from Chinese communism. But only more confusion and weakness will result.

Sulan's northern Arabs still massacre the southern Christian Negroes. Ethiopia and Somalia still fight an undeclared border war which often spills over into Kenya.

Tanzania's President Julius Nyerere fights for his political life against surging leftist extremism abetted by Peiping, while thousands of alien rebels use his country as a haven to plot war against the white man.

SLAUGHTER

Neighboring Uganda is racked with political schisms, while bloodshed continues the order of the day in neighboring Burundi, whose Premier and every elected officer of both parliamentary houses were slain, and America's Ambassador kicked out, while the Burundi King dallies in the Swiss Alps.

All this is largely because Africa's people were unprepared for sudden independence. They don't understand the big gap between dreams and reality. Economic instability makes security forces necessary, and this power breeds ambition. Also, some ambitious political leaders who have no army behind them turn to Communists who promise money and support—for a price.

Nor can our State Department divorce itself from the responsibility it shares for this tragic state of affairs in Africa, or absolve our Government of its complicity in these premature experiments in self-government. They were warned time and time again that these African nations were headed for the most ruthless forms of dictatorship, but still they pressed on for immediate self-rule for all of the colonial territories.

In October of 1963, the Prime Minister of Rhodesia and Nyasaland paid a special visit to the President of the United States in order to bring this deteriorating situation to his attention. While in Washingon he told the National Press Club:

A most unpleasant matter is the form of government which pan-Africanism is bringing to the Continent of Africa, the dictatorships and single-party states which that movement favors. I have called it a confidence trick that these new dictatorships are now accepted as suited to the African. It is also, I think, a matter of dishonor.

Posing some embarrassing questions about American foreign policy in Africa, the Prime Minister continued:

But I'll ask another question: Do we not want progress for the Africans as much as we want progress for the people of this continent, or Europe or elsewhere? Must he be forced back into the past? This I know is not what the African wants. The people of the continent cry out for education, for skill and work their condition is as poor today as it has ever been, yet all they are getting is the costly pomp of independence which to them means subservience to more ruthless and exacting masters than ever colonialism came near to bringing.

There are no checks and balances in these new states, and little integrity. Instead

power is growing more absolute day by day—and poverty for the people remains as real as it ever was before. The gift of freedom has been to the politician in power, not the people, nor can the people now easily change the governments they have got. They cannot do it by constitutional means. They cannot do it by opposition to the ruling party. Change now can only come with the death of the dictator, and in condoning what has happened the Western Powers have made it almost certain that political change in Africa must be by assassination. To those who may think I have exaggerated, may I say that in the last 2 years in Africa alone one such dictator has been assassinated and at least two attempts made on the life of a second.

And so, I repeat—what right have we to wish this upon the people of Africa and why should we think that it suits an African to be the subject of such a state?

But our State Department experts on African affairs have shown themselves disinclined to listen to anything that might alter the course to which we have been committed. As shown by their efforts to silence the small Rhodesian Information Office here in Washington, they apparently cannot even tolerate the existence of any informaiton which tends to expose the absurdity of their African policies. As was so ably expressed by Chrysostom in his Trojan Discourse:

Like men with sore eyes: they find the light painful, while the darkness, which permits them to see nothing, is restful and agreeable.

But I suggest that the time has come to pierce the news blackout which has thus far cloaked their operations in Africa and has shielded them from the criticism of an enlightened public.

Mr. President, how strange it is to hear this same State Department crown that led the American people to believe that Mao was a simple agrarian reformer, that Castro was a modern version of Robin Hood, and that Kwame Nkrumah was a contemporary of George Washington, now tell us that the interests of Rhodesia's Negro population will be best served by turning the country over to Joshua Nkomo and his black nationalist terrorists.

Following the pattern of other African takeovers, the black nationalist leaders of Rhodesia attempted earlier to wage the same savage and bestial campaign on atrocities against their own people. In 1961 Robert C. Ruark described the black nationalist strategy in Rhodesia in an article appearing in the Washington Daily News of October 5 of that year. I will insert the entire article at the end of my remarks, but I would like to note several paragraphs contained therein at this point as stated by Mr. Ruark:

SALISBURY, SOUTHERN RHODESIA.—The topic here is terrorism; in short, intimidation, irresponsibility, sabotage, and a concerted effort by outside powers to inflame and create chaos. The pawns are wild, unemployed young men—youth wings, so to speak—who are spurred to violence and mass insurrection by skillful drill masters of social discontent.

The violence is only occasionally directed against the whites. The real violence is aimed at the good things the white man has wrought—an attempt to destroy a black bourgeois class if it means peaceful coexistence with the white man to the mutual profit of both black and white.

* * * * *

In a span of a year and a half some 50-odd native schools have been burned down by youthful mobs * * *. The modern young African thirsts for knowledge, and in the past few weeks mobs have beaten up small children on their way to education to such an extent that the schools had to be closed.

* * * * *

A favorite form of intimidation is to burn the houses and fields of African small farmers; to maim cattle; and always to beat up, violently, the subject of the intimidation. An African with a small hotel may find it smashed and looted, or simply burned to the ground.

The object, of course, is to mark, clearly, the penalty of getting along with the white man, and to destroy the greatest enemy of collectivism: Successful private enterprise.

The white and black people of Rhodesia joined together in a coordinated effort to put down the first wave of terror that threatened their mutual peace and prosperity. Ringleaders of the so-called black nationalist movement were arrested and isolated from the society they sought to destroy. But the black nationalists cannot tolerate the continued existence of such a successful example of racial cooperation. The success of the Rhodesians stands out in stark contradistinction to the dismal life of fear, frustration, and despair which these terrorists have brought to other African nations. It is an embarrassing and a constant reminder of their own failure, and thus it has become all the more imperative to wipe Rhodesia off the face of Africa.

But the black population of Rhodesia is not unaware of the fate of their neighbors to the north or of the reign of terror, chaos, and corruption that pervades those unhappy lands. They have seen first hand, in their own country, the atrocities those black nationalist demagogs have committed against them. It is little wonder that the Rhodesian Council of Tribal Chiefs voted unanimously in favor of UDI, or that the Rhodesian Negro population has remained calm throughout this crisis.

As a result of their prior experience with black nationalism, appeals for racial uprisings have been ignored and the previous claims that UDI would bring racial war to Rhodesia have now been exposed as ridiculous. The Christian Science Monitor of January 4, 1966, in an article by Robert M. Hallett, explained why the nationalist movement has been rejected by the Negro people of Rhodesia. As stated by the Christian Science Monitor:

The ineffectiveness of the Rhodesian African nationalists is a great disappointment to other Africans on the continent. Exiled nationalists had said that a unilateral declaration of independence would bring direct confrontation of black and white in Rhodesia.

CALM PREVAILS

This has not happened. In fact, so far as is known, only one African has been killed by the police. He was shot during a stoning incident in a Bulawayo township. The country today is largely calm. Had there been widespread incidents among the African population, other African states would have been more militant in calling for international intervention.

Radio Zambia has permitted Rhodesian nationalists to broadcast appeals for violence and sabotage to Africans here. They have had some small successess.

A barn was set on fire and tobacco plants have been uprooted in parts of the northern section of the country reached by the radio. But they have provided no organized movement.

The Christian Science Monitor also contradicted the allegations that the Rhodesian Government has taken a harder line toward its Negro population as a reaction to pressures brought about by external efforts to create internal disorder within the country and the economic sanctions being applied against them by foreign nations. To the contrary, the Hallett article revealed that the Smith government has increased its efforts to improve the lot of the Negro population. The story concluded with this observation:

It will introduce a pilot scheme to establish and promote small cottage industries in tribal areas. Loans are being made available to African councils to establish local government administration centers.

Landowners are increasing the pace of building African housing. Tribemen's taxes are being cut in half (one point yearly rather than two). Money will be given over to local government councils in tribal areas.

The government has set aside £500,000 ($1,400,000) for special schemes of assistance and development in tribal areas. An additional £150,000 has been provided for improving African education.

This money will partly bolster chiefs who are paid by the government. They have been built up to counterbalance the nationalists.

A special school for training the sons of chiefs and headmen is being considered.

The government realizes that Africans working in the lowliest capacities in industry will be the first to suffer from unemployment due to sanctions. Various plans are also an effort to maintain African employment.

Mr. President, there are those who have deluded themselves into believing that the Rhodesians will not fight if a military expedition is sent against them. These were the same people who said that the Rhodesians would not dare follow through on their threat to declare independence, but they did just what they said they would do. And when the Rhodesians say that they will fight if provoked by a hostile military move, I believe they will do just what they say. I draw your attention to the recent statement by the Rhodesian Deputy Minister of Information:

If Mr. Harold Wilson is prepared to use force, let him realize the consequences of what he would be doing. There would be no easy, quick victory. Under these circumstances I believe that 1 Rhodesian fighting on his home ground for the survival of his home, his family, and his country would be worth 10 of any other troops fighting reluctantly and with reservations, and this would be a long, drawn-out, bitter struggle.

Does Harold Wilson believe that we in this country, whose forefathers fought at Agincourt, Dunkirk, and Vegkop, are endowed with less resolution than the Russians displayed when in retreat from the Germans? If he were to prevail in this country he would take over a smoking ruin and a desert.

The Russians had the fortitude to adopt a policy of scorched earth and so have we,

and everything in the path of an advancing army would be destroyed. Let Mr. Wilson realize this before he embarks on something which can only lead to disaster.

Even the Washington Post is disinclined to endorse the theory that Rhodesia's Army is either weak or of questionable loyalty to the Smith government. In an editorial dated November 16, 1965, the Post observed:

Economic sanctions that make Rhodesia's course very expensive are a much better tool than the sort of military intervention demanded so blithely by some countries in the United Nations.

In the second place, Rhodesia's military strength is not to be lightly ignored. She has some 12 battalions of infantry now under arms or rapidly mobilizable, plus artillery, plus sizable police contingents with armored cars, plus an efficient small air force with Canberra fighter-bombers. Perhaps 20,000 trained men are now at the disposal of the government. Many of these are Africans serving under white officers, but there is no reason at this point to suspect that they would not obey orders. No U.N. force is presently available, and even if there were agreement and contingents were volunteered the logistical problems would be formidable.

Even if a military intervention could be mounted, the effectiveness would be doubtful. Embattling the white population, however, would be virtually certain to cause a bloodbath.

Mr. President, the perilous direction which British policy is taking in regard to the Rhodesian question, and to which we have apparently been committed, recalls the warning which Churchill gave the Labor Government in 1936:

I have watched this famous island descending incontinently, fecklessly, the stairway which leads to a dark gulf. It is a fine broad stairway at the beginning, but after a bit the carpet ends. A little farther on there are only flagstones, and a little farther on still these break beneath your feet.

While there is still time for our Nation to withdraw from this unworthy enterprise, the American people should fully realize that we shall be held accountable for whatever consequences result from our involvement in this dangerous course of action.

Before it is too late, we should give serious thought to the reports that Great Britain may soon ask the United States to directly participate in, and assume the burden of a more aggressive policy toward Rhodesia. Mr. Charles Bartlett, in an article appearing in the December 9, 1965, issue of the Evening Star, commenting on reported State Department pressure on the administration for a more active American role in the Rhodesian affair, stated:

Johnson and the top layer of the State Department will shrink from this advice as long as they can. The original decision to avoid an initiative was rooted in an awareness that while the British recognize the Rhodesian problem as their own, they will instinctively grasp at any chance to induce the United States to share the burden.

Since the late 1940's, when Britain handed the problem of the Greek insurgents to the United States, this country has been a magnet for international responsibilities. In areas like the Middle East, some nation had to fill the vacuum left by the ebb of British power. In other situations, this country frequently resists in a firm but friendly fashion Britain's aspirations to shift her encumbrances onto the broad shoulders across the Atlantic.

Mr. President, even assuming that these economic sanctions achieve the purpose of toppling the government of Ian Smith, as unlikely as that may be in my opinion, what will our policy be then? Those who endorse our present policy on the naive assumption that the government of Ian Smith will be peacefully overthrown, should ponder the questions raised by Eric Sevareid in his column appearing in the December 6, 1965, issue of the Evening Star, wherein he noted:

The world's moral disapproval will not put forward this Rhodesian clock-in-reverse, not even if it includes a personal denunciation by the President of the United States, which Mr. Carl Rowan wants to hear. Economic sanctions would not only have to bite very deeply but would have to be sustained for a very long time to topple Mr. Smith and his crew. But suppose they do topple him, what then?

The alternatives would be rule by the untrained black majority which virtually no Rhodesian white, however moderate, believes endurable and which they will resist; or, a direct rule from London, a prospect that must appall even Prime Minister Harold Wilson; or, the emergence of a white moderate ruling group that would extend the franchise and truly begin to train Rhodesian blacks for positions of power. The third alternative may be the best, by many judgments, but it remains much more a hope than a prospect.

Mr. President, while there is still time to turn away from the precipice toward which we are being so recklessly plunged in Africa, I urge our Government to take immediate steps to absolve our Nation of any further complicity in this unfortunate affair, by rescinding our support of the United Nations resolution calling for the use of force against the Government of Rhodesia; by revoking the illegal and arbitrary economic sanctions being imposed against the Smith government; by renouncing our policy of hostility toward Rhodesia, as well as any commitment to participate in any further ventures of this nature, the purpose of which being to topple that government; and to publicly announce our intention to return to our historic and traditional policy of nonintervention in the internal affairs of friendly African nations.

I ask unanimous consent that some material dealing with this subject be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

REPORT FROM RHODESIA: POINTING THE WAY TO A MULTIRACIAL AFRICA?

(The report of the fact finding mission of the American-African Affairs Association, Members: Representative JOHN ASHBROOK, chairman; Dr. Max Yergan, Ralph de Toledano)

INTRODUCTION

(NOTE.—On November 11, 1965, the African State of Rhodesia declared its independence and, at the same time, pledged its loyalty to the free community of nations. Thus, Rhodesia joined a long list of former African colonies and territories that had achieved independence since the end of World War II. But what a different reaction it caused! Instead of offers of economic aid, an embargo was imposed on the newly independent state. Instead of immediately seating the new state in the United Nations, demands were made for U.N. military intervention to crush Rhodesia. Why was Rhodesia different than Kenya—or Ghana—or Chad?

(The Rhodesian situation raised questions that demanded answers. And answers were not forthcoming. In an attempt to find these answers, the American-African Affairs Association dispatched a three-man fact-finding mission to Rhodesia: Congressman JOHN M. ASHBROOK, of Ohio; Dr. Max Yergan, cochairman of the association whose knowledge of Africa extends over a score of countries in as many years; and Mr. Ralph de Toledano, author and nationally syndicated columnist. The cost of the mission was defrayed through the contributions of concerned Americans. The report of their findings follows below.

(The American-African Affairs Association is circulating this report as widely as possible as part of its program of presenting the facts on Africa without reference to any political or racial dogma. We hope that this report may answer some of the questions which have arisen so that America and the free world can act responsibly and honorably.)

I

American policy on Rhodesia represents the triumph of ideology over actuality. To excuse American intervention in what should be the purely private conflict between the British Government and Rhodesia, it is argued that the chain of circumstances leading to Rhodesian independence was improperly motivated—the result of a racist philosophy and a uniquely selfish economic interest. This position is based on a profound ignorance of the forces at work in Rhodesia—as well as in the rest of Africa.

The aim of both Britain and the United States is to bring down the constitutionally-elected government of Prime Minister Ian Smith and replace it by a puppet regime, to be followed by a "one-man, one-vote" formula—thus applying, in an undeveloped continent, a highly sophisticated Western political system divorced from the realities of the present situation in Rhodesia. Since that country has been significantly in the news for many months, it might have been expected that the American press would have sent numerous able reporters to Salisbury, the capital city, to report developments there at first hand. Instead, news reaching the United States has come almost exclusively from British circles taking their lead from Labour Party publicists. Dubious sources at the United Nations have added their mite to the muddle of misinformation.

Certainly, it is no secret that Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs G. Mennen Williams has used what influence remains at his disposal in Washington to discourage on-site inspection by responsible legislators and newspaper correspondents who believe that U.S. foreign policy should lead from the strength of knowledge rather than the fanaticism of a priori judgment. Important publications have been told that the Rhodesian Government is not admitting accredited journalists—a totally false charge. In actual fact, the Rhodesian Government is not only willing but anxious to open its doors to those able to report what their eyes and ears register. "We have nothing to hide," Prime Minister Smith told our mission when asked if he would receive a congressional delegation.

Planned myopia seems to be the technique of American policymakers—the same planned myopia which led millions of Americans to accept with no attempt at verification the myth that the Chinese Communists were "agrarian reformers" and Mao Tse-tung the George Washington of the Far East. A new myth now prevents a careful reading of the

Rhodesian situation and halts debate by describing that country as a crumbling bastion of white supremacy which must "inevitably" fall before the progressive onslaught of African nationalism. To the propagators of this myth the "petrol bomb" used by Rhodesian nationalists to intimidate their fellow Africans has seemingly become just an instrument of democratic persuasion, acceptable despite the terror it engenders.

The steps being taken in Rhodesia to maintain and extend a high level of living for all, to preserve public tranquillity, and to lift the economic, social, and political level of the African population may or may not be morally or pragmatically justifiable. But before any approbation or opprobrium are meted out, there surely must first be an accurate estimate of the situation. And this estimate cannot be valid unless it answers the following questions, which have been largely ignored by policymakers, the mass media, and those who derive their positions from both.

Is the Rhodesian Government of Prime Minister Smith stable?

What degree of active or passive support does it have from the Rhodesian people—white and black?

Is the Rhodesian economy sound, and how is it threatened by the sanctions which Britain has imposed and America accepts?

If these sanctions succeed, who would suffer most?

Can the country survive a political and economic collapse, yet still continue a respectable member of the family of nations?

Is the philosophy of the present Rhodesian Government racist?

What, in fact, is its philosophy, and where does it lead?

What are Rhodesia's strengths and weaknesses as a nation?

What is the nature of the African population?

Most important of all, would the enshrining of the "one man, one vote" principle in Rhodesia be possible today without subjecting the country to the chaos, despotism and barbarism which have all too often taken over in the so-called developing nations of Africa?

II

Americans, in contemplating the Rhodesian situation, are either unaware or refuse to take cognizance of its complete uniqueness among all the other colonies, possessions, or participants in the systems set up by the European powers in Africa. For example, few know that Rhodesia moved directly from its status as a chartered region to self-government. Until 1887—or 2 years before the Crown granted a charter to the British South Africa Co.—the area now called Rhodesia was the battleground for bloody tribal wars between the militarized Matabele tribes and the relatively peaceful Mashonas. An ancient and endless conflict had kept the Mashonas in a constant state of physical terror and economic uncertainty. These wars, and the incursions of disease and early mortality, had held down the African population to about 300,000. It has now risen to some 4 million—and it is estimated that barring starvation, cataclysm, or the kind of freedom which Britain wishes to impose, it will double in the next 20 years.

The white settlers who emigrated from Britain or South Africa were not looking for fast profits in gold and emeralds. They came to live as farmers, homesteaders, and businessmen. Rhodesia for them was not a way station on the road of imperial convenience, but a way of life. Under the governance of the British South Africa Co., they built cities, established trade, opened up the land, set up a school system, and organized the country with the same goals of permanence that European settlers carried with them to America. They did this with a minimum of damage to the tribal system and its customs, and they did not act with the rapacity which led settlers on the American continent to wipe out entire indigenous populations or to take over the entire area in their civilizing course.

By free choice, after a referendum, the Rhodesians voted in 1923 for responsible self-government as a member of the British Commonwealth, rather than for joining the Union of South Africa as a fifth province. The status was replaced by an assertion of full sovereignty by a legitimate and legally elected government in 1965, at a time when the British Government—with the blessing of the United States—was systematically granting independence to all sorts of former possessions with little or no training or tradition in self-government. The outcry at No. 10 Downing Street over Rhodesia's unilateral act of disassociation may be understood in terms of Commonwealth interest and the general inclinations of Prime Minister Harold Wilson. But to argue constitutionally under the circumstances, or to insist on the right of the British Government to determine the internal organization of the withdrawing state, should have sounded strange to Americans who seized their own independence by force of arms and set up their own government without the permission of George III or his ministers.

III

The test of legal validity will not be found in the animadversions of Britain's Labor government. Despite the reservations of Prime Minister Wilson, it remains a fact that the Rhodesian Government of Mr. Ian Smith was elected by an overwhelming vote of those who held the franchise. It remains a fact that the 14 African Members of the Rhodesian Parliament, elected in the same election—there are 65 Members of Parliament in all—do not favor the surrender of the country to the African nationalists. And it remains a fact that the present Constitution differs only in nonessentials from the 1961 Constitution which Mr. Wilson holds so dear. For Britain to attempt to inject itself into the internal affairs of Rhodesia, and especially its political life, when it has signally refrained from doing so in many former British possessions that are now frankly African police states, is hardly consistent, let alone fair.

The structure of the Rhodesian state and its qualifications for granting the franchise will be discussed later in this report. That it meets the requirements of the Rhodesian situation in an observable fact. Salisbury, the other cities of Rhodesia, and the agricultural countryside are tranquil to a degree unknown in many sections of the civilized world. The streets are policed by African officers far more relaxed than their law-enforcement counterparts in New York, Los Angeles, or Washington. Crimes of violence, an index to social malaise and instability, are relatively few. Political crime—consisting mostly of incinerating people in their beds by tossing "petrol bombs" onto thatched roofs—ceased almost entirely when the perpetrators were arrested, much to the relief of the African population. The telltale signs of racial tension are nowhere to be seen. Neither is that atmosphere of repression so visible in states where power is held against the will of the governed. Sanctions have, in fact, consolidated the hold of the Smith government by winning over to its side such scattered opposition as existed before their advent. For many of the Africans, the fear is not of more white government but of a return to that brief period when nationalist territorists, financed by Peiping, Cairo, et al., were allowed to employ the "persuasion" of bomb and knife.

Rhodesian Minister of Law Desmond William Lardner-Burke told our mission in this regard what others later confirmed. "We don't stop people from speaking," he stated. "The only time we get cross is when there is a bit of subversion." There was a heightening of that subversion when the African nationalists themselves split into two factions, each vying for the financial support of the Committee of Nine (the OAU "Liberation Committee") in Tanzania. During that period, with a cash subsidy of $30,000 set aside by the committee, African fought African with gasoline bombs and hand grenades. Much of the violence was directed against children, and the schools were virtually closed as a result of nationalist threats. When witchcraft was invoked to silence witnesses against the terror, the Rhodesian Government had no option but to disregard the finer points of law. This was admitted by Mr. Lardner-Burke when he said, "You cannot allow complete chaos because of due process." In the United States, this would be heresy. For the population of Rhodesia, black and white, it was a stark necessity.

IV

If there is any noticeable apprehension on the part of the white or African population, it does not derive from the steps taken by the Smith government to put an end to violence and subversion. The fear is that Rhodesia's course toward a viable and responsible multiracial state will be interrupted by some overt military move against the country from either the British or a neighboring African country—with or without the support of the United Nations. These military adventures might take the form of outright invasion—which Britain's allies in Africa have already threatened, should economic sanctions fail to topple the present government. Neutral observers in Salisbury, London, and Paris discount the possibility of British military intervention, however. Such a maneuver would profit Britain little and cost her much. A former American official noted that if, the British were to send in anything less than two divisions, they would be wiped out. An overwhelming force, moreover, would find a devastated country, put to the torch in "scorched earth" fashion. At least half the white population, with Africans at their side, are ready to fall, "rifle in hand"—a phrase heard with startling regularity in Rhodesia. The balance of the white population would probably leave the country permanently, emigrating to South Africa or to other countries which could absorb them and make use of their pioneering skills.

The African country most vocal in its incitements to violence is Zambia, which shares a border along the world's greatest manmade lake and also the hydroelectric installation at Kariba. But the Zambian economy has been sadly sapped by the sanctions which were to destroy Rhodesia in "a matter of months," and its government has so far survived only because of substantial aid from Britain, Canada, the United States, South Africa, and to some extent Rhodesia. Though demagogic passion often burns with a hard, senseless flame, it seems unlikely that the Zambian Government will risk its own downfall by launching an attack across the Kariba Dam against the well-trained and determined Rhodesian Army and Air Force. So far, there have been no overt acts to disturb the calm along the Zambia-Rhodesia border. On the Zambia side, there are no border guards, and the curious can cross over from Rhodesian territory without being challenged or molested. In the Rhodesian interior, Zambian workers continue to hold their jobs. They have made it plain that they do not want to return to the relative poverty of their Zambian homes.

There is, however, some concern that the more hot-headed African nations may mount a massive infiltration of saboteurs and activists whose aim will be to cause the kind of economic disruption which can be publicized abroad as "proof" of political unrest and a

reaction to Rhodesian "tyranny." But here again, the government is prepared. An increase in unemployment, already making itself felt as a result of economic sanctions, can create the kind of unrest which feeds subversions. But with little official prompting, Rhodesian farmers and industrialists are spreading the work so as to lay off the fewest number of people. And unemployment will cease to be a problem if the Smith government is given time to rearrange the economy sufficiently to take up the slack. This rearrangement is already taking place as Rhodesia moves to manufacture at home many products once imported from Britain and the rest of the world.

Here again, the loser will be Great Britain. Though Rhodesian trade is not a major factor in the British economy, its loss is of sufficient importance to increase a balance-of-payments unfavorable to England and to force *further retrenchment* in an already distressing situation. Rhodesia, on the other hand, once she has survived this transition period, will find herself economically stronger and less dependent on the vagaries of Commonwealth politics. Even in the matter of oil, often called the lifeblood of a modern state, Rhodesia is not as pinched as Prime Minister Wilson or the American State Department had hoped. What stocks of oil existed at the time sanctions were imposed is a state secret. So, too, is the amount of oil coming in from Portuguese Mozambique and independent South Africa. There are still cars on the streets, however, and South African neutrality has not prevented a small but steady stream of oil from pouring across the border. At the same time, the Rhodesians are preparing to convert their transport, if necessary, to the use of industrial alcohol for fuel—and since there is an abundance of sugar, this may be the ultimate solution.

The present danger to the Rhodesian economy is to be found elsewhere. Sixty percent of the country's export trade was in tobacco. It is its major cash crop, and Britain was Rhodesian tobacco's major customer. To soften the blow, the Rhodesian Government has set up a corporation to buy at a fair price the entire tobacco crop—but this will put a considerable strain on the budget. Unless a substitute market is found, this will be a source of trouble for Prime Minister Smith. There are signs, however, that Rhodesia may have found an ally in Britain's tobacco industry. The Times of London has already reported considerable perturbation over the ban on Rhodesian tobacco. Grade for grade, it is considerably cheaper than American tobacco. If the ban is maintained, the profit margin will either be wiped out for British cigarette manufacturers—or they will have to raise prices, which they feel will bring serious complaints from smokers who have already sustained a long series of increases.

In other areas, British sanctions have failed to cause any real pinch. Stores in Salisbury are well stocked with luxuries and necessities—and goods on order prior to the imposition of the ban on trade are still coming in. There is no inflation so far, though Rhodesian businessmen bemoan the fact that the greatest boom in their history was cut short by Britain's action. Food is no problem, Rhodesia raises its own. The country has been ridden by drought, but Rhodesians find a silver lining in this. Food was an export, but with homegrown supplies down there will be no surplus to rot in warehouses. To date, there has been no hoarding of food or of other consumer items—a tribute to the self-confidence and self-discipline of the Rhodesians.

V

When Britain's Prime Minister Wilson declared economic war on Rhodesia, there were expectations that this would (1) drive a wedge between the Smith government and the people, (2) cause widespread defections in the civil service and the military establishment, and (3) encourage the Africans to rise up. It has already been noted here that points (1) and (2) were dismal miscalculations. The effect of sanctions was simply to bring the people together—and if there have been any important defections from the Government's civilian or military service, no one in Rhodesia knows about them. Point (3), however, continues to intrigue those who seek the overthrow of Prime Minister Smith and the ouster of his Rhodesian Front Party. Yet here again, their hopes are based on false premises and a profound ignorance of the attitudes and desires of the Africans in Rhodesia. In conversations with African members of the opposition in Parliament—and with the one white oppositionist Member of Parliament—it became abundantly clear to us that no one in Rhodesia wants to see the kind of upheaval which the African nationalists and their foreign supporters seek.

Among those Africans who have risen to public prominence, there are of course some who demand instant applications of the "one-man, one-vote" formula. But for the most part, the desire to rule is tempered by the knowledge that at this point in Rhodesia's development, the precipitate introduction of Western political ideas would benefit no one. P. H. Mkudu, chief whip of the opposition, has freely conceded that his people need much training before they can take over the reins of government. He puts the time period required as "not less than 5 years" and calls for increased educational opportunities and an end to social discrimination. And he has small patience with his colleague in the Parliament, I. H. Samuriwo, who insists that the Africans should be given the opportunity to rule—and then trained to administer the government and the economy of the country. The African opposition as a whole calls for a five-point program:

1. Change the franchise.
2. Institute a crash program in education.
3. Institute a crash program of agricultural development.
4. Change ownership rights and property rights.
5. End social discrimination.

What these points mean and how rapidly they are to be implemented are another matter. Specific proposals are shunned. Nor are the five points advanced as a panacea for Rhodesia's problems. The most articulate spokesmen contend that the acceptance of the five points will insure tranquility and prosperity for Rhodesia. The strongest argument offered in their favor is simple: Without the "change" that is demanded, the country faces bloodshed and turmoil. With it, there is "a possibility" that these eventualities can be avoided. But the demands for a "crash program" in this field or that fail to take into account the cultural context of the country. The changes that Rhodesia requires to make it a truly multiracial nation cannot come into being overnight. In a society as technologically sophisticated as Rhodesia, integration must take place gradually, on an individual basis and the gage must be merit rather than color of skin. Merit, moreover, must be measured by objective standards.

VI

The philosophy of the Rhodesian Government—and it is shared almost universally by the white population—is derived from these beliefs and from the practices that have evolved from them. But beyond this, there is a concept of the role of the races in Africa which commands respect. It is, as the Prime Minister has insisted, completely divorced from any trace of Herrenvolkism, as well as from the apartheid policy of South Africa. Rhodesians see the "one man, one vote" principle as a form of reverse racism, for in practice it would destroy the white community completely and deprive the country of all the techniques of a modern society.

In broad strokes, this has been painted by P. K. Van der Byl, the young Minister of Information. "In Rhodesia," he points out, "there are two distinct societies. One is Western, parliamentary, and democratic. The second is an African tribal society. This tribal society is authoritarian and hierarchical. In between, there is a no-man's land—an intermediary African group—for whom the tribal system has lost much of its meaning. This group belongs to neither the tribal nor the Western system. They are the problem in Africa today."

Like most other Rhodesians, Mr. Van der Byl believes that the whites have no right to tamper with the tribal society "except by example and persuasion." To take this view, however, does not mean that the Rhodesian Government will sit idly by and see its institutions destroyed, nor that it can condone violence and disregard of the law. "We must put a damper on such things as the killing of one of twins. But the Africans must be the arbiters of their own destiny. It would be morally and pragmatically wrong for Western society to impose its own mores. On the other hand, we will put no obstacle in the way of those who wish to leave the tribal society and join the Western system. There is no inhibition on an African getting the vote. But it is our belief that the franchise should call for a high degree of education or other qualifications."

The experience of the other new African nations would seem to confirm Mr. Van der Byl's contention that if those qualifications are forgotten or mechanically lowered to produce an overwhelmingly large percentage of enfranchised citizens, "it debases the entire system." It therefore boils down to two questions: (1) Is the electoral system theoretically impartial, and (2) is it also impartial in practice? There is no doubt that the Rhodesian whites have worked very hard at setting up an electoral machinery which will apply to all three categories of its population. There are two voting rolls—the A roll, which is dominant and which elects 50 members to the Parliament; and the B roll for those in the transitional stage, which elects 15 members. The qualifications for the A roll are higher than those for the B roll. But there are Africans in the A category and white men in the B category. Within the Parliament, members elected on either roll have the same rights and privileges.

To ascertain the practical impartiality of the Rhodesian system, factors other than the strict application of the electoral code must be considered. First, there is the attitude of those Africans still living within their tribal organizations. Among them, there is scant interest in the exercise of the suffrage. They are, therefore, pretty much represented by their chiefs, who have official status. Eventually, the Rhodesian Government hopes to institutionalize the role of the chiefs—by setting up a second legislative chamber somewhat analogous to the American Senate or the British House of Lords—replacing the present Council of Chiefs. Such an innovation will enhance the status of the Africans and give them a greater voice in government affairs without debasing the franchise.

But this is secondary to a matter of far greater significance in assessing the Rhodesian system. Are the whites sincerely dedicated to raising the educational and economic levels of the African population? Or are the inhibitions on the suffrage merely a polite way of preventing qualified Africans from using their numerical preponderance to take control of the country? On this point, the opposition is most vocal. It claims that the government of Ian Smith—or any other white government—will simply create new impediments to granting the franchise as the level of the African population rises

to meet the present inhibitions. But this charge goes to the matter of motive and psychological imponderables. As such, it is almost impossible to weigh objectively. All the evidence at hand, certainly, points to an opposite conclusion.

Has the Rhodesian Government, for one thing, really tried to bring education to the African? The answer lies in economic statistics and an analysis of the school population. At present Rhodesia's ratio of children in school to total population is comparable to Britain's—even though there is a wide disparity (in favor of Britain) in the national incomes of the two countries. The following table of ratios tells a story which goes far to contradict those who reject the sincerity of the Rhodesian whites:

Great Britain	1 in 5.
Rhodesia	1 in 6.
Malagasy	1 in 11.
Tanzania	1 in 18.
Dahomey	1 in 20.
Mali	1 in 43.
Ethiopia	1 in 80.

African education is the single target expenditure of the Rhodesian Government, and it has trebled in the last 7 years. It is significant in this context that 98 percent of all direct taxation is paid by whites. Despite this financial inequity, the Rhodesian Government has been able to meet the demands of an African school population of some 2 million children under 17 for a primary education. As this demand is met, the government has moved ahead to provide secondary school education for those who desire it. But here the government has run into several problems. First, the 10 percent of the primary school population which is female has been kept out of the secondary schools by parents who take their daughters out of school when they become nubile and "sell" them into marriage. Secondly, the demand for the admittedly few but steadily increasing places in secondary schools has yet to equal the supply.

As a matter of educational philosophy, moreover, the Rhodesian Government has subscribed to the Western idea of providing as much education as possible for all, rather than to the practice prevalent in former French and British colonies of training a small elite group and ignoring the rest of the African population. The Rhodesian school system, moreover, is relatively young. (After all, the country has been under settlement for less than 75 years). Rhodesians note that in Britain, with its ancient traditions, only 34 percent continue to go to school after age 15—and in the United States, which boasts of its public education, there are today some 23 million adults who never went beyond elementary school.

The opposition has criticized the Government for not providing more vocational schools. But the Rhodesian experience has been one of apathy among Africans toward this kind of training; and what demand there was has tended to fall off in the past year. The Government nevertheless has pressed for longer periods of education, particularly in the secondary schools. It has organized correspondence courses and night schools. There are, again, no discriminatory practices against Africans, and all African students at the university are eligible for Government support. At the present time, those African students at the University of Rhodesia receiving scholarships, grants, and loans would not have qualified had purely academic standards been imposed. Instead, the school authorities have "discriminated" in their favor—hardly a sign that there is official reluctance to raise educational opportunities for Africans. Nor is it a sign of foot-dragging that the amount spent for African education doubled between 1963 and 1965—with the figure still rising—and that African pupil enrollment has tripled in the past 10 years, with approximately 700,000 students now attending school.

VII

Simultaneously, a strong effort—some of it governmental, and some private—is being made to raise the economic level of the African population by introducing better methods of working the land and by opening up new land for African use. Since 1920, farm and grazing land assigned for African occupation rose from 21.6 million acres to 44.3 million acres, whereas white acreage has been reduced by 12 million. There are 5.9 million acres open for sale to either whites or Africans—but African lands (for which no rent or purchase price is paid in the tribal areas) are protected from encroachment by the more prosperous white farmers. The opening up of increased acreage for African use has been a continuing process, to meet demands by the Africans themselves.

What is done with that land is another matter. The charge has been made that the farmland occupied by whites is much better than African land holdings. This, however, is not sustained by the facts. For example, a tract of "worked out" land was taken over by an agricultural school. On this presumably worthless "sandveld" proper farming methods have produced a high yield of corn—yet African farms in the same area have remained on a subsistence farming level. Soils in the African area roughly match the fertility of those in areas being farmed by whites. Studies have further shown that 37 percent of Rhodesia has a rainfall in excess of 28 inches—and half the African areas are within the preferred zone. The Government recognizes that it requires more than good soil and adequate rainfall to produce cash crops. Capital is necessary, and this is provided to African farmers in loans and grants.

At the same time, white farmers have banded together to help the African farmer increase his yield. They have provided seed, tractors, and instruction in agricultural know-how to those willing to join the program for a minimum period of 3 years. But they have run into what sociologists call a "high leisure preference" among Africans—as well as a tendency to retire from the economic contention once they have put aside enough money to provide subsistence for the immediate future. To counter these tendencies, the government and white businessmen have attempted to increase the level of consumer demand by stocking the shops with the kind of items which will be attractive to the wives of African farmers and to the farmers themselves—washing machines, radios, bicycles, etc. Whether this modified form of the Madison Avenue technique will provide the drive that Europeans and Americans take for granted is not yet susceptible of proof. But the fact remains that more and more African farmers are able to buy new farms in the unreserved areas, to pay substantial sums in cash for homes and farm equipment, and to derive incomes equal to or better than those of the white settlers.

It should be noted here that this previously steady development ran into trouble when the African nationalists began their campaign. An Englishman who has lived for some years in Rhodesia reported that "Agricultural agents would go to African farms to show how to improve the yield. Then the nationalists would follow and say, 'If you do that, we'll burn your house down.'" Since there were 35 "petrol bomb" raids a month before the Rhodesian Government clamped down, the effect on African farmers was considerable. The terror was not only physical, for many of the Africans still under tribal sway have not relinquished their belief in witchcraft and in the "power of the spirit." The nationalists invoked these beliefs and powers and would still be using them if the Government had not proved that it was impervious to nationalist magic.

VIII

That, in brief, is the Rhodesian picture. A stable Government, geared to the needs of a country in south-central Africa, commands the virtually unanimous support of the white population and the respect of a preponderance of the Africans. A sound and growing economy faces the threat of strangulation, but is moving energetically to adjust itself to new conditions. Should it fail, all of Africa will suffer. For the black people of Rhodesia, it would mean a return to the tribal wars which ended less than 70 years ago. It would mean the collapse of the economy as thousands of white farmers, businessmen, and technician either died in the convulsions of a forcible takeover or migrated to South Africa. Under those circumstances, the burnt-out case of Rhodesia would become another and more terrible Congo. Chaos would inundate order, and Africa would not fail to read the message that Western civilization had abdicated. The joint achievement of white and African in Rhodesia would go up in acrid smoke.

It would be comforting to assume that sanity will prevail, that the ideologized fury of Britain's Prime Minister Wilson would be recognized for what it is and not for the principled assault on racism that it claims to be. It would be pleasant to believe that, in American policy toward Rhodesia, facts will triumph over ideological commitments, leading to the withdrawal of this country from participation in the sanctions Britain has imposed; that knowledge will vanquish ignorance. It would be only human to hope that fanaticism over "majority rule" will bow to the realization that Rhodesia's 4 million Africans and 220,000 whites are not living in Chicago or Birmingham but are slowly evolving a sound and democratic compromise which will give the white minority a realistic chance of survival and the black majority an opportunity, almost unique in Africa, of achieving political and economic equality.

But these are not the reasons which lead to our conclusion, which is: that Rhodesia as now constituted will not be crushed by Mr. Wilson and the Labor Government of England. On the beautiful streets of Salisbury, there is a firm determination to stand up to whatever the British, the neighboring African states, and the United States can throw at them. There is a conviction that Rhodesia is pointing the way to the kind of Africa which can develop its tremendous resources for the good of all; that it can sustain a deepening democracy against the totalitarian forces which one by one have taken over the less fortunate nations of the continent. Firepower wins wars, but guns are sometimes loaded with more than bullets. The Rhodesians will feed themselves and find new markets for their goods, whatever the effort may temporarily do to the way of life they have created on the African yield. They are pledged to this without drama, without vainglory, without hatred. Unless the world goes mad, this spirit of resolution is better than firepower and stronger than economic sanctions. It alone can build the Rhodesia that is desired, and deserved, by all her peoples.

[Advertisement by the Rhodesian Information Office appearing in the New York Times, Oct. 31, 1965]

THE TRUTH ABOUT RHODESIAN INDEPENDENCE

WHAT IS RHODESIA?

Rhodesia is a country in transition between primitivism and modernity. Its advance toward a full parliamentary democracy can only be considered justly in the light of its brief history.

Rhodesia began to be settled by whites only 75 years ago. When the pioneers arrived shortly before the turn of the century they found an untamed land sparsely settled by tribes that had driven out the Bushmen whose original hunting grounds this had been. The last invaders to impose their will on the numerically superior Mashona and other tribes were the Matabele, who had made the countryside within raiding distance of Bulawayo their domain, only 37 years before the pioneers entered Mashonaland in accordance with a mandate granted by the British Government.

The early pioneers faced the same difficulties and endured the same hardships as the early American frontiersmen. They shared the same motivations—a spirit of adventure, a determination to make good and a desire to spread the values of western civilization in a pagan land. Largely by their industry and enterprise over 75 years a wilderness has been converted into one of the most highly developed and productive areas on the African continent. In contrast to America, where the indigenous population dwindled to slender numbers, the indigenous population of Rhodesia has multiplied tenfold since the turn of the century.

The black population amounted at that time to 400,000. With the advent of white settlement intertribal warfare was ended, the threat of famine receded and western medicine began to make ever-increasing inroads into the incidence of disease. Today there are 4 million blacks and their numbers are increasing by some 134,000 per year.

Understandably many of them, particularly the older generation, cling to a primitive and traditional way of life—a status recognized by special protective provisions in the Rhodesian constitution. The administration is making patient and strenuous efforts to improve their condition of life and to broaden their limited horizons. The task is great and the resources available for investment in social and economic betterment are small by comparison with the standards of the developed world.

Rhodesia has accepted the challenge of bridging the gulf between the stone age and the 20th century in the shortest time span that is humanly possible. This she accepts as her own responsibility. The goal is only attainable by the maintenance of those governmental, professional, industrial and technical standards that have put the western industrialized nations so far ahead in the pursuit of national prosperity.

ARE THERE RACIAL BARRIERS?

Rhodesians do not recognize any racial barriers to a man's accomplishments in any sphere of human activity.

What they do recognize is a necessity for a man to be properly qualified, be it as a doctor, lawyer, engineer, government official, artisan or whatever occupation in life he may have chosen. Only thus can society be protected from inexperience and incompetence. They consider—and for the same reason—that a voter should be qualified because inexperience and incompetence in voters expose the whole of society to damage.

From its earliest days Rhodesia has applied this principle to its political life, and voting rights have been extended on a nonracial basis to all its citizens as they satisfy certain minimum requirements of education, income or property ownership which are prescribed as tests of civic responsibility. This principle has yielded enviable results in terms of political stability and economic advance.

DOES THE NEW CONSTITUTION WORK?

Political institutions must keep pace with the aspirations of the people that they serve. In 1960 it was felt in Rhodesia that the time had come to refashion the country's constitution and this was done at a series of conferences with British participation and endorsement.

Three important points about this constitution tend to be forgotten—the initiative which brought it into being was taken by the Rhodesian Government; the constitutional conferences were attended by all political and racial groups; the group led by Mr. Joshua Nkomo, accompanied by his principal lieutenant of the day, Rev. Ndabaningi Sithole, was a contracting party to the agreement that was reached.

It is frequently asserted that Mr. Nkomo and his colleagues rejected the agreement. The truth is that at the time they claimed the credit for it. Foreign pressure was subsequently applied; Mr. Nkomo saw his leadership challenged and his funds in jeopardy. He capitulated and repudiated the agreement.

The nonracial character of Rhodesia's original constitution is preserved in the 1961 arrangements. The main body of the legislature—50 seats—continues to be elected on a nonracial franchise but, in addition, there is an arrangement whereby voters with much lower qualifications elect a group of 15 members. This special electorate is almost entirely black and therefore guarantees a minimum potential of 15 black seats. The same voters also exercise a qualified but significant influence in elections for the main group of 50 seats. If all black Rhodesians had taken up the voting rights that are available to them they could already have captured all the 15 special seats, plus a number of the 50 regular seats. They could also exercise such an influence on the remaining seats that a candidate would have little prospect of securing election without black support.

Moreover, the ratio of black/white voting influence must continuously shift in favour of black Rhodesians as more of them become eligible for voting rights through the spread of education and economic opportunity. Rhodesia is irrevocably committed to move progressively toward a completely democratic system of government on the western pattern. There are effective guarantees in the 1961 constitution for ensuring that this process cannot be reversed.

Why have black Rhodesians not taken advantage of the political opportunities available to them? The answer is partly apathy—a slow awakening of political consciousness, but primarily it is the savage power of boycott imposed by Nationalist strongarm gangs and supported by the ugly weapons of intimidation—muggings and the gasoline bomb in the middle of the night for nonconformists.

WHY THE BOYCOTT?

Because, although the 1961 constitution operates in the interests of black Rhodesians as a whole, nationalists recognized that for them as individuals it did not hold out the prospect of immediate personal power. It was the brutal intimidation of fellow blacks practiced by extremist organizations—the tyranny of the few over the many—that led Government to ban them and to rusticate their leaders.

What is likely to be the pace of black political advancement? This will depend very largely on black Rhodesians themselves but the following facts should serve to illustrate the efforts that are being made to equip them with voting qualifications.

HOW FAST IS EDUCATION PROGRESSING IN RHODESIA?

Ten years ago the Government set itself the following educational objectives: firstly to provide 5 years of primary schooling for all, to be followed as quickly as possible by a full range of universal primary education; overall to provide secondary education for as many as could benefit from it.

The first aim has been achieved. The second aim will be achieved by 1972, well before the 1980 target date proposed by UNESCO for Africa as a whole. As to secondary education, it is intended by 1973 to improve existing facilities to the extent of 173 new secondary schools. At that date there will be more black than white Rhodesians completing 4 years of high school education.

In 7 years Government's annual expenditure on education for black Rhodesians has trebled from $6.4 million to $18.1 million. It is the largest item in the range of services financed by Government.

The University College has always been fully integrated and there is exceptionally generous scholarship provisions for qualified black students.

These are not insubstantial achievements in a continent which has an illiteracy rate of over 80 percent. They are unquestionable proof of Rhodesia's determination to advance its black citizens.

DO RHODESIANS EARN ENOUGH?

Like most countries in Africa, Rhodesia is faced with the problem of finding employment for a population expanding at an exceedingly high rate. It is not easy to generate employment opportunities at the rate of population explosion. On the other hand, the more efficient training and use of labor has led to a marked rise in average wages.

The Rhodesian Government holds to the principles of free enterprise and private ownership. Its ability to influence wage levels is therefore limited.

However, industrial conciliation legislation embodies the principle of the "rate for the job" and makes discrimination on the grounds of race an offense. This applies to all workers in commerce and industry. Many black Rhodesians in employment are now in receipt of wages that are high by African continental standards and by the standards of poorer European countries.

The total number of blacks in employment is 654,000. Their average yearly wage has nearly doubled over the past 10 years. Rhodesia's gross national product has increased by 90 percent in the past decade. In 1964 it was $42 million higher than the 1963 total and a significant portion of this increase represents higher wages for black employees.

DEMOCRACY OR DICTATORSHIP?

It is the sincere conviction of Rhodesians, borne out by the evidence of many developments in Africa and Asia over the last few years, that democracy on the Western pattern can only thrive on the basis of a politically conscious and reasonably informed electorate. The hasty transfer of power to people unequipped to make intelligent and reasoned political choices has frequently led either to anarchy or to totalitarianism. It is fashionable in some quarters to accept the one with resignation and to justify the other on specious grounds which reflect little credit on the people who fall heirs to such a system. Rhodesians who have inherited the most refined political system that civilized man has evolved are not prepared to surrender it. They do not accept that the large mass of their black fellow citizens should be expected to forgo the best in Western political values any more than they should be expected to forgo the best in Western material values. The best is yet to come but most Rhodesians, black and white, believe that it will follow more surely for being laid on sound foundations.

RHODESIA HAS EARNED HER INDEPENDENCE

Rhodesia's claim to independence is frequently represented as a conspiracy on the part of white Rhodesians to perpetuate their political domination. From what has been said about the 1961 constitution, which is the basis on which Rhodesia claims her independence, this is demonstrably absurd. This constitution must lead to a black majority as inevitably as night follows day. Nor is it valid to claim, as many of Rhodesia's critics do, that white Rhodesians are only bidding for independence under the 1961 constitution in order to give themselves a point of vantage from which to erode black political

rights. If they held constitutional safeguards in such contempt why would there be so much difficulty in negotiating satisfactory independence terms? Rhodesia could spare herself a lot of political agony by agreeing to almost any terms with the cynical reservation that she could walk out on them once independence was achieved. Her determination to secure independence on terms that she can live with both now and in the future is surely the best test of her sincerity.

The independence claim is based on totally different considerations. Primarily, it is a demand for the recognition of 43 years of capable and responsible government since Rhodesia was granted full self-government early in 1923. During this period a territory the size of California has been developed into one of the most productive and economically advanced areas on the African continent with no foreign assistance; has dramatically improved the standards of living of all its peoples; has made a major contribution to the defense of Western values in peace and war; has faithfully met its international obligations and in all respects demonstrated its capacity for good and efficient government. Rhodesia has a proud record of accomplishment. In a world in which it sees a number of small nonviable states being admitted as full members in the comity of nations Rhodesia believes it has waited long enough in the anteroom of full sovereignty.

Rhodesia offers to the United States:

1. Her friendship.
2. Total and unqualified alinement in any confrontation with the Communist world.
3. A strong and determined bulwark against Communist penetration in Africa.
4. A self-sustaining economy and, therefore, a relief from the burden of aid to underdeveloped countries.
5. A profitable area for investment with one of the best developed economic infrastructures in Africa.
6. An expanding market for American exports.

Rhodesia seeks from the United States:

1. Her friendship.
2. Her sympathetic understanding of the problems involved in perpetuating the values of western culture in Africa.
3. Support for the U.N. Charter principle of noninterference in the domestic affairs of nations.
4. Trading opportunities on a regular commercial basis.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Oct. 5, 1964]

NATIVES PREY ON NATIVES IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA

(By Robert C. Ruark)

SALISBURY, SOUTHERN RHODESIA.—The topic here is terrorism, in short—intimidation, irresponsibility, sabotage, and a concerted effort by outside powers to inflame and create chaos. The pawns are wild, unemployed young men—youth wings, so to speak—who are spurred to violence and mass insurrection by skillful drill masters of social discontent.

The violence is only occasionally directed against the whites. The real violence is aimed at the destruction of the good things the white man has wrought—an attempt to destroy a black bourgeois class if it means peaceful coexistence with the white man to the mutual profit of both black and white.

SCHOOLS BURNT

In a span of a year and a half, some 50-odd native schools have been burnt down by youthful mobs, young roughnecks out for excitement in the name of God knows what. The modern young African thirsts for knowledge, and in the past few weeks mobs have beaten up small children on their way to education to such an extent that the schools had to be closed. Some are just reopening, but attendance is low.

In Zimunia Township a 500-unit modern housing development was built, with some such ridiculous rental as 10 shillings a month. It was irrigated, at Government expense, and the toughs came down and smashed all the irrigation pipes.

They've just declared a state of emergency in Southern Rhodesia in a largely native sector called Highfield. There were 14 separate states of emergency declared here last year to put down mob scenes by the youth wingers. Riot acts are twice read, but there is no gunplay by the called up reservists, who are always accompanied by native policemen who actually make the arrests.

BOMBS

Yet gasoline bombs, stones, sticks, any weapons at all are used by the defiant mobs, members of which have been known to spit in the faces of shock troops.

A favorite form of intimidation is to burn the houses and fields of African small farmers; to maim cattle; and always to beat up, violently, the subject of the intimidation. An African with a small hotel may find it smashed and looted, or simply burned to the ground.

The object, of course, is to mark, clearly, the penalty of getting along with the white man, and to destroy the greatest enemy of collectivism: Successful private enterprise.

But the implementers of the havoc, like the mobs in America, merely go along for the ride, reveling in the license to steal, pay off old grudges, and the exercise of sheer crowd hysteria.

The really emerging native finds himself penalized by his own people—hampered in education and agriculture and in civil rights. The sum is that the whites, who have been willing to bend, are now again tightening into a hard core. The end of this is what is called white uhuru here—a refusal to hand over the country on a one-man, one-vote basis because of intimidation.

TRUST LAND

From the outside, to one who does not know Africa, some of the actions of the white settlers may be thought harsh. But in light of the fact that half the country of Southern Rhodesia is tribal trust land, occupied by natives who do not crave immediate pants and privileges, and that the city spivs are making war on their own kind, there might be something to be said for a refusal to hand over a gracious land to a bunch of connivers at the top and strong-arm gangsters at the bottom.

That is the basic explanation of Southern Rhodesia's threat to declare its own uhuru, even if it means chopping off Mama England's apron strings.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 13, 1965]

A SIGNIFICANT VOTE IN THE U.N.

(By David Lawrence)

An event of tremendous significance has just occurred in the United Nations. By a vote of 107 to 2, the General Assembly has called on Britain to refuse to accept a declaration of independence by Rhodesia, because the latter's present government will not grant a majority of the inhabitants self-rule but will continue to give a white minority the preponderant power.

While there is a widespread feeling that the black man in Africa should have his rights, the incident raises the question of why the same principle shouldn't be applied to the people of other countries where a white majority have been and still are being denied the right to rule themselves.

Thus, for example, the populations of Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are overwhelmingly white, but their independence is impaired by an outside power which holds them in subjugation under "Communist colonialism."

The fact that the General Assembly of the United Nations now is insisting on self-government for different nations throughout the world which have been ruled by outside powers is an encouraging sign. The captive nations in Eastern Europe, however, have never had the benefit of a United Nations resolution declaring that they should enjoy independence and be allowed to develop autonomously without interference from other governments. Certainly the United Nations has never advocated the use of "all possible force" to deal with this problem, as it has just recommended with respect to Rhodesia.

In the case of the satellite countries in Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union supposedly gave independence to this bloc of nations but nevertheless has managed to retain control through the apparatus of the Communist Party and often with military forces. The Russians try to spread the impression every now and then that these Eastern European countries are independent and can make trade arrangements with other parts of the world. But the fact remains that they do not really have self-government.

So any pronouncement by the United Nations today with respect to the right of self-government for the people of Rhodesia, the majority of whom happen to be black, could be taken to mean that the world's biggest international organization may soon express itself in favor of the principle of self-government for white people who have come under the yoke of the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe.

It is significant that the United States voted for the resolution to hold up the grant of independence to Rhodesia by Britain, and in a friendly understanding with the British Foreign Office has undertaken to work in harmony with the authorities there. Pressure is to be brought to bear on the Rhodesian whites to prevent them from becoming independent under a government which, it is argued, wouldn't reflect the will of the majority of the people. There are nearly 4 million tribesmen, mostly uneducated, and 250,000 whites possessing skills of various kinds.

The State Department here has indicated it will participate in economic sanctions whereby trade would be cut off and aid of various kinds would be interrupted if the Rhodesian leaders insist upon separating themselves from the British and going it alone.

But, it will be asked, just why shouldn't Britain and other countries be willing to apply the same formula to Red China? For the Peiping regime has undertaken to prevent a majority of the people in South Vietnam from maintaining their independence.

The United Nations has, in effect, approved all measures of economic or military force that may be necessary to insure the independence of Rhodesia under a government chosen by a majority of its people. This gives hope that in the future perhaps the same concern will be felt and similar measures adopted to insure the right of the majority of the people of Vietnam to govern themselves without interference by a minority aided by Red China or the Soviet Union or any other country. Someday, too, perhaps the peoples of Eastern Europe will be helped by the United Nations to regain the independence they once enjoyed.

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE FOR RHODESIA? WHY NOT FOR ALL COMMUNIST STATES?

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

If Prime Minister Ian Smith of Southern Rhodesia carries out his threat to declare his country independent, he is going to compel the Labor Government in London to put

up or shut up. London will accept no independence that excludes the blacks, almost 12 times as numerous as the whites, from the vote. Smith knows that giving universal suffrage to a people totally unprepared for democracy would result in the killing or expulsion of the whites, the expropriation of their property, and the probable emergence of a new Ghana, half-fascist, half-Communist.

Rather than have this, Smith says, he and the other whites prefer to "go out fighting rather than crawling on our hands and knees."

Smith knows, as I reported from London last June, that Prime Minister Wilson dare not send white Britishers to shoot down white Rhodesians: men and perhaps officers, as well, would refuse. Economic sanctions by Britain alone would have little effect on *white Rhodesians* and might cause other African states to withdraw from the Commonwealth.

Apparently, Wilson is not alone. U Thant, the champion of enforced desegregation everywhere, believes the matter will come before the U.N. Security Council, possibly before these lines are printed. What can the Security Council do?

Send a "police force"—Indians, Ghanians, Yugoslavs—to impose desegregation? That would not be too easy. It was one thing for Dag Hammarskjold to send an Indian-commanded brigade to overcome Tshombe's Belgian mercenaries. It will be quite another to overcome white Rhodesians who feel they have their backs to the wall and no place else to go.

UNITED STATES WOULD FOLLOW THE LEADER

To be sure, just as Hammarskjold then, so U Thant now, would have the support of the United States. Last Friday, Mrs. Eugenie Anderson, representing the United States before the General Assembly's Trusteeship Committee, promised that the United Stats will "take the necessary concrete steps in concert with others" against an "illegal, unilateral declaration of independence" by Smith.

This is to me an astonishing position. It would have precluded the Declaration of Independence by the Founding Fathers in 1776. It would have prevented any number of similar acts since, in most cases, independence was the work of small minorities which, frequently failed to establish democratic regimes.

But Rhodesia, according to Mrs. Anderson and U Thant, is different. And the times have changed. In Rhodesia a small white minority intends to disenfranchise a black majority. Any such action may provoke other neighboring blacks to attack that country, and perhaps causing the whites of South Africa to come to its defense, thus possibly sparking a world war.

AMERICAN POSITION UNTENABLE

Both positions by an American administration are, in my eyes, untenable. I happen to deplore racial segregation and wars, of which I have witnessed five. But legally I see no difference between a 13th of the population ruling Rhodesia and less than that fraction ruling the Soviet Union, Red China, all the other Communist states, Egypt, and Indonesia (at least until last week), etc.

The same holds for the argument against "colonialism" which the irresponsible majority of U.N. members have made their sole criterion. If overseas colonies are bad, then so are the Soviets' internal colonies (comprising almost half of the total population), so is Red China's tyranny over Tibet and parts of Mongolia; so are Kenya's and Ethiopia's suppression of alien Somalis.

Why is the United Nations doing nothing about these situations? Why does it pick only on Rhodesia and, if it dared, on South Africa?

Color is not and cannot be made a binding touchstone in a world of law. Nor can the fear of local war "escalating" into major war. If the United States has, as I firmly believe, the right to wage war to liberate South Vietnam, Pakistan can do the same to liberate the Moslem Kashmiris—or at least to give them the right of self-determination.

Anything less is either an unprincipled bid for the favor of the nonwhite countries, rank hypocrisy or legal confusion which at some point can rebound against us. Oppression is oppression wherever it occurs.

If L.B.J. gets the full facts about Rhodesia, he will, I hope, decide that the independence of Rhodesia is strictly a matter for that country and for Britain. And let the anticolonialists in the United Nations squeal to their hearts' content.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Nov. 4, 1965]

BREATHING SPACE IN RHODESIAN CRISIS

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

A great many friends of Rhodesia, and friends of Britain as well, breathed a collective sigh of relief this past weekend when agreement was reached on the appointment of a royal commission to wet down the whole flaming issue of Rhodesian independence. This is not a guarantee of solution, but in the classic British tradition, it is a reasonable facsimile thereof; and it will give both sides a needed opportunity to let tempers cool off.

It is perhaps an oversimplification to say that all the merit is on the side of Rhodesia and all the power is on the side of Britain, but in the end it boils down to that. To his everlasting credit, Britain's Prime Minister Harold Wilson has rebuked the hotheads who were urging him to send in troops to quell incipient revolution. This is the least of the powers in Wilson's armamentarium; it could not possibly be invoked without inviting his own ruin. For the present, he has the force of a trumped-up world opinion, which may not amount to much in a showdown; and for the future, he has the threat of economic sanctions, which in the case of Rhodesia could well amount to a great deal.

Rhodesia is enormously dependent not only upon her tobacco exports, but also upon exports of asbestos, pig iron, copper, and meat. She exports gold, coal, groundnuts, chrome ore, raw sugar. And while a large part of this trade is with friendly South Africa, a much larger part depends for its existence upon access to markets—especially Commonwealth markets—in the rest of the world. Rhodesia lacks the self-sufficiency and diversification of South Africa; she desperately needs a continued inflow of foreign capital.

Yet it is a truism that might is not always right, and in seeking her independence, Rhodesia has every conceivable right on her side. Seventy years ago, Cecil J. Rhodes found in the Sabi-Limpopo region nothing but primitive jungle, riddled by disease, inhabited by tribes that scarcely had advanced from the Stone Age. Today the Sabi-Limpopo Irrigation Authority dramatically illustrates the fantastic story of modern Rhodesia. Thanks to the vision, industry, capital, and genius of the white settlers, a sturdy and prosperous nation has been brought into being—a nation that has the characteristics of nationhood in ways that Rwanda, Burundi, Gambia, and the Congo simply do not.

Who is it that opposes independence for Rhodesia? It is the same gaggle of professional liberals, hooked on the narcotic of instant equality, whose idiot chant of "one man, one vote" threw the Congo into chaos. These are the knee jerk opponents of colonialism—of Western colonialism, that is.

The several months required for the royal commission's study should provide time for the leaders of Rhodesia, out of a decent respect to the opinions of mankind, to declare more persuasively the causes that impel them to the separation.

In this interim period, perhaps it can be made clear that the Rhodesian constitution, coupled with the Rhodesian program of public education, must inevitably bring political power to the country's 4 million blacks. It can be made evident that within Rhodesia itself, opposition to independence comes largely from a handful of self-seeking black nationalist leaders, whose object is not peace and prosperity, but personal power.

If any people in the world should view the aspirations of Rhodesia sympathetically, surely it is the American people. When our Founding Fathers spoke for government by the consent of the governed, they were not speaking of the consent of illiterate Negro slaves and pagan Indian tribes. Their purpose was to provide new guards for their own future security, and toward that end they pledged to each other their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. Theirs was the last unilateral declaration of independence within the British Empire, dated at Philadelphia July 4, 1776. We forget it today to our shame.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Nov. 24, 1965]

SILENCE ON RHODESIA INEXPLICABLE

(By David Lawrence)

Unprecedented things are happening today in the conduct of the Government of the United States—but most people aren't paying any attention to it, and representatives of both parties in Congress are strangely silent.

Nowhere in the Constitution, for instance, is the President given the right to decide for himself with what countries trade shall be conducted or what tariff duties shall be imposed—unless Congress specifically authorizes such broad powers by legislation.

Yet, over the past weekend, the United States voted in the Security Council of the United Nations to call on Britain to "quell" the rebellion in Rhodesia. Then Ambassador Arthur Goldberg announced various economic measures decided upon by this Government to carry out the purposes of the resolution. He declared that steps will be taken to tighten the economic squeeze on the Rhodesian secessionists and said that President Johnson had canceled Rhodesia's 1965 sugar-import quota of 9,500 tons—a shipment which already was on the high seas en route to America. Goldberg added:

"The President has suspended Rhodesia's sugar quota for 1965 and has directed that this shipment will not be accepted. We will continue to consider urgently any other steps which will insure that no action is taken to assist the illegal regime in Salisbury, Rhodesia. The writing is on the wall. The misguided rebels in Southern Rhodesia would do well to heed the voice of the Council and the voice of the vast majority of the nations of the world."

But coincidentally American boys are being killed or wounded in South Vietnam as a result of attacks by the troops of the North Vietnamese Government—a regime that is obtaining supplies and commodities through trading with many nations of the world. But nothing is being done here to cut off trade between the United States and such countries.

Also significant is the failure of the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to voice any criticism about the interference in Rhodesia's internal affairs such as he expressed about the use of U.S. forces during a rebellion in the Dominican Republic. Not only was the action of Johnson then denounced as an improper interference with the right of a people to determine their own kind of government, but it was argued that the United States had no business interfering with a revolution organized by the

people. In the case of the Dominican Republic, of course, there was a violation of the Monroe Doctrine as well as a threat by Communists to take possession of the government. But no such circumstances or precedents of international law are involved in Rhodesia.

If the principle is accepted that the executive branch has absolute power in international affairs—despite the plain words of the Constitution that Congress shall have the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations"—then the United States will again and again find itself in a awkward position with respect to policies pursued internally by various countries in the world. The economic weapon can be a powerful one, and Congress unquestionably would grant authority when an embargo would protect directly the interests of the United States. It is unlikely, however, that authorization would be given to pass judgment upon the internal policies of any country and to set up yardsticks to determine whether any government is or is not truly representative of the wishes of the people.

In the case of Rhodesia, Washington is doubtless motivated by a desire to please the British Government. But even more it seeks to curry favor with the large number of Negro voters in this country whose prejudices are easily aroused by the statement that Negroes in Rhodesia are being victimized by a white minority. In Rhodesia itself, however, there are many Negroes who feel that the future economic welfare of their country is linked to the opportunities of the whites to direct the development of the nation's resources.

The truth of the matter is that the Rhodesian question is being handled here as a political issue. Fear of the Negro vote in this country is what is influencing not only the executive branch of the Government but also many Members of Congress who are keeping quiet as Washington tries to tell the people of another country what kind of government they must have. To use the economic power of the United States to meddle in the political affairs of a country in another hemisphere is unprecedented. The acquiescence of many people in a policy which reveals an avowed purpose to intervene in the internal affairs of Rhodesia is inexplicable.

RHODESIA CHALLENGES FORCES OF WORLD REVOLUTION

(By Eric D. Butler)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. Butler, Australian correspondent of the Canadian Intelligence Service is an internationally known writer and author, and one of the world's leading authorities on the world revolutionary movement. The following article is excerpted from the February Bulletin of the Canadian Intelligence Service.)

When the true history of our times comes to be written, it will be recorded that on November 1, 1965, Prime Minister Ian Smith, of Rhodesia, speaking for a handful of Europeans determined to uphold civilized values and to discharge their responsibilities toward their African brothers, struck a massive blow against the forces of world revolution. By their courageous stand, the Rhodesians have precipitated an international campaign which clearly reveals the nature of the conspiracy against civilization. At a time when Western leaders in London and Washington are allegedly engaged in directing a campaign of resistance against Communist criminals in Moscow and Peiping, they are in fact uniting with those same criminals in pursuit of the common objective of destroying the Smith government.

The tragic plight of a brainwashed world has never been more graphically demonstrated than by the international campaign against Rhodesia. Both Moscow and Pieping are devoting every effort to a total war—military, political, economic, and psychological—designed to produce a world Communist state. But the leaders of the non-Communist world solemnly proclaim that just over 200,000 Europeans in Rhodesia, threatening no one, upholding a rule of law which protects both European and African, are such a "threat to world peace" that every effort must be made to destroy them. In the "United" Nations, only two nations, South Africa and Portugal, declined to ally themselves with the call to "crush Rhodesia."

British Socialist Prime Minister Harold Wilson calls for the destruction of civilized government in Rhodesia, while advocating peaceful coexistence with the criminals of the Kremlin. Supporting him are the big international news agencies, responsible for what is called "world opinion," and powerful international financial groups.

It was significant that when Prime Minister Wilson blatantly stole Rhodesian financial reserves in London, and suspended the Governor and Directors of the Board of the Reserve Bank of Rhodesia, he replaced them with financiers who have long served revolutionary causes. The new chairman, Sir Sydney Caine, is director of the London School of Economics; while the merchant banker, S. G. Warburg, another member of Mr. Wilson's new bank board, has played a prominent role in attempting to destroy British sovereignty and institutions by forcing the United Kingdom into the European Economic Community.

AFRICA MAJOR COMMUNIST TARGET

The Rhodesian situation can only be realistically discussed against the background of Communist global strategy. Mr. Ian Smith is constantly stressing the fact that he and his fellows are attempting to hold the line for civilization in Africa against the threat of Congo-type reversions to barbarism which the Communists seek to exploit. The Communists have no interest in Africans except as the raw material of their revolutionary strategy. Africa is one of the Communists' most important strategical targets. We know this because they have been frank about their strategy. Following closely Lenin's teaching about conquering the Western nations through their colonies, and the development of this strategy by Stalin in his work on the "National Problem," the Communists have intensified their revolutionary activities in three major areas of the world: Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

A brilliant and authoritative exposition of current Communist strategy was provided by Mao Tse-tung's Minister of National Defense, Lin Piao, in an article in the Peiping Review of September 3, 1965, and subsequently republished in booklet form. After outlining Mao Tse-tung's theory of "the establishment of rural revolutionary base areas and the encirclement of the cities from the countryside," Lin Piao went on to observe: "Taking the entire globe, if North America and Western Europe can be called the cities of the world, then Asia, Africa, and Latin America constitute the rural areas of the world. Since World War II, the proletarian revolutionary movement has for various reasons been temporarily held back in the North American and West European capitalist countries, while the people's revolutionary movement in Asia, Africa, and Latin America has been growing vigorously. In a sense, the contemporary world revolution also presents a picture of the encirclement of cities by the rural areas. In the final analysis, the whole cause of world revolution hinges on the revolutionary struggles of the Asian, African, and Latin American peoples."

The Smith government in Rhodesia challenges this revolutionary strategy as applied in Africa. By so doing it has brought down the wrath of the whole international revolutionary movement on its head. But it is also acting as a type of catalyst, forcing people around the world to face the issues involved in the Rhodesian stand, and to take sides.

Rhodesia could be the turning point in the struggle against the forces of revolution. Mr. Ian Smith firmly believes this to be the case, thus proving that he is not only a great statesman, but a leader of vision.

[Communist Party statement on Rhodesia appearing in the Worker, Nov. 21, 1965]

COMMUNIST PARTY STATEMENT ON RHODESIA

(NOTE.—The following statement was issued Tuesday by the national office of the Communist Party.)

Neither racism nor minority rule has any right to lay claim to political independence in the modern world. That is the fundamental issue at stake in the announcement by the Ian Smith regime that it was separating South Rhodesia from the British Commonwealth.

What is involved is a desperate attempt of a small white exploiting class to perpetuate its state rule over 4 million African people in a country having less than one-quarter million white inhabitants. The so-called declaration of independence of South Rhodesia, therefore, bears more resemblance to the secessionist proclamation of southern U.S. slaveholders in 1860 than to the 1776 charter of liberty whose language is now cynically invoked.

Once again our government is being put to the test of its readiness to carry out in action its verbal commitments to the defense of democracy. Mere resolutions will not do. Nor will it suffice to join with Britain in meaningless or insignificant economic gestures toward white supremacist Rhodesia while continuing to extract mounting superprofits from business with this country and its apartheid neighbor, South Africa, which inspired and supports the racist dictatorship headed by Ian Smith.

No pious partnership between the past masters of colonialism in the British Government and the neocolonialist aggressors of the Johnson administration can evade the call for justice now raised in the chambers of the United Nations. The world has not forgot the speed with which Great Britain has resorted to force to impose its will against the people anywhere who challenge its domination, whether in Aden in the East or Guiana in the New World. Neither are they unaroused by the armed invasion of U.S. forces in the Dominican Republic or in Vietnam.

Nothing less than the removal from power of the racist usurpers will do. The vast majority of Rhodesian people, through such organizations as the Zimbabwe African People's Union and the Zimbabwe African Nationalist Union, have called upon the British Government to use force to stop the rebellion. Thirty-six African nations in the U.N., supported by many others, including all the socialist countries, have called upon the world organization to give its immediate and full support to such action.

The Communist Party of the U.S.A. joins with all other Americans who cherish freedom, equality, and national independence in calling upon the U.S. delegates in the United Nations to put aside all sham or delaying measures in dealing with Rhodesia's racist rulers and to give full support to the use of the full power of the U.N. to insure the freedom and independence of the Zimbabwe people.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Nov. 30, 1965]

IRONIES MOUNT ON RHODESIA ISSUE

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

And so the campaign continues against the independent Government of Rhodesia—

an ugly campaign, unreasoning, demagogic—and the ironies mount up.

In the United Nations, the air is filled with cries that the United Nations must not stand idly by while the rights of man are being violated in Rhodesia. Yet those who shed the largest tears stand dry-eyed as the rights of man are raped through the Eastern world.

By an overwhelming vote, the General Assembly calls for economic sanctions. To our own shame, Ambassador Arthur Goldberg joins the gang. Yet those who would close all ports to Rhodesian trade are strangely agreeable to other commerce—the commerce that feeds strategic goods to our enemies in Haiphong and Hanoi.

Our Government joins in a fervid resolution denouncing Rhodesia's independence as a threat to international peace. Not a scrap of reasoned argument supports this declaration, but one might as well try reasoned argument on a lynch mob. The sin of Ian Smith's regime is that the Rhodesian constitution fails to provide for the franchise in a fashion suitable to the tastes of Dahomey, Gabon, and Chad. To any objective eye, the shortcomings of Rhodesia's constitution would seem to be matters "essentially within the domestic jurisdiction" of that beleaguered country, and as such, beyond the reach of U.N. intervention under U.N. Charter. But the delegates from Dahomey, Gabon, and Chad—and from the United States—do not appear to have read that part of the U.N. Charter lately.

Life magazine is full of moral outrage. Think of it. Under the Smith government, "220,000 whites intend to maintain absolute domination over 4 million blacks, no matter what the cost." Yet the other side of this proposition is that 4 million blacks would maintain absolute domination over 220,000 whites, no matter what the cost—and the cost would be prodigious.

That is the heart of the issue. To the kindergarten mentalities whose intellectual capacity begins with one man and concludes with one vote, it sounds so plausible: Why shouldn't 4 million prevail over 220,000? As Edmund Burke observed 175 years ago, in reflecting upon the revolution in France, such an argument cannot be refuted if the constitution of a kingdom be a problem in arithmetic only. "This sort of discourse does well enough with the lamp post for its second," said Burke. "To men who may reason calmly, it is ridiculous."

The problem in Rhodesia is no mere exercise in sums on a schoolboy's slate. We are not dealing with weights in a scale or numbers on a chart. The object is the formation of government, the preservation of order, the defense of property, the management of public affairs, the regulation of commerce, the administration of law. Those who would deliver Rhodesia into the hands of the 4 million blacks, out of some obsessive lust for instant democracy, have whipped reason out of their temples. They fancy that all men are equal. It is not so; it has never been so.

Do we learn nothing from our history, our own laws, our own institutions? We do not send a boy with a jack-knife to operate upon a President, out of some delusion that competence runs with the edge on a blade. And by the same token, neither do we admit felons, morons, and mewling infants to the polls. Implicit in the franchise requirements of our own land is the sound rule that the vote should be confined, however roughly, to those of presumed virtue and wisdom. It was not until August 1920, just 45 years ago, that women were deemed the political equals of men.

Where, then, does the notion arise that the untutored blacks of Rhodesia are prepared for the heavy responsibilities it is proposed to put upon them? By what colossal impudence does the United States object to the composition of a distant parliament? It is none of our business to say that Rhodesia's franchise requirements, as to property and education, should be rewritten to the model of Kansas or New York. The government of Ian Smith is capable of governing; it is pledged to a continued program of public education and private employment that will lift the native population steadily toward a better life. If colonial status is to end, what more reasonably could be asked?

The answer of the egalitarians is that it is not enough that colonialism should end. "White supremacy" also must end. The demand has become a fetish, so wrapped in a fuzzy emotion that it provokes irrational reverence. In any government, some man, or men, or group must always be "supreme," for power must be vested ultimately in particular hands and minds. In Rhodesia today, by reason of their inheritance and their labor, the industrious whites who built the country have established their supremacy. If this be treason, they are entitled to a chance to make the most of it.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Dec. 21, 1965]

CUBA, RHODESIA, AND TRADING

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The Prime Minister of England marched into the rotunda of the British Embassy a little before 6 o'clock Friday evening, with a small safari of briefcase bearers striding along behind him. He had come to meet the press; and the press had Rhodesia on its mind.

"Since the beginning of the Rhodesia crisis a month ago," the first questioner recalled, "the U.S. Government has cooperated fully with you in the imposition of economic sanctions against Rhodesia. What would be your position, sir, on a reconsideration of Britain's willingness to ship buses and other British commodities to Communist Cuba?"

Above his red tie, the Prime Minister's face turned a little pink; his cold blue eyes frosted over. It was a strawberry parfait effect.

"There is no parallel," snapped the Prime Minister of England. The Ian Smith government, he explained, is an "illegal" government. It is a part of the British Commonwealth in a way that Cuba was never a part of the United States. He could find nothing analogous in the two situations.

It was not the time or place for a newspaperman to argue with the operating head of Her Majesty's Government. Yet if the occasion had permitted, it would have been a fascinating business to pursue the matter with Harold Wilson. The longer the Rhodesian story continues, the more it emphasizes the double or triple or quadruple standards of political morality that prevail among the nations of the world.

Consider, if you please, the matter of Cuba. It is passing strange, merely to touch upon one point, that Wilson should have chosen to disprove a parallel by first emphasizing the "illegal" nature of the Smith regime. One has difficulty in recalling when Fidel Castro was elected to anything. Nor is one especially impressed by Wilson's denunciation (in his speech to Commons on December 10) of the "police state methods" instituted by Smith at Salisbury. No measures taken in Rhodesia since November 11 could compare with the oppressions and confiscations imposed by Castro in Cuba.

Yet there is much more. It was the official position of our own Government, long before that historic October of 1962, that Castro's Cuba presented a formidable threat to international security. As far back as May 1961, the House voted 401 to 2 to declare Cuba "a base and staging area for Communist subversion throughout the hemisphere." In the spring of 1962, Kennedy proclaimed a renewed embargo on U.S. trade with Cuba, and called upon our NATO allies to support our position.

Our good friends in England could not have cared less about assisting the United States in the enforcement of sanctions thought vital to U.S. interests. Over the first 8 months of 1962, 432 non-Communist ships carried Communist cargoes to Cuba; the Greeks were first, with 97 of these; the British ranked second, with 77.

In the fall of 1962 came the great confrontation, when the missiles were discovered and the world held its breath. Kennedy once more begged the British to clamp down on trade with Castro. On October 11, 1962, British shipowners voted unanimously to refuse.

Throughout this period, British tankers carried oil to Cuba. Canada sold wheat to Cuba by the millions of bushels. In the summer of 1963, Kennedy asked Britain to ban trade and travel to Cuba; Britain refused. In February 1964 the effects of continued British trade with Castro were so serious that the United States temporarily suspended military aid to Britain.

But hi, ho, parallels run awry. The U.S. Government supports Britain's sanctions against Rhodesia to the hilt—private contracts cancelled, export restrictions imposed, funds frozen. And now, as the Prime Minister told the press conference, it is anticipated that U.S. planes will assist in an airlift of oil to Zambia.

The sole ambition of Ian Smith appears to be to cling to an island of Western stability in a flood of African nationalism. It would not seem an unworthy ambition. But our Government will join the gang in seeking to pull him loose. We will "crush" him; we will "bring him to heel." And, meanwhile, our good friends of the West continue to trade not only with Castro in Cuba but also with Ho Chi Minh in North Vietnam. In the world of presidents and prime ministers, one concludes, the theorems of geometry seldom apply; and parallel lines proceed elliptically instead.

JOHNSON'S RHODESIA BAN SAID TO BE UNCONSTITUTIONAL

(By Lyle Wilson)

It does seem to be a fact that President Johnson stumbled over the U.S. Constitution when he undertook to interrupt commerce between the United States and newly independent Rhodesia in Africa.

There is not much if any constitutional or other authority for the President of the United States to undertake the regulation of foreign commerce. Article 1, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution asserts in language both plain and vigorous that: "The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

The Constitution does authorize the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties with foreign nations. By treaty, the President often is authorized to negotiate commerce arrangements with foreign powers. No such treaty seems to apply precisely to the situation in Rhodesia which was a British colony until some months ago when the Rhodesian Government proclaimed its independence.

Representative H. R. GROSS, Republican, of Iowa, last month reminded the House of Representatives of a law which would appear to forbid the President to boycott Rhodesian trade. GROSS recalled that last summer the Congress amended the 1949 Export Control Act. Among the amendments was the following provision: "The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States (a) to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States and (b) to encourage and request domestic concerns * * * to refuse to take any action * * * which has the effect of furthering or sup-

porting the restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any foreign country against another country friendly to the United States."

L.B.J.'s instant support of the British boycott against Rhodesia is in contrast to the British refusal to support the U.S. boycott of trade with Communist Cuba and with North Vietnam. The British Government does support the American war in southeast Asia but the support is tendered in words whereas support in substantial deeds is withheld.

It is quite possible, of course, that global considerations dictate U.S. support of the British boycott against Rhodesia but that would not automatically make it constitutional.

A recent news dispatch from Salisbury, Rhodesia, reported that the British were fudging on their own boycott. A British waiver of boycott restrictions was said to have enabled British concerns to import scarce chrome ore from Rhodesia after American firms had begun to boycott the Rhodesia ore. Chrome is scarce. Alternate supplies for the United States are in Turkey and the Soviet Union. But Turkey was reported to be unable to step up production to meet U.S. needs before August of next year.

Out of the Johnson administration action against trade with Rhodesia, arises need for two inquiries:

One by L.B.J. to determine the facts relating to chrome ore and a second by Congress to establish under what authority, if any, the President undertook to regulate U.S. commerce with Rhodesia. If no authority can be shown, the attempted regulation should cease.

[From an editorial, National Review Bulletin, Dec. 21, 1965]

WHAT FOR RHODESIA?—AN AMERICAN VIEW OF THE RHODESIAN CRISIS

To withdraw the U.S. consular representative from Salisbury was clearly within the Government's legal province, and perhaps appropriate to the wish of our closest ally. But to cancel the contracted enterprises of private citizens (as in the case of the 9,500 tons of Rhodesian sugar in transit to a U.S. buyer), to seize bank deposits, to prohibit commercial and financial undertakings between U.S. citizens and Rhodesians white or black? Under what law exactly, under what provision of the Constitution, does the President decree such measures?

Oh well, United States-Rhodesian trade doesn't amount to a damn anyway, so what's the sweat—at most, our actions have a "symbolic significance." Indeed they do have a symbolic significance, and we will do well to try to understand just what they symbolize. Besides being symbol, moreover, they are, or become, precedent. Is this a precedent we really want to see established—that the President, without reference to law, to Congress, or the courts, can on the single basis of his own reading of events, order us to break our contracts and tell us with whom we may or may not do business?

It seems especially odd when you look at it this way: At exactly this same moment that our Government joins to try to throttle the lifeblood out of the Rhodesian economy, it is moving on many fronts to try to expand our trade with the Soviet Union and the other Communist nations of Eastern Europe. Does this mean an official estimate that Ian Smith is a greater potentia. threat to our security and interests than Kosygin and his comrades? It is hard to see how otherwise the disparity in policy can make sense. Still odder is the asymmetry stressed by Barry Goldwater in a recent column. To Britain's call for a boycott of Rhodesia we give a prompt and positive response. To our 4-year continuing appeal to friends and allies for a partial boycott of Castro's Cuba, the response is nyet in every language.

But oddest of all is the fact that our Government has never even asked for a boycott, of any sort, of North Vietnam. Not merely Communist ships, but hundreds—literally hundreds, as Representative PAUL ROGERS of Florida has annotated—of free world ships are delivering cargoes, of free world as well as Communist origin, to Ho Chi-Minh. We boycot Ian Smith. We do not boycott Ho. Try that pair out on one of those logic machines the stores are offering.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Dec. 27, 1965]

WHAT'S RHODESIA ALL ABOUT?

(By David Lawrence)

What's Rhodesia all about? Why should anybody in the United States worry about events in that country in central Africa? Can the realistic situation be summed up and simplified so that the average American can understand it?

This correspondent has just received from an American businessman a letter that had come to him from a well-informed man of financial and business background in Rhodesia, who penned it primarily for the eyes of his close friend in the United States. It reads as follows:

"Having sold my business interests in Britain, I came here with my wife and two children in 1958. At that time there were three territories—namely, Rhodesia, Zambia, and Malawi—federated in one unit under the British Government.

"It was the fact of this single economic unit of 9 million people which attracted a great deal of business at that time, and the potential was very vast. The Federal Parliament was led by Sir Roy Welensky, and the economic and social progress during the years of its existence was remarkable.

"Unfortunately the spirit of African nationalism which demanded immediate power became rampant, and in the face of nationalist demands the British government broke up this federal unit and returned all the territories to their constituent parts.

"The most advanced territory in every respect was that of Rhodesia, and it had enjoyed internal self-government since 1925 and was a remarkably well-managed country. The Parliament consisted of 50 European members and 15 African members who were elected entirely on a nonracial basis and on a qualitative franchise.

"That is to say, the principle of 'one man, one vote' did not apply, but individuals of all races could obtain their vote by showing that they had some measure of educational or property qualification. In the case of what are known as the 'B roll' voters, these qualifications were minimal and resulted in 15 African seats in Parliament.

"Over a number of years, however, it was predictable that the African representation would increase as more of them qualified for the vote, and in anything between 10 and 15 years the control of government would pass into black hands.

"I have no doubt whatsoever that the principle of 'one man, one vote' is totally opposed to the interests of the people—and I mean all the people—of Rhodesia. There is no doubt that this country is today what it is as a result of the initiative, skill and capital of the white man. He is prepared to accept the African in government over a period as he becomes qualified to govern, but not to hand over instantly.

"Just to complicate the position further the African nationalists, who agreed to all these arrangements being put into force, later went back on their word and resorted to methods of intimidation, thuggery and violence in order to place themselves in power without delay.

"While the British Government granted complete national independence to the two less-developed territories of the former federation, they refused to grant independence to Rhodesia in view of the majority government of the white electorate which would not disappear until a number of years had elapsed. I consider that this was a grave injustice and, although our leaders tried to negotiate independence and offered guarantees that the constitution which would result in African rule in a number of years would be respected, these negotiations failed.

"Our Cabinet decided that it could no longer recognize the colonial aspect of British Government rule over this territory and declared the country to be independent.

"There is no doubt that this country could exist and take its place as an honorable member of the nations of the world if it were left to itself. But the British and American Governments have put their heads together to destroy Rhodesia. I hate this because if it were not for the action of the British and American Governments the other nations in the world would be powerless and most of them would accept Rhodesia in a short time as a national entity.

"It seems to me the utmost folly that this damaging policy should be pursued. There is an international effort being made to ruin this peaceful and delightful country which has been well governed for many years and which is a threat to no other nation in the world. It is, in fact, one of the best bastions against communism in Central Africa, and we cannot understand why America fights against communism in Vietnam but is doing everything possible to ruin the opponents of communism in Central Africa.

"We sincerely believe this policy is not only misguided but completely wrong in its conception. For those who live in the vicinity of the Congo and know what happens when a civilized economy is completely disrupted and savagery takes control, it is appalling to think of the policies which are being adopted against us at the present time."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 27, 1966]

THE DESPERATELY DETERMINED RHODESIANS

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Three and a half months have now elapsed since Ian Smith set his pen to an awkward paraphrase of Jefferson's Declaration of Independence and thus asserted Rhodesia's status as a free and independent nation. Since then the ironies, the inconsistencies, the illegalities, and the hardships have mounted—but Rhodesia goes on. And if his besieged government can make it past this spring and summer, Mr. Smith may have survived his own Valley Forge.

The Rhodesians one interviews here in Washington are an attractive group of men, as men of well-born British background generally are. They exude the same tweed-and-leather charm, the same civilized urbanity that one finds at the British Embassy, but there is a subtle difference. The Rhodesians somehow bespeak a certain hardness of the hands and of the spirit. They have embarked upon a desperate struggle to preserve a way of life that seems to them right and wise and realistic; and they are desperately determined to succeed.

In their private conversations, they go as far in confessing resentment at America's policies—or more precisely, at Lyndon Johnson's policies—as the courtesies of the situation permit. How ironic it is, they remark, that the President willingly joins Britain in sanctions against Rhodesia, while Britain cooly refuses to join the United States in sanctions against Cuba. How remarkable that the United States continues to dwell in such amity with Communist Russia and her satellites, where free elections are a travesty, and yet insists upon "one man, one vote" for Rhodesia.

They have read the U.S. Constitution, and they understand that the President has broad powers in foreign affairs. But they raise the same valid question that Iowa's Representative GROSS raised in the House a few days ago: Does not the Constitution vest in the Congress alone the regulation of commerce with foreign nations? And if this is so, by what authority may the President, on his own, impose sweeping restrictions upon private contracts for import-export trade in lawful goods? In the language of the Export Control Act of 1949, Rhodesia assuredly is a country friendly to the United States. Why, then, is it singled out for boycott and sanction?

The Rhodesian guests have other grievances that rankle. If one is to talk of racial policies (and the issue scarcely can be avoided), is not the position of the United States wholly inconsistent with past history and present reality? A century ago, they observe, the newly freed American slaves were by no means ready for intelligent exercise of the franchise, and this truth was plainly understood even by the framers of the 15th amendment. A hundred years have passed, and countless Negroes remain illiterate and apathetic, even though the civilizing benefits of a democratic society have existed all around them. By what stroke of the imagination is it conceived that the African tribes of Rhodesia are now equipped for the sovereignty it is proposed to thrust upon them?

In plain point of fact, our visitor insists, Rhodesia has gone much farther and much faster than the United States, at comparable periods, in the assimilation of the blacks into a political and economic structure created by the capital and know-how of the white. Fifteen seats in the Rhodesian Parliament are held by African voters. Easy communication prevails between black and white. Educational levels edge steadily upward. So do income levels. And race relations are tranquil. Can Harlem say the same? Or Birmingham? Or Los Angeles?

What of the double standards applied by the United States A month ago, the Nigerian Government fell to a military coup, and for the time being at least, civil liberties have been extinguished in Nigeria. Similarly, in Uganda, Prime Minister Milton Obote has seized apparently dictatorial povers and arrested five members of his cabinet. It is a reasonable assumption that civil liberties have gone down the drain in Uganda also. Yet the Liberal commentators and politicians who have wailed so loudly over press censorship in Rhodesia will have little or nothing to say of much grosser abuses of Western ideals elsewhere in Africa.

Are the sanctions hurting? Yes, our visitors admit. The time is almost at hand for Rhodesia's tobacco markets to open, and no one wants to predict how much of the immensely valuable crop will be sold—to whom, or at what prices. If the government is compelled to buy up most of the crop at a fixed minimum, both black man and white man will suffer grave hardship. Meanwhile, reserves of gasoline and oil are dwindling, and unemployment is increasing in business dependent upon export or import trade.

Yet the tough Rhodesians are accustomed to hardship, and they are remarkably united. George III had some loyal supporters in Boston 190 years ago, and Harold Wilson has some loyal supporters in Salisbury today. But they are relatively much fewer now than then.

"You made it with your revolution," says a Rhodesian spokesman. "And we'll make it with ours."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 15, 1966]

THE GREAT RHODESIAN CONSPIRACY UNMASKED

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The downtown Washington chapter of the great Rhodesian conspiracy convened for lunch a few days ago, in order to take stock of the situation and to drink appropriate toasts to the Queen, to independence, and to Soapy Williams.

In the nature of things, this being a proper conspiracy, it is impossible for your correspondent to disclose everything that was said. Neither is it advisable to identify the restaurant where we met, though it was down near the Willard, its walls were a horrid magenta, and the oysters were fine though the martinis were undistinguished.

The meeting was called to order by the chairman of the conspiracy, the Hon. H. J. C. Hooper. His code name is John. He looks like a country banker and is slightly bigger than Gibraltar. The other two conspirators must be officially nameless. One of them, name of Rodney, is short, blue-eyed, mustached, brushed and weskited. The second, name of Ken, is short, brown-eyed, long-haired and tweedy. They all smoke Rhodesian cigarettes. By such infernal devices is the peace of the world imperiled.

The first order of business dealt with the remarkably offensive letter our leader had received on February 26 from Thomas C. Mann, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. It did not even begin, "Dear John," which would have been friendly. It began "Dear Mr. Hooper," and went on, in the coldest kind of language, to object to the mere existence of a Rhodesian Information Office on McGill Terrace NW., or anywhere else. It was apparent that Under Secretary Mann wants no information about Rhodesia distributed. Members of the chapter agreed that, considering U.S. policy on Rhodesia, this was certainly a reasonable position on the part of Mr. Mann.

The chair inquired what should be done about the letter. After some discussion, it was resolved respectfully that nothing should be done about the letter. Perhaps Mr. Mann, on further reflection, would conclude that in a nation purportedly dedicated to free speech, it must seem peculiar to prohibit the Rhodesians from speaking freely. So the matter was tabled.

The next item of business dealt with the resignation of G. Mennen Williams as Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs. Following three cheers and a tiger, led by Rodney standing on his chair, order was restored. A motion was put to send a floral wreath to the voters of Michigan, with a legend wrought in carnations, "Africa's Loss, Detroit's Gain." The motion was approved by standing vote.

Resuming their seats, the members then resolved themselves into a conspiracy of the whole house in order to consider the threat to world peace presented by an independent Rhodesia. Several months ago, when independence was declared, it was widely apprehended that the Zambians, next door, might be fearfully endangered. "What's with Zambia these days?"

Thanks in part to the taxpayers of the United States and Britain, things in Zambia are dandia. At fantastic expense and considerable risk, gasoline is being flown into Zambia. (Rhodesia would be happy to haul it by rail.) Despite the cries of "let's you and him fight," Zambia and Rhodesia have no quarrel. In perfect amity, they still are operating the Central African Airways, which they own jointly with Malawi. Rhodesia continues to supply the cheap coal, hydroelectric power, and rail transport essential to Zambia's copper production. Travelers move freely back and forth.

If Rhodesia is not threatening the peace of Zambia, whose peace is Rhodesia threatening? Ghana? Not hardly. Guinea? Chad? Upper Volta? Tanzania? Nigeria? Kenya? The Congo? Arthur Goldberg? The conspiracy of the whole house looked diligently under the chairs, behind the posts, in Rodney's weskit. A threat to peace was nowhere to be found.

What about the future? Well, it was asked, what about it? The furious sanctions imposed by Harold Wilson and Lyndon Johnson are proving to be an inconvenience, not a disaster. So much petroleum is coming into Rhodesia that rationing has been eased for holiday trips. The de facto government of Ian Smith gets more de facto all the time. Unless Britain drags the United States into the astounding idiocy of a U.N. "peacekeeping" action this summer, it is anticipated that events will continue on their peaceful way.

Meanwhile, the conspirators voted to express their grateful thanks for all the support they are getting from Americans as private citizens. Some 15 organizations have sprung into being spontaneously, among them Friends in American of Independence for Rhodesia (FAIR), the Rhodesian Independence Gung Ho Troops (RIGHT), and Hooray for Ian Smith, Titan of Rhodesian Yearning (HISTORY). While most of these are in the late Confederacy, where the spirit of independence still grows like goldenrod, friendly mail comes in from all over.

No further business coming before the house, the conspiracy arose, paid the check, and proceeded into the real world of Washington, D.C., where friendly little nations are harassed, phantom threats are conjured out of nowhere, and legitimate world trade is prohibited out of deference to the Harlem vote. The great Rhodesian conspirary is make-believe. It's not alone.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Inasmuch as the Senate appears to have completed its business for the day, I move that under the previous order, the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Friday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, adjourned until Friday, March 25, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 22 (legislative day of March 21), 1966:

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

Farris Bryant, of Florida, to be Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 22, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Mr. Paul Thornton Eckel, Grace Presbyterian Church, Springfield, Va., offered the following prayer:

Lamentations: 3: 22–23: *The steadfast love of the Lord never ceases, his mercies never come to an end; they are new every morning; great is Thy faithfulness.*

Let us pray.

Great God, our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for Thy love and faithfulness, without which our world would be chaos, our lives confused, our spirits confounded. In the press of our many duties we often fail Thee. Forgive us for receiving thoughtlessly and using carelessly Thy mercies.

In Thy faithfulness Thou hast given us a new day. We did not ask for it nor do we deserve it. It is a gift from Thee. We thank Thee for it. Help us to put its precious hours to good use.

In Thy mercy Thou hast equipped us to accept fresh duties. Help us to recognize our various tasks as ways we may serve the world Thou dost love. Grant that we may do our work as unto Thee.

In Thy love Thou hast endowed us with every noble and necessary resource. Cause us to use our minds creatively. Enable us to remain sensitive to human needs. And grant that we may always rely upon those inner resources of faith which sustain life and give eternal dimension to daily activities.

And so, inspired and empowered by Thy faithfulness, make us faithful, O God. We ask this in the name of Him, who in the work He did was faithful unto death, even Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12762. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

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

S. 1488. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the 6-month waiting period, of approximately 126,300 long calcined tons of refractory grade bauxite from the national stockpile; and

S. 2642. An act to authorize the release of platinum from the national stockpile, and for other purposes.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was unavoidably absent at a conference in another part of the Capitol during rollcall No. 42. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

THE SUPREME COURT OBSCENITY DECISION

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to note briefly today the landmark decision of the U.S. Supreme Court yesterday in the Ginzberg and Mishkin cases.

To many of us who long have believed that Federal laws have been inadequate to cope with the flood of obscene and lascivious materials flowing into our society, the decisions of the Court majority are a step toward curbing this pollution.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have sponsored legislation which would curb the traffic in pornography through the mails by regulating the use of mailing lists.

In preparing this measure, H.R. 10331, I have had occasion to speak to, and correspond with, Post Office and Justice Department officials on the question of pornography.

The general attitude which I have encountered is one of reluctance to press existing laws because of the belief that if cases were appealed to the High Court, the defendants were almost certain to be released.

This assumption can no longer be made. Not only has the U.S. Supreme Court upheld obscenity convictions, it has added two new dimensions to the grounds for finding materials obscene.

First, it ruled that titillating advertising that panders to the baser appetites of the audience can be evidence that the advertised material is obscene.

Second, it ruled that material which is sadistic and masochistic can be considered to appeal to prurient interests even though such material appeals only to a sexually deviant audience.

These two rulings will strengthen our laws against obscene materials. They will put new vigor into the efforts of our Federal postal officials and our U.S. district attorneys who must ferret out and indict the peddlers of smut.

Further, the rulings make even more imperative the early enactment of my bill, H.R. 10331. This bill will give the Post Office Department a new instrument for discovering who is sending out the kind of pornographic "come-on" material which the Court has cited as additional proof of obscenity.

At present, H.R. 10331 is pending before the Postal Operations Subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. It is my hope that hearings can be scheduled on the proposal in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has struck a blow for decency and traditional American moral values. Now let us go forward toward the goal of making ours a good society by enacting new legislation to help our Federal officials move against those conscienceless individuals whose lust for profit leads them to spew filth and corruption into the American mainstream.

USE OF WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT BY JET AIRCRAFT

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, General McKee, announced commencing April 24 of this year Washington National Airport would be open for intermediate and short-range commercial jet operations. Since that time a number of my colleagues, some from the great State of Maryland and others from the northern Virginia area, have been critical of this decision. I would like to point out to the House that in my opinion General McKee was inherently correct in making this decision. He is being realistic and progressive and facing the times. Anyone who has any semblance of knowledge about the operation of commercial jet aircraft will note that by the year 1970 piston-type aircraft will be a thing of the past in commercial operations.

Mr. Speaker, I have written a letter to General McKee commending him on his decision. The letter reads as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1966.

Gen. WILLIAM F. MCKEE,
Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL MCKEE: In the past several weeks I have noticed some of my colleagues in the House and Senate, particularly from the Maryland and northern Virginia areas, being critical of your decision authorizing intermediate commercial jet operations in Washington National Airport.

Frankly, it appears to me that the complaints concerning possible noise, traffic, etc., are unrealistic and not in keeping with the times.

Your decision in my opinion is the only proper decision that could be made in the public interest. Anyone with any semblance of knowledge of aircraft operations will recognize that commercial piston aircraft are rapidly being phased out, and by the year 1970 commercial planes other than jets will be a rarity.

The purpose of this letter is merely to point out to you that as the ranking minority member of the Transportation and Aeronautics Subcommittee, as a frequent commercial airline user, and as a member of the general public, I wish to commend and support your realistic and progressive decision making Washington National Airport available for short range and intermediate commercial jet aircraft.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL L. DEVINE,
Member of Congress.

FEES FOR USE OF FEDERAL RECREATION AREAS

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, since the idea of charging fees and admissions at our Federal lakes and recreational areas was first proposed, members of the Oklahoma delegation have strenuously objected. Over our objection this proposal was included in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 which the Congress passed last year. And I might add, over the objection of the Army Corps of Engineers who also opposed the charging of such fees at reservoirs.

Today I am left no alternative but to introduce a bill to repeal the authority of the Federal Government to make such entrance and admission fees at these Federal lakes and reservoirs.

I believe these charges are both unnecessary and unjustified. In fact, it is one of the best examples I have seen of the Federal Government practicing double taxation. First, it takes the tax dollar collected to build and provide these areas, and then turns right around and charges the taxpayer another tax to enter upon these waters and grounds.

It seems to me, also, to be doubletalk. On one hand the Federal Government urges the American taxpayer to "see America first," and then it pulls the rug right out from under him by saying, "Of course, there is a small entrance fee."

But more than these obvious arguments, we have been dishonest with the American people. For in too many areas, these reservoirs and lakes were approved by the local folk because they were led to understand that the Federal Government would not interfere with their right to enter upon and use these waters and lands, as they had in times past.

I believe it is immoral to so mislead the American taxpayer in this manner, and I would hope that this Congress will take early action to correct this.

FNMA PARTICIPATIONS—THE COSTLY WAY

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, last week on March 16, the Federal National Mortgage Association sold $410 million of participations against a pool of Government-owned home mortgages. The participations were sold at par. They are due serially in 1 to 15 years. The interest rate on the 3 to 7 year maturities was 5½ percent.

Only a month before, the Treasury on February 15 sold an issue of notes on an exchange basis with a maturity of 4¾ years. The interest rate was 5 percent.

The difference in rate between these two issues measures in part the added cost to the Government of financing through FNMA participations rather than through sale of Treasury notes. In this instance, for comparable maturities, the added interest cost to the Government was a full half percent per year.

Actually it could be claimed the interest differential was even more because on the day the FNMA participations were sold, the Treasury 5-percent notes were being freely traded in the Government securities market at a premium. At the close of March 16, these Treasury 5-percent notes were quoted 100 15/32 bid and 100 19/32 asked. At that asked price, an investor would receive a yield to maturity of but 4.86 percent.

The $410 million issue of FNMA participations was sold outright to an underwriting group of banks and investment bankers. The average underwriting commission of $3.51 per $1,000 of participations was modest enough for such an underwriting deal. Nevertheless, the commission amounted to $1,440,000 on the entire issue. The Treasury does not incur any similar expense when it sells an issue as it offers its securities directly to investors.

There is just no question about it. The FNMA participation way is the costly way for the Government to obtain financing.

Use of the more costly financing system can only be justified if there are other offsetting benefits. Such is not the case with respect to the $1.61 billion of FNMA participations sold to date nor the projected sales of $3.58 billion of FNMA participations in the remainder of this and the next fiscal years.

The objective of such sales has been and is to exclude Government expenditures from the administrative budget. This is accomplished by using the proceeds from FNMA participation sales to offset Government expenditures which otherwise would have to be included in the administrative budget.

FNMA participation financing is pure budgetary fiction. This costly fiction, misleading the taxpaying public, should be stopped.

ADAM YARMOLINSKY LEAVES THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I read in the newspapers that Adam Yarmolinsky is finally leaving the Government and going to Harvard to teach. All I can say is that Washington's gain is Harvard's loss. That is a down-east college which has been defined as the place where the "scions of the rich go, graduate, and turn left."

Along with several others, I attacked Yarmolinsky's record and background and demanded his removal as Deputy Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs. I am pleased that this has been done, and he—plus any influence of his forebears—has been removed from Government in general and the Department of Defense in particular, in a time when we as a nation are in a killing war.

With unanimous consent, I introduce in the RECORD an article on this from the Washington Post:

EX-POVERTY AID HIRED BY HARVARD

Harvard University made it official yesterday that Adam Yarmolinsky, brilliant and controversial Defense Department aid, will become a law professor effective July 1.

At Harvard, Yarmolinsky will develop urban legal studies, teaching both urban law and land use planning. He also will teach criminal law, and probably will be associated with the Kennedy Institute when it is organized.

Yarmolinsky served as chief assistant to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara from 1961 until 1964 when he was loaned to Sargent Shriver to help design the administration's war on poverty.

Yarmolinsky was slated to be deputy director of the poverty war. But southern House conservatives believed him to be too liberal. To assure sufficient votes for the administration's antipoverty bill, Yarmolinsky was bounced out of the poverty program.

For 14 months Yarmolinsky waited for a White House appointment that never came. He wanted to be General Counsel of the Defense Department. Instead, he was named last October to be principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, a post that does not require Senate confirmation.

Before his 1961 Defense assignment, Yarmolinsky was a law clerk for Supreme Court Justice Stanley F. Reed, secretary of the Fund for the Republic, an editor for Doubleday, a Washington and New York lawyer, and a talent scout for President-elect John F. Kennedy. He received an A.B. cum laude from Harvard in 1943 and an LL.B. cum laude from Yale in 1948.

COPPER STOCKPILE RELEASE ALLEVIATES SHORTAGE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I applaud President Johnson's swift and timely action in releasing copper from our national stockpile to help alleviate the current shortage of this important metal. At a time when our men are engaged in a bitter struggle in Vietnam, we simply cannot afford to deny them the equipment and material that they need. And copper is certainly a key item. I cite the manufacture of ammunition as only one example.

By releasing this metal, the President has acted to head off what very possibly could have developed into a major crisis.

But the President's action this morning was more than just one of releasing copper from our stockpiles. He also took steps to expand domestic production of copper through the use of special incentives and to increase our own domestic supply of copper through assistance to the copper-producing industry.

Finally, President Johnson made provisions to replenish our stockpile of this

strategic metal at an appropriate time in the future.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 43]

Ashley	Hansen, Wash.	Powell
Baring	Harvey, Ind.	Rees
Burleson	Hawkins	Reid, N.Y.
Cameron	Henderson	Resnick
Casey	Karsten	Roberts
Celler	Lennon	Schmidhauser
Conyers	Lipscomb	Scott
Craley	McEwen	Springer
Diggs	McVicker	Talcott
Ellsworth	Mackie	Teague, Tex.
Fulton, Tenn.	Matthews	Todd
Fuqua	Monagan	Toll
Giaimo	Morris	Walker, Miss.
Green, Oreg.	Murphy, N.Y.	White, Idaho
Griffin	Murray	Williams
Gubser	Nix	Willis
Gurney	O'Neal, Ga.	
Hagen, Calif.	Pool	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 382 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

RESIGNATION OF CONFEREE ON THE OVERSEAS TEACHERS BILL

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] be excused from serving as a conferee on the bill H.R. 6845.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona? The Chair hears none and the Chair appoints to the committee of conference the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] as one of the conferees. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the appointment.

MEMBERS OF VISITING DELEGATION FROM FRENCH NATIONAL ASSEMBLY'S COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of advising the House that a distinguished visiting delegation from the French National Assembly's Committee on Foreign Affairs is the guest of the House today. They include the following:

Hon. Maurice Schumann, President of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Centre Democratique, MRP, Deputy, Norde;

Hon. Jean-Franck de Preaumont, UNR/UDT Deputy, Seine;

Hon. Pierre Comte-Offenbach, UNR/UDT Deputy, Seine;

Hon. Gabriel Peronnet, Rassemblement Democratique Deputy, Allier; and

Hon. Edmond Thorailler, UNR/UDT Deputy, Eure-et-Loir.

AUTHORIZING AN OFFICIAL RESIDENCE FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 774 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 774

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2394) to provide for the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President of the United Sattes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Public Works now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] and to myself such time as I shall consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 774 provides for consideration of S. 2394, a bill to provide for the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States. The resolution provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate, making it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

S. 2394 would provide authority for the construction of an official residence for the Vice President and to use as a site therefor Federal property comprising 10 acres located in the grounds of the U.S. Naval Observatory.

Also, the bill authorizes the GSA to provide for the care, repair, improvement, and alteration of the official residence. Heating, lighting, and air conditioning would also be provided.

Authority is provided for the acceptance of cash gifts, furniture, furnishings, and other types of gifts, both for furnishing and construction, but without requiring the United States to agree to any condition of such use.

The amount authorized to be appropriated for the design, construction, and furnishings and the cost incidental thereto is $750,000. Annual appropriations are authorized to permit the GSA to carry out its responsibility with respect to maintenance and other annual charges.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 774 in order that S. 2394 may be considered.

Mr. Speaker, may I add that I introduced one of the first bills on this subject, which was a companion bill to the bill introduced in the other body by the able Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. MONRONEY, and passed by the other body.

That bill provided for the naming by the President of a Commission of three to select the site for the Vice President's residence, and to make other recommendations required for the establishment of such a home for our distinguished Vice President.

Mr. Speaker, I attended the hearings before the distinguished Committee on Public Works and the subcommittee, headed by the able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY], and presented the merits, I thought, for the provision of a suitable home for our Vice President.

Mr. Speaker, I believe all agree that the time has come when we can no longer neglect the important duty and task of providing a suitable residence for the Vice President of our country. So, Mr. Speaker, we are all agreed upon that. There was early disagreement as to whether this particular site of land should be chosen by the act itself as the site upon which the residence could be constructed, or whether the Commission should be charged with the authority to make a survey and finally to recommend a site and a suitable residence.

Mr. Speaker, upon reflection about this matter I have concluded that the subcommittee has rendered to the Congress and to the country a very valuable service in the selection and designation of a 10-acre tract comprising part of the Naval Observatory Grounds just off Massachusetts Avenue. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the bill as it is reported to the House of Representatives by the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the able chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY], and his committee, for expediting the bringing about of the establishment of a suitable home for the Vice President, by the selection of this tract of land. I have concluded that probably no better site could be chosen by a commission that might make a survey than the site located by the committee. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if the other body will concur in the action of this House if we enact the committee substitute, we will greatly expedite, I believe, the selection of a site, and finally the construction of a suitable home for the Vice President too long delayed by our country.

Mr. Speaker, therefore, I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that I suppose in the scheme of things that has been indicated by the founders of the Great Society, this bill does not rank very importantly in that scheme. After all, we are talking about an item involving the expenditure of three-quarters of a million dollars, which is a pretty small sum of money when it is put in the context of a budget of $112.8 billion for the next fiscal year, or in the terms of $119 billion which was appropriated by this Congress last year.

However, Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill is important, and I believe that our action on this bill today is going to be watched by the executive branch. It is going to be watched by the people of this country very carefully, because what we do on this bill is going to symbolize whether or not we are going to have the restraint, in the weeks and months to follow, in enacting the various appropriation requests that are sent down; whether we are going to have the restraint that is needed to keep from further fueling the fires of inflation that are already threatening our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I noted the remarks that were made just the other day by the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Fowler, when he said this:

> We are watching carefully what happens to the President's budget in the appropriations process. It could move the budget from the posture of approximate balance to either meaningful deficit or surplus.

Then, Mr. Speaker, he went on to say if a meaningful deficit develops that the President is not going to hesitate to call for increased taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the important thing, I believe, to point out to the Members of this body is that as recently as the first of March 1966, the Bureau of the Budget was opposed to this bill, because the report clearly indicates that they favored the approach adopted by the other body; namely, to appoint a commission which after a period of 18 months would then proceed to submit its recommendations as to what kind of residence, if any, should be built.

Let me say that my disagreement with the present Vice President, the incumbent of that office, on certain domestic issues does not extend so far as to want for 1 minute to deny him the proper kind of residence or to deny him the dignity or emoluments of his office. But I would submit that a GI sitting in a foxhole or in a pup tent over in South Vietnam reading the latest issue of the papers from home, when he comes to the item that says this Congress has decided here today to appropriate three-quarters of a million dollars to build a mansion for the Vice President—I wonder if he is not going to ask himself, Do the folks at home know that a war is going on—or is it just business as usual with the home folks?

Are we just going to go on doing the things that we want to do, that are desirable and comfortable to do? Or are we going to get down to business in this House and finally decide that we are going to steel ourselves to the necessity of taking those actions that are necessary to support the war—yes, but that we are not yielding to every impulse that we have to do something when somebody comes along and says—yes, this would be nice. We have waited 177 years to build a house for the Vice President so let us get busy and build one right now.

I hate to disagree with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, who has offered this bill. But when he appeared before the Committee on Rules a few days ago and in addressing himself to the guns and butter issue, he said, "Well this is really the low-priced spread that we are getting; this is not butter at all, this is the low-priced spread."

He actually spoke of this as if it was just a modest little house. Those were the very words he used in describing this mansion. That may be true in southern Illinois but where I come from in the northwestern part of the State, a $700,000 house exclusive of the cost of the land is more than a modest little home—it is something of a mansion.

Then getting back to the question of what actually will be spent to construct this mansion they say that they will only spend $45,000 during the next year at the most for architect fees and thereafter it will be decided whether we are actually going to proceed to build the $750,000 mansion for the Vice President.

I do not think there is a Member in this body here today who thinks that is the way things are really done here in Washington. I was not here at the time because I think it was back in 1955, but I am sure somebody must have stood right here in this well when they started on the Rayburn Building and said, Well, we are going to have a modest, humble little office building, but it turned out that they spent, I believe it was, $150 million or something like that for this monstrosity.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. First, I want to compliment the gentleman on an excellent statement. I was here at the time the Rayburn Building was authorized and we were given assurance that the building would cost $60 to $65 million. It wound up costing approximately $125 million.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

But the thing that disturbs me and now I wish to return to the point I made originally. When the time comes to present a tax-increase bill to the American people, you know who is going to get the blame. This is not an administration bill that we are considering here today. The Bureau of the Budget is not for this bill. They are for the commission approach. So when the tax-increase bill comes down and when the administration starts to add up the appropriations by Congress and compare them to the budget requests that were made by the executive branch, they are going to assess the blame for excessive spending on the Congress. If we vote for a million dollars here and a million dollars there that the executive branch did not want—the folks back home are going to get the message and they are going to get that message loud and clear—that it is not the executive branch that is to blame for the budget moving into a deficit, but it is this Congress which does not and did not have the self-discipline and the restraint to realize that in the kind of times in which we are living today we should not yield to every spending impulse that comes along.

I repeat that if these were normal times and if we were living today in anything approaching a normal period, I would be standing before you in support of this bill. I am not fundamentally opposed to this at all. I am not basically opposed to the idea of a residence for the Vice President of the United States. Although—I do not know—and with this remark I will close—I remember it was not too long ago that I heard or read the President of the United States quoted in a somewhat strong complaint to the fact that before the birds even began to sing the first morning carol, the President heard the tread of thousands of marching feet under his bedroom window.

Well, I suppose this will be another monument, and I suppose there will be the tread of thousands of marching feet of people coming to see this great, beautiful, palatial mansion that the Congress in its generosity in this war year of 1966 decided to build for the Vice President.

But I hope, and I say this in all sincerity without derogating in any way from the sincerity or the convictions of the gentleman from Illinois who is the author of this bill, but I hope today that this Congress will decide to do something about holding down expenditures and that we will acquit ourselves in such a fashion here today by denying the rule and voting against this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman spoke of visitors coming to Washington to see this mansion. I wonder if they are going to be able to see it. This is going to be segregated and there is going to be a barbed wire fence, apparently a high security type or cyclone fence topped with barbed wire, and it is going to be located on the restricted naval observatory grounds. I wonder how they are going to get in to see it?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I suppose that they will have to have passes the same as we have now and I do not know how many people are going to have to be employed for that purpose just to take telephone calls just as when Members call to say we want constituents to go to the White House. I suppose the same thing will be necessary here.

Mr. GROSS. With reference to the 10 acres of ground that this $750,000 palace is going to be built on, does the gentleman have any idea or did the hearings bring out any idea of the value of the 10 acres?

Would the gentleman think this is something in the nature of a country club?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. It is unquestionably very valuable property. Nothing was said before the Rules Committee as to any value that had been placed upon it by the Public Works Committee.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], a member of the committee, tried his level best to find what the total bill would be in terms of real estate. I do not know whether we are going to get the information here today or not. I hope that we do, for the hearing record is silent on that point.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I heard the gentleman describe the building as a mansion. The gentleman from Iowa has described it as a palace. But at $20 a square foot—$750,000 for the house—it would make it more like a zeppelin hangar.

Does the gentleman have any idea what the structure will look like at that price?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. The committee was not given any plans to look at; at least the Rules Committee was not.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, my colleague on the committee.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman has made a very interesting and forceful talk. I am sure that my friend from Iowa wanted to be helpful to him, for he is usually helpful. But I just wanted to suggest that I think the opposition lost its fight here when the gentleman from Iowa pointed out that this house would be segregated out there.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Can the gentleman tell us about the cost of operation? Is it planned to take up that matter later?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I am glad the gentleman raised that point, because in preparing for this debate today, I went back and looked at the figures in the White House appropriation bill for the operating expenses of the Executive Mansion. I found that in 1965 $696,000 was appropriated to run the Executive Mansion. In 1966 there was a big decrease because they turned out the lights. It went down $2,000 to $694,000. In other words, as it is often said about the well-known institution of matrimony, it is not the initial cost, it is the upkeep. We will be spending almost as much in annual operating expenses on this project as we will if we pass this authorization today.

Mr. HOSMER. It seems to me that a good rule for a Congressman in determining expenditures is whether or not the money will do something for the Republic. Throughout our history this money has not been spent and the Republic has prospered. I can see nothing in here but a repetition of the same kind of inconsistency that we got when we heard the lectures last year about the gold output. The President said that everybody should stay home and not go to Europe for a vacation. This year the Secretary of Defense goes to Switzerland and takes his family for a vacation.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in closing, in May of 1965 the Chief of Naval Operations told the House Appropriations Committee that 85,000 eligible Navy and Marine Corps families were unsuitably housed. Witnesses before that same committee said that even with the housing that was provided in last year's bill, a total of 106,000 Army personnel would still be living in housing rated either completely substandard or unsuitable. In other words, more than 200,000 military families are today housed in substandard or unsuitable housing.

And yet you know what happened last December. The Secretary of Defense canceled better than $600 million in appropriations that had already been voted for military family housing in this country. I think maybe if we can delay that kind of housing program, we can certainly delay for 18 months the construction of the Vice President's mansion.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Has the gentleman considered the fact that, as a matter of history, we have not had a Vice President for about 25 percent of the time, and while we have a constitutional amendment in process, it has not yet been ratified and there is a possibility, of course, perhaps remote, that it might not be ratified. Has any thought been given as to what use this mansion would be put to during the time there was no Vice President?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. The gentleman will have to ask that question of some of the members of the Public Works Committee who conducted hearings on this bill. To my knowledge, there was no testimony on that point before the Committee on Rules.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. That particular question was asked by the gentleman from Florida who is speaking now before the committee meeting. There was suggested at that time that if this unfortunate circumstance should occur again, there should be some provision to determine what will be done with the house during the period of vacancy in the position of the Vice Presidency. However, no language was drafted to accomplish that objective.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for his answer.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I wonder if the gentleman in the well of the House, who has made such an excellent presentation of this rule, has any information as to whether or not the Vice President or his family is desirous of such accommodations.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Frankly, I have not talked to the Vice President, obviously, on this matter. But I wonder if the Vice President himself is not a little bit embarrassed, having recently himself been to South Vietnam and seen the conditions in that unhappy country. I wonder if he is not a little bit embarrassed about the fact that this Congress is taking up this bill today, because I think he is essentially a man of simple tastes. I do not think in his heart he would really approve of the timing of this particular measure.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I too am not privy to information from the Vice President, but I understand he does not desire it.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, let me make two or three observations on the remarks made by the able gentleman from Illinois.

His first reference was to the suggestion that the Bureau of the Budget was not supporting this bill or this proposal. In the report which is before the Members of the House at this time, on pages 6 and 7, appears the statement of the Assistant Director for Legislative Reference, representing the Bureau of the Budget. Part of it is as follows, referring to one of the bills:

> An appropriation of $750,000 is authorized and the cost of care and maintenance would be borne by the United States.
>
> It appears that a wide variety of suggestions with respect to the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President has been laid before the committee. We believe that consideration should be given to all of the various possibilities in order to determine the most appropriate means of acquiring the residence. Accordingly, we believe that the approach taken in the study commission bills is preferable to that taken by H.R. 12994.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
> *Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.*

Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of the Budget said they would prefer a commission, but the commission bill carried an authorization of $1 million, not $750,000. So the Bureau of the Budget is not opposed to the expenditure or the objective of the legislation, which is to provide a suitable residence for the Vice President of our country.

Next, Mr. Speaker, in 1958, President Dwight D. Eisenhower recommended that this country provide a suitable home for our Vice President. Only a few days ago, a former Republican incumbent of that office, the Honorable Richard Nixon, publicly stated that he favored the Congress providing for the country a suitable residence for the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether George Washington asked the Congress of the United States to provide him, as President of the United States, a suitable residence or not. I do not know whether or not John Adams, the first occupant of the White House, asked the

Congress to be sure to provide a suitable residence for the Chief Magistrate of our land. I presume they did not, and that the Congress took pride in providing a suitable residence for the President of the United States.

It is regrettable that we have delayed so long in the provision of an appropriate home for the Vice President. I realize that the functions and the office of the Vice President have been much enlarged, and therefore the public respect for the office has been much increased in later years.

The former beloved "Veep," Alben Barkley, used to tell the story that a lady in his State of Kentucky had two sons—one son went to sea, and the other became Vice President, and neither one of them was ever heard from thereafter.

That was a long time ago. Today the office of the Vice-Presidency looms greater than it ever has in history. The functions discharged by the Vice President, by the request of the President, have never been so important as today. The incumbent of that office today is rendering a great service to our country and the cause of freedom, in the way he is discharging his responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a partisan matter. This is to provide for the Vice-Presidency of our country a suitable residence. I certainly hope that the rule will be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it seems very strange to me to note the opposition of some on the Republican side. I hope that it will not spread to the great majority on the Republican side, because everybody admits that in the world of today and tomorrow the Vice President ought to have an official residence.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON], has made a very, very emotional speech. Of course, we know why it was made. He brings in Vietnam, and he talks about guns and butter. I thought that had gone out of the window when I had a little colloquy with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD]. I thought the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] repudiated that slogan, "guns and butter," because that was a reflection upon the great dairy industry of our country.

I was rather surprised to see my friend from Illinois failing to take advantage of what I thought was very wise judgment by the sloganized leader of the Republican Party, our dear friend from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], because he just directly repudiated that—the Republican-invented slogan of guns and butter. I suggested to my Republican friend that he ought to appoint a commission to create another slogan.

This fight brings my mind back to some years ago, when I was majority leader.

Some of the members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations felt that the majority leader should have the dignity of an official automobile. Some here will remember that. The majority leader of the Senate had one, and they thought the majority leader of the House ought to have an official automobile. I heard that one of the Republican members of the Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch of the Committee on Appropriations was going to oppose this automobile, so I said, "Well, I am not going to subject the House to a fight on whether or not I be given an official automobile." I am sure my friend from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], might have supported it, but if he did not, I can imagine him in the well, with all the fluency of expression on his part as to why the majority leader at that time should not be given an automobile. Having brought my friend's name in, in a most pleasant manner, I naturally would like to yield to him.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, of course.

Mr. GROSS. The point at that time—and I am sure the gentleman will recall it—was the fact that the then Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson, said, "What is good for General Motors is good for the country." It was impossible for me to believe that those who were then ridiculing Wilson for having made that statement would at the same time accept the use of a General Motors car. I could not understand why you went to a General Motors product when you were ridiculing the Secretary of Defense, former head of General Motors, for his statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. Was he not a Republican? I thought Secretary Wilson was a Republican. However, in any event, I was just leading up to what I wanted to say here. So I said, "I am not going to have a fight on the floor of the House and have this Chamber reverberating to the oratory of illogical emotionalism. I am not going to subject the Members to a fight as to whether a poor fellow by the name of JOHN MCCORMACK, who happened to be a Democrat, should get an official car." So I said then, "Do not get it," and they did not. But the next year, in the 80th Congress, CHARLEY HALLECK was the leader, so the Republicans then gave him a car, and we Democrats supported him in getting the car. Now, when I came back as majority leader, I had to inherit the car from CHARLEY HALLECK. In other words, they would not give a Democrat an official car but at that point we gave the car to CHARLEY HALLECK. CHARLEY and I have had much joshing about it through the years. I remember riding up to the White House one day about a year after CHARLEY got his car, and I said, "CHARLEY, you know, we Democrats are going to come back, and it looks like I am going to inherit this car through you." Well, that is just how it happened.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. All I wanted to point out was the gentleman's support paid off, because he got himself a nice, shiny Cadillac, and it was a General Motors product.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. But I did not get it originally.

Mr. GROSS. You did inherit a Chrysler.

Mr. McCORMACK. But I got it by way of inheritance. Now, my friend from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] made one or two frank statements. He said, "I am not opposed to a residence for the Vice President." You heard him as well as I did. Some time in the remote future, 20, 30, or 40 years from now, when the American people in a moment of mental aberration might reelect a Republican President. So he is for it not for a Democrat but for a Republican. Apparently what my friends want to do is to stop a Vice President who is a Democrat from being given an official residence, just as they did not want to give an official car to JOHN MCCORMACK as leader of the House, but they want any future Democratic Vice President to inherit it by way of a Republican Vice President.

To me this is not big. It is not big. The Vice President in these days and in the days of tomorrow, without regard to party, should have a residence, with all of the responsibilities placed upon him. I would be supporting this bill if there were a Republican Vice President now just as strongly as I support the bill today and urge its passage.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a word in response to what the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives has just said. I would repeat my pledge that I am in favor of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States, and I would be willing now to state that I would vote for such a bill when we are at peace, and when the war in Vietnam is over.

Mr. Speaker, I do not care whether we have a Democrat or a Republican as the incumbent of that office, I would be willing to support a bill for an official residence.

Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed the very amusing little story as related by the distinguished Speaker of the House as to how he finally acquired a Cadillac. But I would remind the distinguished Speaker that that action took place back at an earlier time when we were at peace, and when we could afford a Cadillac. However, I do not believe we can afford this residence today for the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this proposed legislation to build a Vice-Presidential palace or mansion. We do not need one. The President has not said we need one. The Vice President has not asked for one.

I am sure that the Vice President does not want this three-quarter-of-a-million-dollar palace. I cannot imagine our distinguished Vice President asking this House to vote three-quarters of a million dollars to buy him a home while some of our soldiers sleep in tents on the cold ground for want of military housing appropriations. I do not think that we should authorize the expenditure of this money until we ask our distinguished Vice President what he wants

because I cannot imagine him wanting a palace for himself while others suffer.

I also do not believe we ought to act without a statement from our great President that this palace is of the first priority. I cannot imagine our President wanting to spend all this money on housing for just one family. As a member of the Housing Subcommittee, I have been sitting through hearings on the President's immense "demonstration cities" concept. I cannot believe that the President wants to spend three quarters of a million dollars on one family while, according to his statistics, millions of American families are living without adequate shelter. I just cannot believe that the President would build a luxurious palace for the Vice President before using that same money to provide basic housing for the poor.

Last year, it was my privilege to play a part in a fight against a program which I thought was a menace—the rent supplement program. I said at the time that the real goal of the program was not to help the poor because the qualifying income ceilings were too high. Now I know I was right. If the bill before us today passes, the Vice President will be the recipient of the Nation's first full-fledged rent supplement.

He does not need a rent supplement. He can afford to buy his own house. To make things worse, the bill we have before us today does not require him to pay 25 percent of his income for rent like any other rent supplement recipients would have to if the program is set up.

I urge you to defeat this "rent supplement" for our Vice President. It deserves the same appropriation as the rent supplement program deserves—not a cent. We are in a war this year. We have a wartime budget. This is a good year to insist that people live in accommodations they can afford and save subsidies for the war effort and not rent supplements.

I urge the defeat of this rule.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINO. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, in that apparently guns and butter is not to be the slogan used in the future, we could appropriately use the slogan of "guns and frills." That is exactly what this proposal represents, frills to go along with the guns, so in the year of the South Vietnam war if this bill passes, we will have guns and frills as the national objective.

This should be the slogan characterizing the actions of this Congress, if this bill passes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, perhaps it would be far more practical to acquire an existing structure on a properly located parcel of real estate rather than enter into this most dubious suggestion of spending upwards of three quarters of a million dollars for a residence for the Vice President of the United States.

As the Members well know, one of the controversial aspects of the inflation sweeping the country has been the adverse effect on real estate values. Specifically, the rapid increase in interest rates and shortage of funds are slowing down home construction and home financing and are dampening real estate purchases and development across the country.

Certainly, there are a number of very substantial buildings in the District of Columbia which could be acquired for far less than this proposed new residence due to the soft real estate market. Surely, despite the size of the Federal deficit, the loss of purchasing power of our dollar due to inflation, and the continued outflow of gold, the credit of the Federal Government is still good enough to make it an acceptable buyer of a residence for the Vice President.

Even as an individual, the Vice President, I am sure, could qualify under the liberal provisions of the present FHA regulations. If necessary, he personally could qualify for a loan even though he would have to pay a much higher interest rate this year than a year or two ago before the administration let loose the inflationary tidal wave now adversely affecting all Americans.

I can picture a great number of socially prominent Washingtonians or loyal Democrats who would be willing to sell their homes at a very modest price to the Government for use by the Vice President so as to be able to tell their friends and grandchildren that they had the honor of disposing of their property for the hallowed use of the Vice-Presidential family.

There might even be some prominent Washingtonians interested in maintaining good will with this administration who would be willing to sell their residence at a very nominal price. Perhaps an executive of the aluminum or steel industry would appreciate an opportunity to acquire good will from the administration by negotiating a proper price on a home that could be used for a Vice-Presidential mansion.

Mr. Speaker, I raise all these questions since I join many of my colleagues in questioning the timing and the cost of the proposal before us this afternoon. At a time when our men in Vietnam are suffering from the direct costs of war and our homefront is being ravaged by war-stimulated inflation, this proposal is especially ill timed, extravagant, and indefensible. Perhaps my suggestions ought to be studied and we should remit the bill to committee for further consideration and a more proper solution to this issue could be forthcoming.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND].

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this point to offer just one or two comments in regard to this proposed legislation. I understand, of course, if we adopt the rule, we will then go into the Committee of the Whole and there will be further debate on the details. I want to be sure that my colleagues are fully aware of the fact that I prepared my minority views in verse and I hope that they all have had a chance to read them. For those who did not, I am going to recite them later on when we are in Committee of the Whole. Perhaps that is a good reason to vote down the rule because if we do not get into the Committee of the Whole, you will not have to hear the verse. In case we do vote down the rule, Mr. Speaker, at this time I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman for a question. Is the gentleman going to ask a question?

Mr. JOELSON. I will ask the gentleman a question. I would state first that we are all glad to see the gentleman here, and looking so well. I would ask the gentleman further if he has suggested to the police that perhaps what motivated the gentleman's assailant last night was that his attacker may have been a lover of good poetry.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I thank the gentleman very much for asking that question. I am always interested in the way that the distinguished Member can make a comment out of a question. It had occurred to me that perhaps the man was a poetry critic of one of the metropolitan newspapers that apparently are in support of this legislation.

One of the main reasons I have taken this time is to correct what I believe to be a misstatement of facts. The distinguished gentleman from Florida pointed out that the Senate bill called for an authorization of $1 million, and then with great pride he points to this bill which has an authorization of three-fourths of a million dollars and this, he says, is a great saving. Well, now, that in my opinion is a specious and false argument because the Senate bill did not snatch off 10 acres of million dollar property at the naval observatory. The Senate bill had included in their $1 million the cost of land acquisition. We save absolutely nothing as compared to the Senate bill. Let us get the facts straight on that.

Another point I want to make is simply this. The remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. ANDERSON], are remarks that I subscribe to wholeheartedly.

With all due respect to our honored and revered Speaker, and I know he is a much honored and revered man and I have great respect for him as all of us do, and coming from New England perhaps my respect is even greater—I believe our distinguished Speaker has missed the single central point that the Republicans are trying to make. That is that you do not build this type of housing at this time and in this place in history. We are at war.

We socked the people of this country with a tax increase just last week, and you all know we may have to do it again

before the year is out. At this time and in this place in history, if we build this type of palace and if we construct this type of mansion, we are sending out false signals to the world.

We are informing the world that we do not have the guts or the courage to say "no" or to practice self-restraint at the very time that our President is calling on us to practice self-restraint to save the dollar against the effects of inflation, at the very time we are fighting a war.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 21, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] introduced the bill now before us. He promptly announced that his Public Works Subcommittee would open hearings on it the following Thursday, February 24.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I could not understand why the rush. In truth I was shocked that there should be such great urgency about providing the Vice President adequate housing when, at the same time, the Secretary of Defense took a rather indifferent attitude toward a long-standing housing need for our servicemen for which funds had already been appropriated.

This prompted me to issue a public statement the day before the Public Works Subcommittee opened its hearings.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE LESLIE C. ARENDS, OF ILLINOIS, MEMBER OF HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, RE HOUSE FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT

Tomorrow morning the Committee on Public Works will open hearings on a bill introduced last Monday by my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] for the erection of a $750,000 home for the Vice President of the United States.

In the light of the speed with which the committee is acting on this proposal there is apparently some emergency with which we are not aware. But, paradoxically, there is no emergency from the point of view of the administration with respect to furnishing proper housing for our servicemen.

Last September the Congress provided funds for military housing sorely needed. Some of our servicemen have been living in little more than barns, even in tents. Last December the Secretary of Defense arbitrarily shelved our appropriation for military housing. In testimony before our committee the Defense Department claimed that this unilateral action was taken because of other budget demands and that the expenditure would add to the inflationary pressures.

I concur in the desirability of furnishing proper housing for our Vice President. But why the rush?

And I should like to ask this question: Why should we at this time concern ourselves about furnishing an expensive house for the Vice President, admittedly needed, when the Secretary of Defense refuses to use the funds we have already appropriated to furnish proper housing for our fightingmen?

If proper housing for our servicemen is to be deferred because of budget limitations and inflation pressures, why should not the same principle apply in connection with an expensive house for the Vice President? First things first.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The gentleman has on two occasions since he has been in the well referred to the great rush to supply a home for the Vice President of the United States. It seems to me that in 178 years we have not been in too much of a rush.

Mr. ARENDS. This is a comparatively young country, you want to remember. I am sure we will get it done before too long. I repeat, I favor the idea and objective, but not now, under conditions we presently face.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. My distinguished friend—and I do consider him one of my good friends—is a member of the Armed Services Committee. We are a young country. But I assume the gentleman has been down at Fort McNair and seen the big white-pillared mansions we have furnished for a few of our admirals.

Mr. ARENDS. Yes; we have seen those. But I should like to state in passing that this morning some of us had the privilege of meeting with the Secretary of Defense at breakfast. We discussed the tremendous problem we face in that part of the world. I am sure there must be concern on the part of all of us as to what is going on in Vietnam. The cumulative and tremendous costs of this undertaking will be with us for a period of years. Let us establish a priority list. Let us take these things in their order. Let us do those things that are necessary to do right now, put off those things which can be undertaken 1 or 2 years from now and, in the final analysis, eliminate all of those programs or projects that are unnecessary and unneeded.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The gentleman from Florida has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader such time as he might consume.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on the rule, but the argument which the distinguished Republican whip has raised deserves some comment.

In the first place, I do not think consideration of this bill should be tied to consideration of whether we need certain other housing for servicemen or anyone else. I think both propositions should stand on their own feet. The House in its historic devotion to men in uniform will take proper care of the men in uniform and their requirements. This country is big enough and strong enough to do what is necessary in all necessary areas at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I think also we should consider the timeliness of this legislation, since that issue has been raised. This is important legislation. The gentleman from Illinois is to be complimented for bringing it to the floor. In my judgment he and his committee have done a service to the House and to the country in reporting this legislation for our consideration.

Legislation to accomplish this purpose was introduced as early as 1929. The need for it has been recognized by leaders of both major political parties. If I am not mistaken, in 1958 President Eisenhower recommended legislation of this kind, and at that time I certainly for one was in support of that recommendation. If we went back far enough, I believe we would find little reason for such a residence in the early days of our country. The responsibilities of the President and Vice President compared to what they are today were minor.

But today the burdens of the office of the President are enormous. He must call upon the Vice President to assist him in the performance of his duties more now than ever before. If there ever was a time when this legislation was needed, if there ever will be a time when this legislation is needed, it is needed now. We are at war, and being at war the burdens of the office of President have increased enormously. The burdens of the office of Vice President have also increased and must necessarily increase in time of war or other national crisis.

The problems of the world are daily becoming more and more complex. The maintenance of the position of the United States as leader of the free world is a greater and more demanding task than ever before. In order to give the President time to consider and deal with the problems of our government, more and more the Vice President has been called upon to assume not only ceremonial but also many other duties of the President.

Vice Presidents, particularly since 1953, starting with Richard Nixon, have become personal representatives of the President in diplomatic dealings and in foreign policy discussions both here and abroad.

As has been indicated in statements made heretofore, the Vice President, in addition to his constitutional duties, serves in many positions vital to the well-being of the United States.

He is Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council. He heads the Peace Corps Advisory Council. He is Chairman of the Special Cabinet Task Force for Travel-USA. He is a member of the Security Council and he is a Cabinet level member of the Youth Opportunities Council. In addition, he performs many special duties for the President of the United States, as everyone knows.

It is right, I believe, that the Vice President, the second-ranking executive officer in the land, assume these duties and other duties which can reasonably be passed on to him in order to give the President the opportunity for consideration of the many other pressing problems which confront him.

It is also important as a matter of principle, Mr. Speaker, that we provide for our Vice President a residence suitable and appropriate to the high office

which he holds. His is the second office in our land.

More important, the safety and security of the Vice President are of prime concern to the Nation and to the world. The orderly procedures of the U.S. Government, and even the fate of the Nation, may at some time depend upon the safety and the adequacy of security arrangements for the Vice President of the United States.

This bill would provide a residence for the Vice President, suitable to his duties, and it would locate the residence in an area where his privacy could be assured and his safety and that of his family guaranteed.

This House, in my opinion, should have acted long ago to help ease the burdens of the Vice President. This, of course, is not a partisan issue. We do not want a Democrat to have to inherit this job from a Republican, and we do not want a Republican to have to inherit this job from a Democrat. We want Republicans and Democrats alike to provide this residence for the Vice President of the United States, whoever he happens to be.

This is not a proposal for an individual. It is not a proposal for a Democrat or a Republican. It is a proposal for a man who is second only to the President of the United States, who symbolizes the greatness and the importance of our country. Surely all of us, Democrats and Republicans alike, can support this important bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, there is a need for a residence for the Vice President of the United States, whether he be Democrat or Republican. But we quarrel at the present time with the need and the necessity to take this action, bearing in mind the fiscal pressures that we face and the problems of inflation which are with us.

I think it is fair to point out, in light of the fact that the gentleman from Oklahoma mentioned that former President Eisenhower had recommended a home or a residence for the Vice President, that recommendation was not made at any time such as the present time, when our Nation faces a conflict such as we are faced with today in Vietnam. Those recommendations from President Eisenhower came at a time when this country was at peace.

Mr. ALBERT. What the gentleman says is true, but I think that President Eisenhower would make the same recommendation now. This in a sense is a war measure. Security considerations for the President of the United States are always more important in time of war. The same is true for the Vice President, particularly as he takes on additional duties.

I think it is in the interests of national defense that we furnish this residence and the additional security that it will afford to the Vice President of the United States. That is one of the points I am trying to make.

We increase the security of our leading military people in time of war. It seems to me that no one, short of the President of the United States, has a more significant role in time of war. Certainly no one else has a role nearly so significant as the role of the Vice President, who by election and by training in the Office of the Vice President is most suitable to take over in case of the death or incapacity of the President of the United States.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think our majority leader has stressed the one point that apparently has escaped some on the other side; that is, that this war, in which we are now engaged, has been a war which has exposed the character on the part of the enemy facing us and a method and a system of conducting warfare that represents a new departure in warfare.

The problem of security for the second-ranking Executive of the United States is probably more acute today, by reason of he nature of the enemy that we confront in South Vietnam, than it has ever been before. I think this does indeed identify this as a war measure.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it should be apparent that one of the principal reasons for the decline of the minority party in the House over these years is that they have always been able to find some point, however untenable, on which to be against everything.

It also occurs to me, in connection with the previous remarks of the distinguished Speaker of the House that in the 80th Congress the Democratic minority leader was not furnished with an automobile. The Members on this side of the aisle then contributed $100 or more apiece and bought a Cadillac automobile for the late Sam Rayburn, then the minority leader.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I was wondering, when the able minority leader referred to the recommendation of President Eisenhower not being in time of war, if it is not a fact that the recommendation of President Eisenhower was at or about the time that the Government had one of the largest deficits in peacetime history of over $12 billion.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I think there is some difference between the country facing some economic problems and the United States facing a crisis of war such as we are facing today. Yes, a deficit of $12 billion is substantial, but I hasten to point out that this took place while the Congress of the United States was under the control of the gentleman from Florida's party.

The point is, if the Vice President needs additional security protection—and he may well need it—those of us on this side of the aisle will provide whatever is needed through the help of the Secret Service or others, but we do not think we should embark on a $750,000 construction job at this time when we have the kinds of commitments, both financial and manpower, that we have 12,000 miles away in Vietnam at the present time. That is the only issue we raise here today.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the distinguished minority leader has said. But I had thought, Mr. Speaker, that we had reached here one little issue on which we had given our Republican friends the chance to erase the image of blind opposition. However, if there is any issue on which they will retreat from that position, nobody in the House of Representatives has been able to come up with it.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I should simply like to suggest that the Members vote for this rule and then listen carefully to the debate on the bill. In this way, they will share, as the committee shared, in a careful investigation of the need for this residence, a need which has been acknowledged by Democrats and Republicans alike in increasing numbers for 10, 20, and maybe 30 years. Certainly in the past there has been no question on either side of the aisle as to the need for such an official residence. In time of war this Nation never just stopped with its problems of civil government or with the ongoing provision for the necessary facilities of civil government.

During the Civil War when the question was very gravely posed as to whether this Union would survive, President Lincoln defended the continued building on the Capitol of the United States. He was severely criticized by those who said, "Oh, we cannot afford this in time of war." However, his reply was a classic. He said, "If the people see the Capitol going on, it will be a sign to them that we intend the Union, too, shall go on." Surely we need such an official residence for our Vice President. Clearly we can afford it. The rule should be adopted and the bill should pass.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 236, nays 135, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 44]

YEAS—236

Abernethy	Grabowski	O'Hara, Mich.
Adams	Gray	Olsen, Mont.
Addabbo	Green, Pa.	Olson, Minn.
Albert	Grider	O'Neill, Mass.
Anderson, Tenn.	Griffiths	Ottinger
	Gubser	Patman
Andrews, N. Dak.	Haley	Patten
	Halpern	Pepper
Annunzio	Hamilton	Perkins
Ashmore	Hanley	Philbin
Aspinall	Hanna	Pickle
Bandstra	Hansen, Iowa	Pike
Beckworth	Hardy	Poage
Bennett	Hathaway	Pool
Bingham	Hays	Powell
Blatnik	Hechler	Price
Boggs	Helstoski	Pucinski
Brademas	Hicks	Race
Brown, Calif.	Holifield	Randall
Broyhill, N.C.	Holland	Rhodes, Pa.
Broyhill, Va.	Howard	Rivers, Alaska
Burke	Hull	Rodino
Burton, Calif.	Hungate	Rogers, Colo.
Burton, Utah	Huot	Rogers, Fla.
Byrne, Pa.	Ichord	Ronan
Cabell	Irwin	Roncalio
Callan	Jacobs	Rooney, N.Y.
Carey	Jarman	Rooney, Pa.
Casey	Jennings	Rosenthal
Chelf	Joelson	Rostenkowski
Clark	Johnson, Calif.	Roush
Clevenger	Johnson, Okla.	Roybal
Conte	Jonas	Ryan
Conyers	Jones, Ala.	Satterfield
Cooley	Jones, Mo.	St Germain
Corman	Jones, N.C.	St. Onge
Craley	Karth	Saylor
Culver	Kastenmeier	Scheuer
Daddario	Kee	Schisler
Daniels	Kelly	Schmidhauser
Davis, Ga.	Keogh	Selden
Dawson	King, Calif.	Senner
de la Garza	King, Utah	Shipley
Delaney	Kirwan	Sickles
Dent	Kluczynski	Sikes
Denton	Kornegay	Sisk
Dingell	Krebs	Slack
Donohue	Kupferman	Smith, Iowa
Dorn	Landrum	Smith, Va.
Downing	Long, La.	Staggers
Dulski	Long, Md.	Stalbaum
Duncan, Oreg.	Love	Stratton
Dyal	McDowell	Stubblefield
Edmondson	McFall	Taylor
Edwards, Calif.	McGrath	Tenzer
Edwards, La.	Macdonald	Thompson, N.J.
Evans, Colo.	Machen	Thompson, Tex.
Everett	Mackay	Trimble
Evins, Tenn.	Madden	Tunney
Fallon	Mahon	Tupper
Farbstein	Marsh	Tuten
Farnsley	Martin, Mass.	Udall
Farnum	Mathias	Ullman
Fascell	Matsunaga	Van Deerlin
Feighan	Meeds	Vanik
Flood	Miller	Vivian
Foley	Mills	Waggonner
Ford, William D.	Minish	Watts
	Mink	Weltner
Fountain	Moeller	White, Tex.
Fraser	Moorhead	Whitener
Frelinghuysen	Morgan	Whitten
Friedel	Morrison	Wilson, Charles H.
Gallagher	Moss	
Gettys	Multer	Wolff
Giaimo	Murphy, Ill.	Wright
Gibbons	Natcher	Wydler
Gilbert	Nedzi	Yates
Gilligan	O'Brien	Young
Gonzalez	O'Hara, Ill.	Zablocki

NAYS—135

Abbitt	Bray	Colmer
Adair	Brock	Conable
Anderson, Ill.	Broomfield	Corbett
Andrews, George W.	Brown, Ohio	Cramer
	Buchanan	Cunningham
Andrews, Glenn	Byrnes, Wis.	Curtin
	Cahill	Curtis
Arends	Callaway	Dague
Ashbrook	Carter	Davis, Wis.
Ayres	Cederberg	Derwinski
Bates	Chamberlain	Devine
Battin	Clancy	Dickinson
Belcher	Clausen, Don H.	Dole
Berry		Dowdy
Betts	Clawson, Del	Duncan, Tenn.
Bolling	Cleveland	Dwyer
Bow	Collier	Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn	McCulloch	Rivers, S.C.
Findley	McDade	Robison
Fino	McEwen	Rogers, Tex.
Fisher	McMillan	Roudebush
Ford, Gerald R.	MacGregor	Rumsfeld
Fulton, Pa.	Mailliard	Schneebeli
Gathings	Martin, Ala.	Schweiker
Goodell	Martin, Nebr.	Secrest
Greigg	May	Shriver
Gross	Michel	Skubitz
Grover	Minshall	Smith, Calif.
Hall	Mize	Smith, N.Y.
Halleck	Moore	Springer
Hansen, Idaho	Morse	Stafford
Harsha	Morton	Stanton
Harvey, Mich.	Mosher	Steed
Herlong	Nelsen	Teague, Calif.
Horton	O'Konski	Thomson, Wis.
Hosmer	Passman	Tuck
Hutchinson	Pelly	Utt
Johnson, Pa.	Pirnie	Vigorito
Keith	Poff	Walker, N. Mex.
King, N.Y.	Quie	Watkins
Kunkel	Quillen	Watson
Laird	Redlin	Whalley
Langen	Reid, Ill.	Widnall
Latta	Reifel	Wilson, Bob
McCarthy	Reinecke	Wyatt
McClory	Rhodes, Ariz.	Younger

NOT VOTING—60

Ashley	Griffin	Nix
Baring	Gurney	O'Neal, Ga.
Barrett	Hagan, Ga.	Purcell
Bell	Hagen, Calif.	Rees
Boland	Hansen, Wash.	Reid, N.Y.
Bolton	Harvey, Ind.	Resnick
Brooks	Hawkins	Reuss
Burleson	Hébert	Roberts
Cameron	Henderson	Scott
Celler	Karsten	Stephens
Cohelan	Leggett	Sullivan
Diggs	Lennon	Sweeney
Dow	Lipscomb	Talcott
Ellsworth	McVicker	Teague, Tex.
Flynt	Mackie	Todd
Fogarty	Matthews	Toll
Fulton, Tenn.	Monagan	Walker, Miss.
Fuqua	Morris	White, Idaho
Garmatz	Murphy, N.Y.	Williams
Green, Oreg.	Murray	Willis

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Monagan against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. O'Neal of Georgia against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Walker of Mississippi against.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee for, with Mr. Lipscomb against.

Mr. Todd for, with Mr. Gurney against.

Mr. Karsten for, with Mr. Harvey of Indiana against.

Mr. Mackie of Michigan for, with Mr. Talcott against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Brooks with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Fuqua with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Murphy of New York.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Ashley.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Dow.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Leggett.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Murray
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Matthews.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Hagen of California.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Cameron.
Mrs. Hansen with Mr. Rees.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. McVicker.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mrs. Sullivan.

Mr. KUNKEL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AUTHORIZING AN OFFICIAL RESIDENCE FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2394) to provide for the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2394 with Mr. ST GERMAIN in the chair.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] will be recognized for 1 hour. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2394 which would authorize the establishment of a much-needed official residence for the Vice President of the United States on some 10 acres located on the grounds of the U.S. Naval Observatory. This is needed and necessary legislation.

I would be remiss in my remarks if at this point I did not pay full and proper tribute to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable KENNETH J. GRAY. Mr. GRAY's handling of this entire matter, both throughout the hearings and in his in-the-field inspection of various sites proposed for a Vice-Presidential mansion, was performed in the most efficient manner. It is his work basically and the time and effort that he put into it that brought to the floor of this House legislation which, I believe, will solve a long-standing problem of a residence for the Vice President.

The stature of the office of Vice President has grown continuously throughout the years, and over the past decade the importance placed upon this position has been clearly shown by the duties, both on a national and international level, that have been given to the Vice President under Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. The Vice President can no longer efficiently and properly carry out his duties without a residence that will be fully in keeping with his office. I do not mean by this something on a wide and elaborate scale, but a proper modern residence that would give to the Vice President the opportunity to fulfill the many social functions in which he must engage in entertaining various dignitaries from all parts of the world and also provide for him an area where he can operate and carry out many of his official duties.

Since the beginning of this Nation there has been a continuing need for

such a residence. Proposals authorizing this legislation have been before this Congress for some 18 years. I believe the bill before us today will solve the problem in the most efficient and practical manner. We are past the time for study of this matter. We have the record of the past to guide us, and the time is now for proper action to provide for the second highest officer of our Nation an official residence.

S. 2394 carries out these objectives, and I strongly urge its passage by this body.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the House Committee on Public Works takes great pride in presenting for your consideration a bill to authorize the General Services Administration to plan, design, construct, furnish, and maintain an official residence for the Vice President of the United States on a suitable site at 3400 Massachusetts Avenue NW., at the Naval Observatory in the District of Columbia. I hope all of my colleagues will join our committee in helping us reach this historic milestone.

There are many reasons why we need a permanent home for the occupant of the second highest office in the world. In order that my colleagues will have time to discuss this matter, I shall mention just a few of the compelling arguments in general debate and then will be glad to answer any questions propounded by the membership of the House at the time of my remarks.

Before I explain the bill, I want to take this opportunity to thank our distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Public Works [Mr. FALLON] my colleagues on the subcommittee and full committee on both sides of the aisle for their helpful consideration of this legislation. Although I am disappointed that the minority on our committee has not seen fit to support the bill, they have been fair. I also want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], who introduced one of the first bills on this subject, and my other colleagues who have testified at our hearings and written letters on this subject. I want to thank our beloved Speaker [Mr. MCCORMACK], and our majority leader [Mr. ALBERT] for their able assistance with this proposal. I also want to thank the Committee on Rules for their expedious action in granting a rule.

Mr. Chairman, the first reason for speedy passage of this bill is due to the fact that the Office of the Vice-Presidency has been catapulted into an enormous task. The Vice President cannot serve the President and the people adequately without facilities. As chairman of the Space Council, liaison with world leaders and troubleshooter for the President, we must realize that the Vice President's business is our business. With the Vietnam conflict occupying more than 50 percent of the President's time, many important functions must, by necessity, be delegated to the Vice President. If we give him the proper tools with which to work and he does a good job, we benefit. If he does a poor job, whoever he may be, we suffer. This bill will provide him with an official home in which he can live and conduct the people's business.

Second, the Members of the other body passed a bill last October authorizing a Vice-Presidential residence. Information provided at that time showed very clearly that the present accommodations for the Vice President are wholly inadequate, both from a financial and prestige standpoint.

Third, the people who know best have all urged Congress to act on this matter. Former Vice President, and later President, Harry S. Truman, has stated publicly his support for such a residence. Former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, just 10 days ago, told Washington Post reporter, Marie Smith, that there was an urgent need for a home for the Vice President and advocated new construction in preference to remodeling an existing structure. President Eisenhower, in 1958, addressed an executive communication to Congress calling for the establishment of the Vice President's home. Former Vice President and now President, Lyndon B. Johnson, has voiced his approval. I ask those of you who may not have made up your minds concerning this proposal if this is not a pretty good testimony for the bill before you.

Fourth, not one witness, either in or out of Congress, testified against the need for a vice-presidential residence. We held 2 days of hearings, plus, I, personally, as subcommittee chairman on Public Buildings and Grounds, wrote all 435 Members of the House without a dissent as to need. It is true that certain witnesses had different locations or different methods to propose, but all were in support of a permanent home for the Vice President.

Fifth, the argument made by the minority that this is a desirable proposal but should be deferred because of the so-called guns and butter issue, is not a valid argument. Mr. Chairman, it is not a valid argument because of two factors:

First, it is our intention to ask for only $45,000 this year to draw the necessary designs, complete architectural planning, and other work. This will take from 12 to 18 months. At the end of this period, if the Vietnam war is still going on, we can make a judgment as to whether or not we want to proceed with actual construction.

Second, the "guns and butter" issue is not valid because this bill authorizes the acceptance of cash gifts and there is every reason to believe that by the time we are through with architectural and engineering plans, we may have received enough funds through donation to construct the residence without any of the taxpayers' money.

In 1957, the Annenberg Foundation of Philadelphia offered a cash donation of $250,000 for the construction of a permanent residence for the Vice President. This and other offers may come long before we have the plans completed. I know that many nonprofit foundations and organizations will want to share in the pride of furnishing either cash, furnishings for the house, or other gifts. The General Services Administration will make sure that there are no strings attached to any gift and that it will become the property of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, you will hear arguments advanced today by the minority that if this residence should be built, it will take millions of dollars to operate and maintain it.

Once again, I regret to take issue with my good friends on the minority side, but this is not an accurate statement. We do not plan to construct a residence for the Vice President of the size requiring a large number of people. To give the membership an idea of the size of this residence, we envision a three-story brick, with stone trim, structure, plus a full basement and a three-car garage. The basement, of course, will be for utilities. The first floor will be for public use areas such as dining room, ballroom, and a conference room that can be used for public gatherings. The second floor will be used for the private living quarters for the Vice President's family and will be equivalent to a six-bedroom, six-bath home. The third floor will be used for domestic help and could double as spare bedrooms during inaugurations and other busy times.

We envision each floor with approximately 4,000 square feet, so, if you take in the basement, we are talking about a house of approximately 16,000 square feet. Comparing this with the White House in size, there are 61,000 square feet, not including the executive wings of the White House. Therefore, you can readily see that we propose a home large enough to do the job but only one-fourth the size of the center part of the White House. To say it will cost millions of dollars to operate and maintain a house of this size is simply not true.

Just across the road from the proposed site, you will find the Admiral's house, a three-story structure. This is the home of the Chief of Naval Operations. I am sure he would resent being accused of spending millions of dollars in entertaining, operating, and maintaining his home. He is not and we are not going to either. Please do not believe this argument. It just is not so.

Mr. Chairman, we have selected the 10 acres at the Naval Observatory site as the best location for this residence. It affords a fenced-in, built-in security force, Government-owned land, is in the center of Embassy Row, and accessible to both the Capitol and the White House. The other body passed a bill to create a three-member commission to select a site and gave them the authority to spend $1 million. After careful consideration, we came to the conclusion that Congress is better able to determine the location of this home than some three-member Commission appointed by the President who would be in office a maximum of 18 months and with no assurance that they could even agree on a location.

Furthermore, the bill before you would authorize a maximum of $750,000, thereby cutting the Senate figure by one quarter million.

The bill before you provides for new construction. The Commission would have had authority to buy an existing structure and, believe me, most of the

structures proposed to our committee were built around the turn of the century and would be very costly to renovate and very costly to maintain. The commission idea would only delay this proposal and certainly would cost more money. The bill before you is adequate to build and furnish this residence even if we do not get the expected donations.

Knowing the history of the Rayburn Building and other Government structures, I can assure you emphatically, as subcommittee chairman on public buildings and grounds, that our committee will not be back before the House asking for additional authorizations. You can inform your constituents that $45,000 is all that will be required for the first year and that Congress will insist that the administration stay within the limits authorized by this bill in planning and constructing the residence.

Mr. Chairman, in closing let me remind my colleagues that the lack of a vice-presidential residence has been a handicap to the office for years and it has seriously detracted from the dignity of the high post. The Vice President is a standby President. The trend in recent years is for the President to give additional responsibilities to his Vice President. Since 1948, five Senators have been elevated to the position of Vice President. They have all done an outstanding job with what they have had to work with. This bill transforms good intentions into action. Bills have been introduced into Congress for the past 18 years dealing with this subject. For 176 years we have failed to provide an official residence for the Vice President. Please lay partisan politics aside and join with me and the other members of the Public Works Committee in taking this historic step.

Some say we cannot afford this home. I would like to remind the membership of the House that the States of Georgia, California, Ohio, and other States are now planning Governors' Mansions costing more than this proposed residence. Louisiana recently completed a home for their Governor. Are we to say that a single State in this Union is better equipped than all the 50 States combined?

George Washington stood on the Naval Observatory site while a member of Braddock's army, and looked down on the rolling countryside and said, "This would make a nice location to build the Federal City." Let us stand here today with the courage of George Washington and point to the beautiful Naval Observatory grounds and say, "This would make a great location to build a permanent residence for the Vice President of the United States." I am sure generations yet unborn will be as proud of our action as we are of the action of our first President who gave us this beautiful Federal City. I hope all of you can agree with the reasoning advanced by your Committee on Public Works and support this historic proposal. In closing, let me recite the following poem I wrote this afternoon that explains why we must be builders:

I saw the gentlemen from New Hampshire
tear the Vice President's home down.
He and a group of men in a busy town,
with a ho heave ho, and a lusty yell,
They swing a pen and the proposal fell.

I ask you my dear colleagues, are these men
as skilled
As the men you would hire, if you wanted
to build?

I am sure you would say, no indeed
Just common labor is all you need.

So we should ask ourselves as we consider
the bill today,
Which of these roles do we intend to play?

Will we be builders who work with care,
Measuring the need by the rule and square;
Passing our proposal providing for a well
made plan.
Patiently doing the best we can?
Or, will we be wreckers who inform our
great town,
That we have joined Mr. CLEVELAND in tearing the V. P. home down?

Lest we neglect our duty to our followers,
Let us go forth from this hall as builders.

45,000 dollars planning money is a small
amount of dough.
With the truth out, the guns and butter issue will quickly go.

Thank you.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, after that impassioned plea by my beloved friend from Illinois, who is chairman of the subcommittee and for whom I have the highest regard, I would suggest that now, since we have a "White House," should this bill become law, that we should name the Vice President's residence the "Gray House."

The gentleman discussed a number of matters, but when you get right down to it, the sum total of what is being proposed here is one thing: a home for the Vice President.

The Vice President has a home. The Vice President is happy in that home. The Vice President's wife, I think, does not particularly desire to become a person required to spend many long hours on entertainment. She is, and has said so, happy in her home. The Vice President has said his home is paid for and he likes his home. So we are not talking about providing a home for the Vice President. He has a home. He is happy in it.

We are not talking about an office for the Vice President. The bill specifically indicates, and so do the hearings, that there is not going to be any office space in this new building. There will be no office space in it.

This is not like the White House, which is a "work" building, where there are working offices, where the Vice President is going to do his work and meet people who come in and have responsibilities, along with his office in the Senate.

This bill is for one specific purpose, when all the chaff is out of it, because there is nothing left. I repeat he has a place to live. I repeat he has a place to work, for he already has an office. I repeat there is going to be no office in this new building. So it is for one purpose: To provide a palace for entertainment for the part of the Vice President of the United States. The 4,000 square feet on the first floor is for entertainment. That is a great amount of square footage. This large House Chamber is only 7,752 square feet.

My distinguished colleague has suggested, with respect to the cost of this new residence, that the $750,000 does not have anything to do with the great value of the land. In the testimony it is admitted that the land, the 10 acres involved, is worth millions of dollars. So we are talking about millions for land plus an additional $750,000.

The evidence in the hearings is clear that the $750,000 has nothing to do with the cost of administration, with the number of gardeners, with the number of butlers and waiters, and with the number of special people brought in for entertainment purposes.

What about the chef? Are we going to be subjected in this country again to the lengthy discussions and very trying problems of who is going to be a chef for the Vice President?

I do not know exactly what salary we pay for the chef in the White House, but there is going to be a chef for the "Gray House." There are going to be gardeners, waiters, busmen, more chauffeurs, and more guards. When we get all of those additional employees on the Federal payroll, I think the bill on this is going to run close to what it costs to run the White House for entertainment purposes, $600,000 plus.

So what we are talking about is not the necessity of an official residence for the Vice President. He has one. He is happy in it. He likes it.

We are not talking about offices where he can administer the functions of the Vice President. He has those right here in the Capitol and in the Executive Offices of the White House.

We are talking about 4,000 square feet for entertainment. If the Members of the House want to go on record at this time, with the war in Vietnam—after having appropriated $13.6 billion just last week for the purpose of providing guns and support for our military personnel—to provide frills, support entertainment for the Vice President costing $750,000 to start, and millions to follow in years to come, then let them do so.

As someone said on the floor just a few minutes ago, the slogan probably should be "rifles and ruffles," not "guns and frills," perhaps.

Believing in fiscal responsibility at all times but particularly at this time being deeply concerned about the fact that our national debt is now $323 billion with an authorized debt of $328 billion and being deeply concerned about the fact that last February the cost of living went up seven-tenths of 1 percent and five-tenths of 1 percent in January—and if it continues at an average rate of six-tenths of 1 percent, then we are heading for a 7.2-percent cost-of-living increase in fiscal 1967—believing this and being concerned about this, I am opposed to this expenditure at this time. Democratic Members of the House say they have a concern about the poor man and woman on fixed incomes. Do they not have any concern about the American who today, because of our prolific spending and an unwill-

ingness to set necessary priorities, which we have a fine opportunity to do here today, is being put in this terrible position? Do they not have any concern about him? This prolific spending is one of the major contributors to inflation. People on fixed incomes are being robbed in this fiscal year 1966 of possibly 7.2 percent of their wages and earnings. This, a year in which the United States of America, regrettably we must admit, is at war. Where is our sense of responsibility in setting proper priorities? Just where is it? If there is a bill that has come before this House this year with which we could better demonstrate our determination to protect the American people against continuously increased taxes, then I do not know of any better one than this one. We know increased taxes are coming. We have voted for them once already this session. Higher spending and the ravages of inflation have been occurring systematically. This bill is the best way I can think of to stop this. This is a symbolic bill. This involves more than the $750,000 suggested. It involves millions more that are going to be involved in the future.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Florida kindly yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I will in a few minutes. I want to answer the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] first.

The gentleman mentioned Harry S. Truman. I think it is interesting that his wire was dated March 17 of this year. I would have expected to get a favorable reply, but I just wondered why, if this was so important, he did not ask for a similar residence and get one with a Democratic controlled Congress during the long period of time when he was President of the United States. Was it not equally important for him to have his Vice President housed in a building such as this, which, according to the Senate report, will be second only in stature to the Capitol itself, and the White House? Why now, after 175 years? What is the urgency? What is the urgency, in a time of war, that we should be considering this bill at this time? It was suggested here that President Eisenhower back in 1958 proposed it. However, my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] at the same time said or suggested that the burdens of the Presidency then "were not half so great." I agree with that statement. I do not think the President of the United States then, President Eisenhower, if he were President today, would recommend the building of a Vice-Presidential mansion at this time.

Now, with regard to former Vice President Richard Nixon and his statement, I talked to him on the phone about this the very day he was in town and made this statement. He told me on the telephone, and I am confident he would not mind being quoted on this, that he was in principle for the Vice-Presidential mansion but not if it was thought by the Congress that these expenditures were not justified at this time, in these critical years.

Now, with regard to other matters which were discussed, first of all with respect to Mrs. Gandhi, I just wondered why Mrs. Gandhi could not be housed equally well in Blair House. I understand that the Blair House is available for such purposes. If the President, as suggested by my distinguished colleague from Illinois, is spending a good deal of his time—and he assuredly is—on the South Vietnam war and is not entertaining at the White House to the extent that he would otherwise, then what is wrong with the Vice President entertaining at the White House? There are hundreds of square feet available there for wonderful entertainment at the White House, which is presently all tooled up with personnel to handle this. Why not have the entertainment go on there rather than build a new White House or Gray House in this instance?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Florida now yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Florida, realizes that we have the assurance of the committee handling this bill that actual construction costs of the building would not exceed $500,000. I also wonder if at the same time he realizes that we have a number of million-dollar residences all over the world for our Ambassadors. A number of these million-dollar-plus residences were acquired or constructed during the Eisenhower administration. I find no fault with that, but I do say that I feel that a residence for the Vice President is certainly more important than these residences for our Ambassadors abroad.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am surprised that the gentleman from New York did not vote against those expenditures if he felt they were wrong.

While I have the floor, Mr. Chairman, I want to correct the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY], spoke of the alleged Eisenhower endorsement of this thing, as being in a crisis year of 1958.

Mr. Chairman, the Suez crisis was in 1956.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I should like to remind the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], my distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, that appropriates for these $1 million residences for ambassadors, that during the Eisenhower administration he said they were built when the Republicans were in control. The Republicans, true, were in control for a period of 2 years, and for the other 6 years the gentleman from New York who complains about these buildings, was the chairman of the subcommittee which appropriates the money with which to build these structures abroad.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Florida yield briefly so that I may answer my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow]?

The gentleman from Ohio apparently misunderstood my statement here on the floor this afternoon.

Mr. BOW. If so, it is the first time I have ever misunderstood the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am not placing myself in the position of defending anything. I note that the distinguished gentleman from Ohio went along during the Eisenhower administration in acquiring the properties about which we are talking.

My argument is simply that if we can spend $1 million plus for a residence for one of our ambassadors abroad, we certainly can afford to spend $500,000 to construct a residence on Government-owned property here in the District of Columbia for the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield further to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I would say this: that at the time we were doing that, much of it was being done with counterpart funds. We were furnishing properties which we had owned for some period of time. When we get into the $1-million class that was true. In addition to that, during the Eisenhower administration we were not in the position in which we are in today.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, let us get now to the subject of the gentleman's suggestion that this building is going to be put up at a place where it is going to be fenced. I believe the gentleman from Iowa observed, "How does that make it available to the general public?"

Mr. Chairman, I suppose we ought to call this bill the antipicketing bill, based upon what the gentleman from Illinois has said. The gentleman said it was going to keep the people from expressing their views, in the nature of picketing, because you will have the pickets located a long way from the Vice President's mansion. So I guess you could call this the antipicketing bill of 1966.

Mr. Chairman, I was under the impression that most of the people on the right side of the aisle, which is really the left, I guess, thought that picketing was all right. We have a bill which is scheduled to come up with respect to picketing in the very near future. I wonder if perhaps we should not call this the antipicketing bill of 1966.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida is putting words in my mouth. I said that the pickets

would have to be outside the fence. I would not deny anyone the right to picket. I said that the security factor is an important factor, and it would certainly be much better to have the fence than it would be to be exposed like the Vice President was only last Sunday when pickets were present. The site is well protected, and located.

Mr. CRAMER. I doubt that anyone inside the house could see the pickets. Therefore it would not do much good.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If others are going to be picketed, why should not the Vice President be picketed? If the gentleman wants to protect the Vice President from picketing——

Mr. CRAMER. That is what I say. This apparently should be dubbed the antipicketing bill of 1966. It is all right for the President to be picketed, but it is not all right for the Vice President to be picketed.

Now, where do we stop? How far do we go? Is the next thing to come before us to be a bill for a mansion for the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court? Is it next proposed a mansion for each of the members of the President's Cabinet? You can justify them almost equally as well. They have to entertain and represent the U.S. Government. So where does this stop?

Mr. Chairman, let me quote Mrs. Humphrey, who is quoted in the New York Times of December 17, 1964, in which she said, when pressed about whether she thought the Vice-Presidential family should move to a larger home, some interesting points. Let us give a little attention and consideration to what Mrs. Humphrey thinks, because she is the one who is going to have to operate this entertainment palace. She is the one who will have to do the entertaining. I am concerned about Mrs. Humphrey, and I think her view should be of concern to the Members of the House.

She said:

> We are very happy here, and would like to stay put. We can entertain very nicely and informally here.

Mr. Chairman, if we do not pay any attention to the Vice President's wife—and I believe almost everyone else realizes you have to pay attention to what your wife thinks about these things—let us talk about what Mr. HUMPHREY thinks about this proposal.

Let us talk about what Mr. HUMPHREY thinks about this proposal on the basis of his having been quoted: "I love that house I have."

He said that in August. I am concerned about his attitude. You know the Vice President of the United States and I agree that he is one of the busiest men now than ever before. He is out of the country three-quarters of the time and that means he is going to be using the house one-quarter of the time. The Vice President of the United States is a busy man and rightfully so. He has grave responsibilities particularly during these crisis hours of our great Nation. So why should we not give some thoughts to what he thinks about whether or not he wants to have this residence for additional entertaining and these 4,000 square feet for that purpose. He says:

> I have to admit I love that house I have. I have to admit it. It is paid for.

Well by golly, I agree with HUBERT HUMPHREY in that regard even though I do not agree with him on quite a few other things. But I do agree with him in that respect. Let us give some consideration to this man who is so overworked now and everybody admits that. Are we going to put on his shoulders this grave responsibility of spending such a large portion of his time entertaining when he should be out doing the work for the people of this great Nation of ours? I say, let us not overburden the Vice President of the United States. Let us heed what his wife said. Who in the world came in before our committee and testified for this bill? What is the urgency and what is the rush? Who is for it?

Despite the fact that it may be called a "Gray House" who is for it? Who else is for it? Well, we had one witness who testified for it before our committee and that was the General Services Administration. Every other witness came in and did not like the way the bill was drafted. One wanted the commission and one wanted something else. My own distinguished colleague from Florida and I am sorry he is not here at the moment wanted the commission. He wants this thing. Everybody tried to get into the picture. Some wanted the National Planning Commission brought into it. Someone else wanted the arts and science people and other people suggested that the architects be brought into the thing. They said, Let us do it and if we are going to do it and to make this a crash program and suggesting that this is a must. As a matter of fact, they tried to suggest that this is a wartime necessity. I doubt that.

But I wonder who is going to set the priorities? This session of the Congress—it is up to us to start setting priorities and to start today.

Will the administration be willing to set priorities? Yes. Let us take a look at the priorities that it has set up. Congress is going to differ with them I think. They say, "Let us decrease the school milk program from $103 million to $21 million annually while at the same time calling for the $82 million cut in the school milk program, he is proposing. $200 million to be spent on highway beautification."

Let us take another example. Who is going to set these priorities? I say it is time that we in the Congress do that.

In the national defense education program, he has knocked out the direct loan program. At the same time it is interesting to note that the administration is cutting out the direct loan programs for these students, it is paying 40 percent of the $2.1 million grant to the School of Technology of the University of Havana to train Communist students in the use of missiles and electronics, to which I have objected.

The impacted area program is going to be almost dismantled.

At the same time $5 million is proposed to eliminate racial imbalances.

Today is the day for the Congress of the United States to set priorities and this is the bill in which to do it.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE], a member of the committee.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support enthusiastically the bill, S. 2394, as amended by the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives because I firmly believe that now is the time for the U.S. Congress to provide an official residence for the Vice President of the United States.

I also highly commend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY], the very capable chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, for his extremely effective leadership.

Mr. Chairman, no man can deny the fact that we are now living in times of uncertain international stress. Because of this fact it appears to me that we in Congress have an obligation to provide this modest but adequate official residence for the Vice President which we are considering today.

In particular, I am of the firm conviction, Mr. Chairman, that we have a responsibility to the American people to provide this official residence as well as ample security for the Vice President who is the servant of all the people of our great Nation regardless of political affiliation.

Should we fail in our responsibility today, we would not discharge our obligation to the American people to provide adequate facilities for the protection of all future Vice Presidents of the United States.

I should like to call the attention of Members of the House to the fact that only last week pickets gathered for a demonstration in front of the Vice President's small and modest home in Maryland. No one can answer this question, but the question is, Should this crowd have become violent, what could the police department, what could the Secret Service have done to protect his life?

In listening to the observations that have been made here today, I strongly state the opinion that our American forces fighting in Vietnam right this minute fully expect the United States Congress to provide adequate security protection for the second highest official of our Government.

In conclusion, it is my hope that this measure will be passed this afternoon by a substantial majority.

Mr. Chairman, the responsibility is ours. I feel that we will do the job which has been entrusted to us. Thank you.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for a very fine statement.

We have no further speakers on this subject at the present time.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he begins his statement?

Mr. KUNKEL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. I would like to tell the House how very much our Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds regrets that the gentleman now in the well is leaving the Congress after this session. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] has been a very valuable member of the Committee on Public Works and the subcommittee which I have the pleasure of being chairman the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I wish to state publicly that we on the majority side regret seeing the gentleman leave the House after this session.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. KUNKEL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I, too, wish to join with my distinguished colleague in expressing to the gentleman from Pennsylvania our regret at his determination to retire. He has been one of the stalwarts, one of the outstanding members of our committee and in the Congress, and I am sure this House, the Nation and his district in particular will miss him. They are losing a great public servant.

Mr. KUNKEL. Thank you very much. Frankly, I would much rather stand here and listen to these kind comments than to make a speech against the bill, especially in view of the fact that our chairman has done so much work on it, and I think he has done a splendid job.

My only reason for being in opposition to the bill is that I think it is the wrong time. I listened to the gentleman from Illinois give a long list of all the appropriations and the authorizations passed by the Congress during the past two years. Then he drew the inference that we had to continue to pass everything that was proposed, irrespective of how nonessential it might be.

I just do not think you can go on that way. Every little bit added to what you have already spent makes your national debt and your expenditures just that much higher. I think we have to draw the line. We must keep to essentials. The principle involved here is most important, even though the amount is small This bill is a symbol of our fiscal policy and what it is to us in wartime.

The majority leader spoke about the Republicans being political on this. Well, in one sense we certainly are being political and properly so. Why? Because we think it raises one of the great issues now before the country. That is the one of making priorities and trying to cut expenses in nonessentials to the bone so that we can continue with the war in Vietnam as we must do, and so that we can continue with the programs here at home that are essential to our people at home to the greatest extent possible.

The only way we can do that is by cutting down and setting priorities and eliminating nonessential programs. If you vote for all these programs put together, even the so-called little ones, they add up.

For example, this year we have already passed the bill for the Interama down at Miami Beach. That may be a nice thing, but it certainly is not essential these days and it certainly is not essential for the Government to participate in it.

We have also passed the bill for the centennial of Alaska. That is a desirable objective, for which I would ordinarily want to vote, but I feel that it is not in the priority class by any means. So I voted against the interama.

Mr. Chairman, a careful weighing of all the pros and cons ought to convince anyone that this bill today presents us with a splendid opportunity for saving $750,000. Only in that sense can it be said that this idea of building another Federal mansion has been brought up at the right time in the right place.

I think our distinguished subcommittee chairman had a slip of the tongue when he spoke about building residences for the postmasters, because I do not think we are doing that. What we are doing is building post offices and post office facilities for the American people. That argument is not very apropos.

We have a war going on. It is eating up tax dollars and I O U's at the rate of approximately $30 million a day. We have inflation bearing down on us. The latest danger signs are in the wholesale price index. It has shot up nearly 1½ percent in the first 2 months this year—in other words, at an incredible and ruinous annual rate of close to 9 percent if it continues. No one here needs a primer course in what inflation does to people—or in how Federal spending aggravates it.

The executive branch obviously refuses to set any meaningful priorities. I am at a loss to know who is going to set them if the Congress does not. But so far, sad to say, this body has failed to weed out nonessentials.

Certainly it cannot be convincingly argued that HUBERT HUMPHREY is being hampered in anything. In fact, I would like to take a moment out to compliment the Vice President greatly on the fine attitude he and his wife have taken in leaving this entirely up to the Congress. I also compliment him on the outstanding services he is rendering our Nation. If we follow this same general pattern as the Vice President and his wife, we will discard this program at this time, or perhaps I should say we will postpone it until a later time.

In fact, I agree with the majority report on this bill where it says:

> We are long overdue in establishing such a residence.

I hope that such a residence will be established. All I am saying is, this is not the time to do it. Let us reject this bill and be able to go home and tell the folks that we have saved a few dollars anyway. Then, when the war is over and we are no longer in such a fiscal bind, we can afford to be a little more free about what we spend money on, we can come back and pass this bill with a clear conscience. Then use the argument that this is long overdue—but not until then.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said about the legislation before us. The central issue under consideration seems to be twofold. First, whether the building of the Vice President's home should proceed with the minimal amount of study given to the proposal rather than evolving through the regularly established study commission concept as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget; and, secondly, to reiterate the fact that a principle is at stake as we consider this legislation—the principle of establishing priorities on projects and programs to be approved and advanced by this Congress.

During the winter of 1964 and throughout most of 1965, many areas of the country were hard hit with natural disasters—floods, forest fires, tornadoes, hail storms, ice blocks, and hurricanes brought destruction of a magnitude heretofore unheard of in the history of this country.

These disasters dramatically point to projects that are urgently needed to provide the security and peace of mind to our citizens. This is particularly true of the many flood control, navigation, and water resource development problems in need of consideration and funding throughout the country. These are the priorities that I believe should be accelerated wherever possible.

While the amount of money to some is insignificant, it nevertheless represents an item that could be deferred, as some have suggested. However, this point is relatively unimportant, in my view, as compared to the many items and programs of a duplicating nature that are placed in appropriation bills year after year—many of which could be deleted in their entirety. This, of course, will not be resolved here today but I believe it incumbent on the minority to take this means of focusing attention on considerations before the Congress that can be deferred—this is the chief responsibility of the loyal opposition.

Finally, I want to again refer to a point that I made in committee—that being the desirability of submitting the architectural design to nationwide competition so as to incorporate the best and most creative ideas into the design of the structure.

I want to make myself abundantly clear, I do not strongly oppose the objective of providing the Vice President with a home. I do have some reservations about the manner in which we are proceeding. A departure from established

procedure could lead to unforeseen problems that have occurred in the construction of other important buildings on Capitol Hill—this we should avoid, if at all possible.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. REID].

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, looking back over the past 20 years since the end of World War II, most of us will agree that the role of the Vice President in our Government has become increasingly prominent. This is as it should be, and I do not doubt that the office will continue to grow in importance in the future. In addition to the Vice President's official assignment as President of the Senate, today he must necessarily assume more and more of the oversight and ceremonial functions heretofore performed by the President himself; and I think it is essential that we recognize this. Certainly I agree that at some time we should provide an appropriate official residence in Washington for the Vice President and his family. Like the President, the Vice President is also a public man; and probably should live in a comfortable residence provided by the people—one which will reflect the dignity of his office, afford proper security, and free him during his tenure of office from the added burden and the perplexities of maintaining a private home sufficient for his official needs.

However, even though I subscribe to the long-range objectives of the bill before us today, I cannot in good conscience give the measure my support because I disagree with both its approach and particularly its timing. When S. 2394 was considered by the Senate last year, the Senate Committee on Public Works very wisely pointed out that this will be more than a family home—it will become a national landmark. For this reason, the Senate favored the establishment of a special commission to study and coordinate the project. Yet, the House version before us today, which abandons the commission approach, represents a crash program to provide an immediate official residence for the Vice President at a time when a dire and compelling emergency, beyond inconvenience, has not been demonstrated to exist. Admittedly, it would be nice to have an official mansion for our second-ranking elected official, and it may be that the site selected in this bill is a superior one. But I think this is not a decision we in the Congress should make, even if we were in fact fully qualified to make such a judgment. What we are contemplating in this legislation is a mansion which, by its very nature, will have great historical importance for the future. I believe it would be far more appropriate to submit the question as to the present and future needs of the Vice President to a nonpartisan commission of outstanding individuals in Government and the arts who could consult with the Federal agencies involved, the National Capital Planning Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts, the American Institute of Architects, and others.

The principal objection to the commission approach, of course, is the fact that it requires time—but it seems to me that the timing of this project is the most important factor which should be given even more serious thought by the Congress. S. 2394 as now written calls for the expenditure of an initial $750,000. Yet, after almost two centuries without an official residence for our Vice President, the proposal is being made at the very time when we are involved in an expensive and critical war of indefinite duration in Vietnam. I went to Vietnam during the last congressional recess and spent several days visiting with our boys who are so valiantly fighting in the cause of freedom. It was an experience I shall never forget. Perhaps having been there I feel more of a personal interest in what they are seeking to achieve and what we should be doing here at home. Frankly, I am disturbed over this attitude which many have that Congress should continue to authorize deferable and uncritical projects here at home as if Vietnam does not exist. I am disturbed, too, that while our boys over there take their daily hardships in stride as their duty to their country, we continue unnecessary spending with a domestic economy facing a new threat of inflation, with a national debt growing to alarming proportions, and with another year of deficit spending ahead. This is a time when the Congress should be realistic—when it should establish as I have said before some meaningful priorities as to essential and necessary spending. Vice President HUMPHREY has said that he loves his little house in Chevy Chase—that it is bought and paid for. How will he feel then, in a lavish official mansion with a $750,000 Federal mortgage? It has been said here today that in opposing this legislation we prove that we are against everything. Now I do not feel that I am against everything—I know I am for fiscal responsibility and for sound sensible economy in government.

I sincerely hope that we can one day soon provide an official residence for our Vice Presidents. This would make all of us proud. But I think a majority of Americans would want it to be both properly planned, properly budgeted, and properly timed—not just another symbol of an era of deficit spending. I think in truth this is the way our Vice Presidents would want it, too.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I am mindful of the fact that most of my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle are in opposition to this legislation and particularly our leadership. I do not like to find myself in opposition to my Republican colleagues in their continued efforts to reduce, to eliminate, and to prevent nonessential Federal spending. In fact, on the contrary, Mr. Chairman, I think their success in attaining this objective is most essential if we are going to maintain a sufficient degree of fiscal stability in order to provide all of our people with the better things in life which we desire to provide for them. Most certainly we are going to have to maintain our economic strength if we are going to remain a free nation.

Furthermore, I should like to point out that this idea of trying to reduce nonessential Federal spending is not a popular cause or a popular political role to fill.

Mr. Chairman, it is not pleasant to hear demagogic statements to the effect that by attempting to reduce expenditures we are attempting to sacrifice the poor and the hungry.

Mr. Chairman, it would be much easier to get on the spending bandwagon and let the floodgates down. However, all of us know that unless there is some restraint exercised in some quarter there will not be any degree of fiscal stability in our Nation. We cannot obtain a millenium by uncontrolled Federal spending. On the contrary, we will have economic chaos if restraint is not exercised.

So, Mr. Chairman, while I agree with the objectives of my Republican colleagues, I do not agree that their opposition to this measure at this time is consistent with a sound economy drive.

Let me say in the first place that the amount involved by comparison is insignificant. It represents only a drop in the bucket. It is peanuts, if you please, insofar as the tremendous financial problem with which we are confronted is concerned.

I have always felt that there were two areas in which we could economize, in general. First of all is to eliminate a nonessential Federal program, to start with, or better yet, not to enact the program. That is how you can do some real economizing.

We could save billions by just eliminating a few of these unessential programs.

A second broad area in which we can economize is to continue looking for better or more efficient administration and management, as all industry must do in order to survive under the competitive free enterprise system.

Mr. Chairman, we most certainly cannot economize by failing to adopt good procedures or through failing to attract the best and the most qualified and the most efficient personnel.

We cannot economize by failing to provide proper equipment and facilities, even though at times this may require the purchase and construction of facilities that may have a luxurious appearance, which may have such items which in the past some people have said were luxuries, such as air conditioning, better lighting, and generally attractive surroundings.

Mr. Chairman, what I am trying to say is that we cannot always economize by failing to provide necessary expenditures with which to improve our operation equipment and our operating facilities even though it may require a substantial initial authorization of funds.

Mr. Chairman, the Office of the Vice President was created by the Constitution, obviously. It is silly for anyone to say or to even suggest that that office be abolished. Yet that would appear on the surface to save money by eliminating the salary and expenses of the Vice Presi-

dent and his assistants. But we all know that this would be ridiculous. I make this reference to show that there are limits to how far we can go in our efforts to economize. So, Mr. Chairman, we agree that we should maintain the Office of Vice President and it is the second highest office in the land, the second highest office in the greatest, the most powerful, and the wealthiest Nation in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, everyone agrees that the office of the Vice President is an office with increasing responsibility almost daily. In fact, during the last three administrations the Vice Presidents have played an excellent role in helping to create more good will throughout the world. I say our Nation can well afford, well afford, to provide adequate and proper facilities, in keeping with the dignity as well as the responsibility of that office.

And, Mr. Chairman, let me say that $750,000 is not too much to pay for such a facility. The fact of the matter is it is not going to buy too much of a home or a residence or headquarters for our Vice President. In fact, we are paying a great deal more of our money through foreign aid programs which in turn is buying much more expensive homes for foreign potentates throughout the rest of the world, and I say we are spending a great deal more for some of our embassies in some sections of the world. I say the State responsibilities, the official responsibilities of our Vice President require more than the minimum with repect to living standards and housing facilities.

This proposal contained in this bill would not provide the Vice President with a residence much greater than many of the foreign ambassadors have while they are stationed here.

I do not believe our Vice President should be required to go into debt in order to provide himself with this proper living standard and with proper headquarters. I do not believe we should subject the Vice President, whoever he may be, to the possibility—and I say possibility, because I do not believe that any of our Vice Presidents in our lifetime would be subjected to this—but I do not think we should subject the Vice President to the possibility of being obligated to some financial institution or to some individual in order to borrow the funds sufficient to purchase a home here in Washington in an attempt to provide himself with the minimum standards that we all feel he should have.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, we have waited too long to face up to this responsibility and to come up with an answer to this problem. There is never a good time to authorize the expenditure of additional funds. But I think this bill here today provides the absolute minimum that we, the greatest Nation the world has ever known, should provide for decent living standards and decent headquarters and a decent place from which the Vice President can carry out his duties of state and the responsibilities of the second highest office in this Nation of ours.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this House will by a substantial majority approve of this legislation at this time.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. I want to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Virginia for the very fine statement on the subject of housing. It might interest the gentleman from Virginia and also my other colleagues to know that the State of Louisiana has just built a Governor's mansion at a cost of much more than we are proposing here. The State of California has authorized a Governor's mansion. The State of Ohio is going to build a Governor's mansion and the State of Georgia is going to build a Governor's mansion.

These legislatures have approved plans in those States that I know of and certainly if one State can afford a Governor's mansion costing more than we are suggesting here, certainly 50 States ought to be able to provide one residence for the Vice President of the United States.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman for the stand he is taking here today on this legislation.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I think in opposing this legislation, it would appear that some Members are guilty of being pennywise and pound foolish.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this legislation will be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I will not take issue with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, relating to the figures more so than I already have, but I would suggest that it is my understanding that the Governor's mansion in Louisiana cost only $150,000. I suggest that there is a considerable difference between $750,000, as provided for in S. 2394, as reported, and $150,000 for the Governor's mansion in Louisiana.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. I would say to the gentleman, I had the honor to live there once during the disaster and I would sure love to be able to buy it for $150,000.

Mr. CRAMER. I wish we could build one for that little.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, there is no question but what the gentleman from Virginia is correct in saying that this is an insignificant item in the overall economy of the Federal Government. But it is symbolic and I think symbols are quite important these days. I felt that President Johnson when he turned out the lights in the White House was engaging in symbolism—and very properly so—to try to call the attention of the Nation to the importance of economy in those times—2 years ago.

I think we must view this in this light—that it is symbolic at a time when we are fighting a war and when the President in his message to the Congress said that those who are talking about cutting expenditures would be directing attention to cutting programs for the poor. This same expression has been used by other supporters of this administration in its expenditure policy. Namely; the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DOUGLAS, one of the ranking members of the Joint Economic Committee at our recent press meeting when we filed the report on the President's Economic Report. He said the same thing. He said—Well, Republicans will be cutting out money that would be directed to the programs for the poor.

I said at the time, I resented the President's statement in his address to the Congress and I resented the remarks of the gentleman at that time; that certainly no one was anxious in these times to either cut back—for the war in Vietnam or on the poor people of this country. So this becomes very important in a symbolic fashion. This is not an item of military defense or for the poor. This is symbolic of an item that can be delayed.

This is symbolic of the very area where we have heated up our economy unduly—in the field of construction, where construction workers are in great demand today. We frankly have jobs going begging in this area and we can see a serious shortage in construction materials.

The Ways and Means Committee is holding hearings on a very critical situation in respect to copper shortage. The majority leader just today announced with pride that 200,000 additional tons of copper were released from the stockpile because there is a shortage. There is a shortage of aluminum, and a shortage of other building materials.

So this issue before us is highly symbolic. I think we must be concerned at the Federal level with these kinds of symbols. It is certainly true that if the Federal Government and the Federal Congress is not going to set an example in this area of building public buildings, the States will certainly not stand off. They will continue to build their Governors' mansions, mentioned during the debate and so will the people in the private sector continue along these lines. They will say, "If Congress symbolically does not say this is a serious problem that faces our society in this inflationary situation in time of war, why should we be concerned?"

I was frankly shocked the other day—again speaking of symbolism—when Secretary McNamara chose to vacation over in Switzerland in these times when the President of the United States had told American tourists and people contemplating touring abroad to try to cut back because we have a serious gold shortage and a balance-of-payments problem. No one begrudges the Secretary of Defense a well-earned vacation. But people in high position must realize that what they do is symbolic, just as, I again say, President Johnson realized the symbolism of

turning off the lights in the White House, the result would be a pittance; it was meaningless as far as the actual money was concerned, but it certainly was symbolic of the issue that faced our society. And that, I submit, is the issue with which we are concerned here today.

I thought the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] expressed it beautifully. I think we do recognize that we should have a residence for the Vice President. I would agree with what was said on the other side. We have waited too long. But symbolically this is not the time, and there is every reason in the world why we in the Congress should demonstrate to our people that we are at war and we are in a critical situation as far as inflation is concerned. We must finance the war in Vietnam and also take care of the poor.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Missouri has put his finger on the critical issue which faces us here today. In setting priorities, if we cannot say "No" to the enactment of legislation to provide for the Vice President's residence, then we shall set a pattern in this Congress for endless spending on all sorts of matters that should not have the priority of wartime expenditures. That is the issue, which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] has put his finger on very pointedly.

I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND].

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, before I read into the RECORD the "poetry" that I have chosen to express my supplemental views on this legislation, I should like to call the attention of this Committee of the Whole to the fact that my supplemental views, which happen to be in poetry, or, as some critics that I think are slightly harsh have said, doggerel—I want my colleagues to know that my verse is footnoted. There are 13 footnotes.

For example, I cite the distinguished authority on Congress, Neil MacNeil. I cite the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. I cite a statement in connection with inflation attributed to our President, Mr. Johnson. I cite the distinguished Congressman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. At one time I even cite one of my favorite authors, the gentleman from New Hampshire, Congressman CLEVELAND. I also have a quote here from the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman BRADEMAS. So it goes. My footnotes are all in the report, Report No. 1310.

The doggerel may be rough. The poetry may be rough. But the points I attempt to make are important. I will not recount the many arguments made here today, but certainly we are at war in Vietnam, and certainly—and here I paraphrase the President of the United States—we are faced with the problem of inflation. The distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON], the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] have all pointed out this inflationary problem. There is no argument that it is a real problem.

We socked ourselves and we socked the people of our country—and I say this in my poem—with a big tax increase the other day because of the war in Vietnam and because we are afraid of inflation.

I quote the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, MENDEL RIVERS, on this, that we are so short of money that we cannot build adequate houses for the soldiers who are fighting this war.

We know, when we talk about this bill costing only $750,000, that we are kidding ourselves. We know what happened with the cost of the Rayburn House Office Building and we know what happens with almost every other public building. They always cost more. Do not kid yourself about that and do not try to kid the voters about it next fall.

With this background, let me share with you my supplemental views.

In this first verse, I remember the distinguished majority leader [Mr. ALBERT], criticizing the Republican leaders for being obstructionists. I am sorry he is not on the floor to hear this first verse.

Republicans, it's sometimes said
Are "No-men," who obstruct,
When all we ask is why and when,
How much and where construct?

So it is with trepidation
That here again I file dissent,
For it's * * * "to get along, go along"
Down here where the dough is spent.

The issue here before us
Is clearly drawn and square:
Do we need a junior White House?
Why? When? How much? And where?

The Senate says we need one,
Second only, so they say,
To the White House and these hallowed Halls
Where the spenders now hold sway.

But while boys who fight for freedom
Are poorly housed and chill,
Is it right to build a mansion,
A frill up on a hill?

While the dollar fades before us
And inflation robs the poor,
We should build and spend with true restraint
So the dollar may endure.

Let me say this, in connection with this line: That is where I am footnoting a direct quote of the President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson. I want to repeat that verse.

While the dollar fades before us
And inflation robs the poor,
We should build and spend with true restraint
So the dollar may endure.

Our VP says he loves his home,
It's paid for free and clear;
Why move him from such happy state
To a mansion priced so dear?

They say there is a desperate need
For space to entertain;
But can our Nation stand it
If twisting halls are twain?

On the brighter, lighter side
We may perhaps agree
That the mansion will be lighted
So at night, it's there to see.

This bill, of course, will pass,
The word is out for sure;
So we may perhaps take comfort
If it's visible to the poor.

But bright at night or dark
It is the concept we should douse;
While we're at war and fighting
It is a we-can-do-without house.

The Great Society has needs
But here's a new low blow,
To sock us with a tax increase
And millions for a go-go.

Down here where money's easy,
Let's spend, let's spend, the cry;
And it's apres votes, the deluge,
Let's build to beat Versailles.

We talk about the signals false
That flash across the sky
When bearded students shrilly ask
"Why die for General Ky?"

Well, what then do we signal
If we vote this palace through,
While we talk of the poor and fight for our life,
To world opinion, what's that do?

Now it isn't really easy
And to question can be tough;
Understaffed and misunderstood,
The minority role is rough.

But our duty is clear as we see it
And may I suggest in this poem,
Though we fight for freedom abroad,
We can lose it here at home.

The cramming and jamming of spending bills,
The thud of the rubber stamps,
A sorry echo to the bugle calls
That sound in those far-off camps.

Hasn't the time come, colleagues,
To heed the voice of dissent?
Isn't it time for selective restraint
Before all of our money is spent?

Must every minority question
Be scoffed and laughed from view?
Yes, isn't it time for selective restraint
To do just what we have to do?

Your Committee on Public Works reports,
They ask that no Member shirks;
But when you vote, "yes," remember
It's the public who's getting the works.

Another executive fortress
Where come the people who please,
Another step back for Congress
With freedom down on its knees.

Why not a house for our Speaker,
Or a center where visitors roam,
Or a house for our Court's High Justice,
Or a Freedom Academy home?

Let's reason together, my colleagues,
Before it's too late to do so;
Let's screw up collective courage,
Let's learn again to say "No."

Let's reassert independence,
Let's let this proposal expire;
Our VP is happy at home
And his rivals far higher aspire.

Respectfully written and offered
These supplemental views;
We've writ before and we'll write again
Though most of the time we lose.

But over the hill and horizon
A light is beginning to burn;
Dissent is getting respectful again,
Thinking is taking a turn.

And the tired old labels of "no"
And "obstruction" are wearing thin,
And people are asking questions
And that's when beginnings begin.

For minority views are important
Though seldom heeded, it's true;
And minority staff is growing
To articulate our view.

So, courage my lonely colleagues,
Be of good heart and of cheer;
Minority views are sometimes read
And the public's beginning to hear.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, after that dissertation, I think regardless of

how it is described, until someone comes up with something better, JIM CLEVELAND is entitled to the honorary title of poet laureate of the Committee on Public Works of this House.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCEWEN].

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak on this bill, may I first extend to my beloved colleague from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] my sincere admiration for his interest in this subject, and my regret that I cannot agree that this is the time to enact this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I am looking at those minority views of my very dear friend and colleague from New Hampshire and at that last verse:

So, courage my lonely colleagues, be of good heart and of cheer; minority views are sometimes read and the public's beginning to hear.

Mr. Chairman, speaking only for myself, I can report for my district that the public is beginning to hear. For the benefit of my colleagues who might be interested and concerned about what the folks back home may be thinking, may I share two letters I received on this bill? One person wrote and said:

I have just heard on TV that a new home for the Vice President is being planned at a cost of a million dollars or more.

At a time like this when our boys are fighting in Vietnam, and all too many of them are giving their lives that others might live in any kind of a home at all, I am amazed that anyone in Congress, or out, would contemplate building this expensive home at this time.

What will our boys living in the swamps and mud in Vietnam think about this plan?

We taxpayers are having a hard time to pay our taxes now, and with the President's plans to wage a war on poverty, and other improvements, I ask you Mr. McEwen, where is the money coming from?

The writer is a grandmother, nearing 60, a registered nurse, working 8 hours a day in order to help meet our expenses. We do no entertaining, our lives consist of work, work and more work. Our real estate taxes on an 85-year-old house are $500 a year.

I hope you will do all you can to stop any unnecessary spending at this time.

Mr. Chairman, may I point out that the whole tenor of this letter is spending at this time.

Finally, another letter I received from a lady in my district very much along the same vein. She says:

Surely this money could be used to better advantage—something essential, as Vietnam, or not appropriated at all.

Then she uses these words, which I think we might all heed. She says:

Let us put first things first.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the words of my colleagues, including those on the Democratic side of the aisle. Let me say that I am listening more clearly, I hope, to those back home who are expressing themselves on this legislation. As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] pointed out this may be small in dollars but important as indicative of whether or not we are giving attention to priorities and first things first.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Chairman, just one final thing. In concluding, this lady said,

As a registered Democrat—

And may I add she corrected her typing by penning in a large "D" she said—

As a registered Democrat, who has voted for you every time, don't let me down now.

So I wish to assure the lady I will try not to let her down.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN].

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, most of the developed nations of the world provide official residences for their top elected officials. The United States of America has been remiss in failing to provide an official residence for its Vice President. Our colleague, Congressman KENNETH GRAY, of Illinois, on February 21, 1966, introduced a bill authorizing the General Services Administration to plan, design, and construct an official residence for the Vice President of the United States. The proposed structure would be located on a site at the U.S. Naval Observatory on Massachusetts Avenue. The location would be ideal since it is both scenic and would provide physical security for the Vice President with a minimum expenditure. I heartily endorse the proposal and urge the Congress to speedily enact authorization for the construction of the residence.

The office of the Vice President is the second highest elected official in this country. His constitutional duties have grown through experience and history. This is especially true over the last several years when he has become an increasingly vocal and effective instrument of the executive branch. With these added responsibilities have come increasing demands on his time to represent the President at home and abroad.

These demands both official and ceremonial in nature require the Vice President to meet with important foreign and domestic leaders in formal and informal receptions. The present Vice President in his usual cordial manner has used his own home for these purposes. While he has made the best of a bad situation, it is apparent from the frequent, as well as large, receptions that a typical American home will not suffice for these purposes.

Certainly, the acknowledged leader of the free world can afford to properly house its Vice President and provide him with an official residence and household staff which befits the high position he holds. Today's diplomacy demands that the Vice President have a residence so that he can efficiently carry out his duties.

We must also remember that the Vice President is next in line of succession should anything happen to the President. The physical protection of the Vice President is, therefore, an important factor in the proposed residence. The 10-acre site at the U.S. Naval Observatory will enable the Secret Service to adequately protect the Vice President and his immediate family.

Mr. Speaker, the modest expenditure provided in Congressman GRAY's bill will correct this situation and will add further evidence to the value the American people place on the office of the Vice President.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of our time to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, in this country today we recognize the office of Vice President as one of significance, a position from which an individual can render great service to the American people.

And so I believe, Mr. Chairman, that as an elective official ranking second only to the President of the United States, the Vice President should have a house furnished him by the taxpayers. It should be a house of which the people can be proud. It should be a residence fully befitting the stature of the individual who, with his family, occupies it, the No. 2 man in the country.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is a time to build and a time to mark time on a project of this kind. I say this is no time to be building a $750,000 mansion for the Vice President—and my opposition has nothing to do with the merits of the project itself or the individual occupying the office.

I would like to ask the supporters of this authorization bill: By what logic do they advocate the spending of $750,000 on a residence for the Vice President when the Secretary of Defense has sidetracked 8,500 units of urgently needed military family housing authorized and funded by Congress in 1965 for construction this fiscal year?

In a press release dated last December 20, Secretary McNamara said the Defense Department was deferring $620 million worth of military construction, including $160 million for the 8,500 military family housing units.

What was Bob McNamara saying by this action? He was declaring that it was vital to this Nation to refuse to spend not only $460 million in funds earmarked for general military construction but also $160 million tagged for housing the families of our men in uniform.

While he did not use the word "inflation"—and perhaps he avoided it deliberately—McNamara left no doubt he feared the deferred projects might have put extra push behind the already high cost of building in this country.

Only last week, McNamara said he will not ask Congress for any new military family housing construction for fiscal 1967. Instead he proposed leasing 13,075 housing units over the next 2 fiscal years.

I say we are experiencing a more heated inflationary situation than we were in December 1965, and the prospects are that the cost of living will be spiraling more in the months ahead. I say it doesn't make sense in times like these to be spending $750,000 of the people's money on a house for the Vice President.

If the Vice President were asked today how he feels about the project. I have great doubts he would want to go ahead with it knowing that some of our servicemen and their families are living in what amounts to slum quarters.

Bob McNamara last January 26 told the Subcommittee on Military Construction Appropriations that the 8,500 family housing units he had frozen were justified but he was putting off construction just the same.

McNamara added in direct testimony:

We think it wise to defer the start of that construction until there is less pressure on our total construction industry in this country.

Let us assume the Vice President's house is, to use McNamara's word, "justified." Is this the time to build it—when we are fighting a multibillion-dollar war in Vietnam and trying to dampen the fires of inflation at home?

Should we cut the school lunch and school milk programs but build a three-quarter-million-dollar house for the Vice President?

Should we cut agricultural extension programs and reduce support funds for our land-grant colleges but construct a handsome house for the Vice President?

Bob McNamara put a hold order on 8,500 places for our servicemen and their families to live while saying this construction was "justified."

Other Defense Department officials also testified the military housing was desperately needed. Unless we think they are given to telling fairy stories, we have to believe them.

J. J. Reed, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Family Housing, on May 25, 1965, pleaded with the military construction appropriations subcommittee to provide funds for all 12,500 family housing units then sought by the Defense Department for fiscal 1966.

He said the program was urgent because:

First, decent living conditions create a better military man; second, the Nation has an obligation to provide decent living conditions for the family of the military man who has pledged to risk his life for the common defense; and third, decent living conditions make a military career more attractive—it assists the military forces to retain qualified personnel in competition with higher paying civilian careers.

Despite this justification for building all 12,500 housing units, Bob McNamara shelved 8,500 of them for an indefinite time.

Assistant Defense Secretary Paul Ignatius declared in testimony before the subcommittee April 13, 1965:

In lieu of our request for 12,100 units in fiscal year 1964, only 7,500 were funded (by Congress). Last year (calendar year 1964), the Congress funded only 8,250 units as opposed to our request for 12,500 units. In view of the level of funding for new units that has been approved in the past 2 years, it is now apparent that it is impossible, without a crash building program, for the (Defense) Department to obtain its objective within the original 5-year program.

Ignatius said the Defense Department would have to build 12,500 family housing units annually over a 6-year period to meet the needs of its men.

Those plans have been crippled by McNamara's hold order on 8,500 units of family housing for our men in uniform.

Certainly, the Vice President and the Nation will not suffer if the proposed Vice-Presidential residence is left on the drawing board along with the family construction program for our servicemen.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I take great pride in yielding 10 minutes to close debate on this side to our very distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] who serves on our subcommittee—and I started to say, Mr. Chairman—he is the Wordsworth of Texas since we have heard the poetry by the Wordsworth of New Hampshire.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I make no pretense to any such title. I was, however, so deeply moved by the sentimental strains and poetic prowess of our distinguished and lyrical colleague from New Hampshire that I felt constrained to reply in a verse in old English pentameter:

THE HOUSING OF THE VEEP

Sir Cleveland's verse
(And it could be worse)
Doth make the sad heart weep;
That a land so fair
Hath no butter to spare
For the housing of the Veep.

In Smith's fair hall
It cast a pall
Of socialism's creep;
Yet brave men all
Sought wherewithal
For the housing of the Veep.

Cleveland raiseth a ghost
That appalleth most
When he spake of the cost of it all;
He crieth aloud
And raiseth a shroud
Of a garish Taj-ma-Hall.

Yet wise men these,
Of birds and bees
And of castles and moats and mucks,
Asked: "How hath he spake
Of a Treasury break
Over forty-five thousand bucks?"

Sir Cleveland arose,
Struck lordly pose,
And with his fist he smote!
"It's bound to be
A great castle," said he,
"For the Senate so hath wrote!"

But Sir Kenneth expressed,
As a grin he suppressed,
"Methinks that argument dumb;
'Tis fact well known,
And often shown,
That their lordships exaggerate some.

"Build we houses not
For the woodland lot,
For all our forest rangers?
And upon our coast
Lighthouses we post
For countrymen and strangers.

"And in dungeons dank
We never shrank
From housing the prison's warden;
Can we be so cheap
With our only Veep
That we drive him to dwell in the garden?"

Still unimpressed,
One beat his breast,
And said: "None of that I wot!
For the Veep himself,
Though not burdened with pelf,
Hath said he needs it not."

But a wiser knight,
Too old for fright,
Recalled a day long past;
He averred with a groan,
" 'Tis not this Veep alone,
But whomever the Nation hast.

" 'Twould be the same
Were it—what's-his-name?"
And with this he brake into a frown,
Until from the past
The name came at last—
"Sir Richard of Whittier Town!"

Then strong men wept,
Or their silence kept,
Whilst the air grew heavy and hot;
'Til at last one said,
With a nod of his head,
"He's the onliest Veep we've got!"

Then all did say,
With a chorus of "aye!"

"He's the onliest Veep we've got,
We've got!
He's the very best Veep we've got!
Opposition we'll souse,
And we'll build him a house
Whether New Hampshire likes it or not.

"The lights he may douse,
But we'll build him a house:
He's the very best Veep we've got!"

Well, my colleagues and Mr. Chairman, while I hope that those last somnolent lines may be prophetic as well as poetic, in a quite serious vein, let us see now if we cannot bring this back into some semblance of sensible perspective.

For many, many years everyone who has looked at this problem has agreed that we do need an official residence for the Vice President of the United States. I know of nobody who has taken issue with that basic proposition.

As long ago as 1917, a distinguished lady, the widow of a former Member of the other body, offered her home to the United States in recognition of the need for an official residence for the Vice President.

In the year 1948, a bipartisan group of Republican and Democratic Members alike presented bipartisan legislation designed to construct an official residence for the Vice President of the United States.

When I came to this Congress in 1955, everyone had by then agreed as to the need for a residence for the Vice President—a residence in which he could perform the duties of his office and in which he could hold the necessary meetings and receptions attendant upon the performance of those duties.

In the year that followed, 1956, Ambassador Davies offered his home for the purpose. Still no one said that it should not be done.

In 1958, as has already been mentioned, the then President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, officially recommended such a residence in his budget message, while stating that, of course, the times were perilous and the future uncertain, but nevertheless concluding that we needed to build an official residence for the Vice President.

So today no one says that it should not be done. As pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY], all of our living former Vice Presidents have endorsed the basic proposition. Even the distinguished gentlemen on my left, who have said they do not believe we

ought to pass the bill today, almost without exception have made mention of the fact that they believe it is a worthwhile objective. They are in sympathy with the purposes of the bill. They think it should be done. But they say, "Well, not just now," or, "Not right there," or "Not in just this way."

It is mindful, in a sense, of the prayer reportedly uttered, before he became such a great Christian, by St. Augustine. He is said to have prayed—

Lord, make me holy, but not just yet.

I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the House, that we can talk until doomsday. Always there will be some reason for not doing it now. A vote against this bill today is a vote not to build an official residence for the Vice President. It is that simple. I think there is reason for doing it right now. I think there are valid reasons for deciding it this year.

First, the duties of the Vice-Presidency have assumed a far greater importance in our scheme of things and in our form of Government than they have ever held in the past. An official residence is, therefore, more greatly needed.

Second, the responsibilities of providing security for the President and for the Vice President of the United States are graver than ever they have been in the past. Enactment of this bill will facilitate the provision of that security.

Finally, I think we might give thought to the reasonable fact, on which everyone seems to agree, that American politics has become or is becoming a rich man's game. The sad lament has been heard in these halls that only a person of great personal wealth in this time can afford the luxury of participating in American politics. This is one way in which we can help to remove that unnecessary impediment upon the participation in American politics. This is one way in which we can say, with a loud affirmative "yea," that we do not believe that a qualification requisite to serving as Vice President of the United States ought to be a man's personal wealth.

I happen to know that when the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson was Vice President of the United States, out of his own personal resources, and at considerable personal expense to him, he purchased a large house known as the Elms for the sole and exclusive purpose of serving as an appropriate place for him to hold the meetings and the receptions that the President of the United States asked him to hold, and to provide the hospitality that he was asked to provide as an official part of his duties as Vice President.

It is fortunate that he was able to do so. And yet it is a little sad to contemplate that at least four out of the last five Vice Presidents of the United States would not have been able from their personal resources to have purchased such a house as that.

Why is the prospect of passing this bill today so frightening? Why is it such a terrible thing that we want to spend a maximum of $750,000 to provide an official residence for the Vice President of the United States?

I ask you to stop and contemplate all the things of a similar character that we have been doing without batting an eyelash. On every military base in the United States and every U.S. military base throughout the world we have provided an official residence for the commanding officer of that base. Nobody shudders at that. Is not the Vice President the second in command of the whole U.S. Military Establishment? Is not he as important as a local base commander?

As was mentioned earlier, in all the chanceries throughout the world we have provided residences for the American Ambassadors, and I do not object to that. No objection has been raised to that. Yet is not the Vice President of the United States today as important in our scheme of things as an American Ambassador?

Each of our forest rangers is provided at Government expense a home in which he lives. Are not our Vice President and the duties he performs as important as those of a forest ranger?

Every one of our prison wardens has a similar facility. Nobody raises a cry of "inflation" or says we should do away with them because of the war in Vietnam.

As I pointed out earlier, President Lincoln defended the proposition of continuing work on the Capitol Building during the War Between the States. Surely our Nation was in graver peril then than it is today. Additions were made to the White House during the Korean war. Just last year, we authorized $228 million—more than 300 times as much as this would cost—for public buildings. The Vietnam war was in progress then; yet nobody complained. The buildings were needed, and so is this one. We do not simply suspend the functions of civil government because we are at war. We never have.

Nobody has suggested that, because of the war in Vietnam, we should do away with these regular routine activities of the Government which I have mentioned. And yet, in composite form, the cost of these programs is many, many times the cost of providing one residence for the Vice President of the United States.

The question of cost has been magnified far out of proportion. When we think of the one-time cost of providing a residence to serve down through the years, and compare this with the wealth of the Nation, it seems absolutely ludicrous for anyone to raise the question of whether we can afford it or not.

The United States today is wealthier than any nation in the history of the world. Our gross national product is at an alltime high. Our national income is at an alltime high. If every penny authorized in this bill were spent on a suitable residence for the Vice President, the total maximum cost would come to approximately 39 cents per citizen. No staggering precedent would be set. It would not set off the specter of an expanding program. We have, after all, only one Vice President at a time. And we propose to build one official residence—just one—for all future Vice Presidents.

This is the first serious attempt to take this matter out of the talking stage and do something about it. To quibble and quarrel about such a matter seems at best dilatory and at worst childish.

If this bill should be voted down today, who knows how long it will be before Congress might summon the initiative to reach this point again. It could be 20 more years—or 30 more years—or 50 more years.

One of the gentlemen opposing enactment of this bill, while stating his sympathy with the basic purpose, asked: "Cannot we wait another 18 months?" Well, of course, we could wait another 18 months—or another 18 years—or another 180 years, for that matter. But what purpose would be served?

The logic of the matter is very plain. We clearly need such a residence. We surely can afford it. No purpose can be served by waiting. So, therefore, let us build it.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, no other Member of the House is in quite the same position today as that in which I find myself.

The incumbent Vice President is a resident of the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland, and we have found him to be a good neighbor. At the same time, the location of his residence in the Sixth District makes it a matter of daily observance that the Vice President incurs definite limitations in the discharge of his official duties because of the lack of an official residence.

Thousands of Marylanders pass his present home each day. They can imagine the problem created by the need to carry on official entertaining and cope with the flow of staff work incumbent upon the second highest officer of the land from a typical suburban residence.

Those of us who are interested in economy can be reassured by the fact that no excessive expenditures will be made in the immediate future, in accordance with understandings established in debate today. Republicans may join in support of this bill in anticipation of the day when the official residence of the Vice President will be inhabited by a Republican.

I personally am supporting the authorization of this residence because I feel that it is a necessary tool for the Vice President in the discharge of his official duties and responsibilities.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the pending legislation to provide an official residence for the Vice President. This legislation is long overdue and I hope that it will be overwhelmingly adopted.

I call attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that there is nothing in the pending bill which requires consultation with the Commission of Fine Arts. I would hope that provision can clearly be made for such consultation with the Commission of Fine Arts. This should be done prior to a final report to Congress by the Acquisition Commission, and most particularly if the Acquisition Commission recommends the design of the official residence for the Vice President. We are building a very important addition to the Nation's Capital city, and the nature of the design of this building must meet the high standards of beauty and character which most buildings in Washington now

possess. I would hesitate to single out those buildings which do not measure up to these high standards, but this is why we have a Commission of Fine Arts in order to preserve these standards.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, regardless of the merits of the basic idea of providing an official residence for the Vice President of the United States, I believe we would be ill advised to consider spending $750,000—plus the cost of 10 acres of valuable land—for this purpose at this time.

You will recall that the Secretary of Defense shelved the appropriation Congress made last fall for construction of housing for our military personnel. In taking this action, the Department stated it was doing so because of other budget demands and inflationary pressures. If adequate housing for our servicemen is to be deferred because of budget limitations and inflation pressures, why should not the same principle apply in connection with an expensive house for the Vice President? Why should we at this time concern ourselves about furnishing an expensive house for the Vice President when the Secretary of Defense refuses to use the funds we have already appropriated to give proper *housing for our fighting* men?

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to add my endorsement of the establishment of a residence for the Vice President of the United States. I commend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY], for his leadership in resolving this longstanding need of the country.

The office of the Vice President has become increasingly important in the functions of our Government and it is appropriate that he and his family have an official residence which is befitting of the office he holds. The official responsibilities and consequently the stature of the Vice President have so increased that few will argue any more against the desirability of providing him with an official home.

Through the years we have had various suggestions for an official residence and these have been primarily nonpartisan in intent. Indeed, in 1948 a nonpartisan bill, to provide an official residence in the District of Columbia for the Vice President of the United States was introduced by a Democrat from Kentucky and a Republican from California. Calvin Coolidge, after serving both as Vice President, and as President, suggested a vice-presidential residency in his autobiography in 1929.

Any number of Presidents have urged the establishment of an official vice-presidential mansion, befitting the obligations and stature of the Nation's number two executive.

Our rapidly shrinking world has increased the number of visitors this country entertains officially from abroad. If the Vice President had an official residence which could be used for state functions, it would considerably ease the load of the President in providing necessary entertainment for our visitors from home and abroad. The Vice President performs so many official functions that relieve the President's burdens that he ought to be furnished a home second only to the White House in appearance and elegance in which to carry out his increasingly arduous duties.

The Vice President of today must be more familiar than ever with the problems of the White House and as the load of official duties increases in the office of the President, so it increases in the office of the Vice President. The record shows that the Vice President, particularly in the last three administrations, has more and more assisted the President with policy and ceremonial functions. On the grounds of prestige alone it would seem highly desirable to provide an official residence for the Vice President.

The arguments in favor of an official residence are very persuasive. Even the last boost in the salary of the Vice President is not enough to provide the kind of home that the Vice President ought to have if he is going to assume part of the President's burden of entertaining official visitors. The Vice President should not be asked to dig into his own pocket to entertain the Nation's guests.

The dominant consideration is, of course, that a Vice President today is frequently called upon to entertain distinguished visitors, including foreign heads of state. He should have a suitable place in which to do it. Only rarely is the Vice President apt to have the private resources required to meet this need, and certainly the pay and allowances of the office alone are insufficient.

In my opinion the proposal has merit and I urge its passage.

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to vote against S. 2394. I would like to make it clear that I am not opposed in principle to providing a residence for the Vice President. However, in this year, when budget pressures are causing reductions in essential programs, the establishment of an official residence must be assigned a low priority.

It would be difficult for me to justify to myself and to my constituents a vote for S. 2394 when cutbacks have been proposed in the school lunch program, the special milk program, and impacted area funds. I, therefore, urge that action on the establishment of an official residence for the Vice President be deferred until such time as the defense budget can be reduced to normal levels and essential programs upon which so many people rely can be fully funded.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 2394, a bill to establish an official residence for the Vice President of the United States.

I think Members on both sides of the aisle can agree that the role which the Vice President plays has broadened considerably beyond the constitutional duty of presiding over the other body.

In recent years the Vice President's activities have broadened considerably. The Vice President's duties include the chairmanship of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, the Peace Corps Advisory Council, the Cabinet Task Force on Youth Opportunity, and the Special Cabinet Task Force Travel, U.S.A.

Additionally, the Nation's second highest elected official is a member of the National Security Council and the Board of Regents of Smithsonian Institution and is honorary chairman of the National Advisory Council to the Office of Economic Opportunity.

All of us are well aware of the diplomatic assignments which were handled by former Vice President Richard M. Nixon and by Vice President Johnson during the Kennedy administration, and the very recent and quite successful mission to the Far East by Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. In short, the Vice-Presidency has become a position of vast importance. It is only fitting that the incumbent in this office is given an official residence which is in keeping with the high office he holds. Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of S. 2394.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, so far as I can recall, no one has mentioned the U.S. Constitution during this debate. Of course, that is really not an unusual oversight. Indeed, to some it may seem in poor taste to try to test legislative proposals by the Constitution.

I took the trouble to examine the constitutional responsibilities of the Vice President and find them to be very limited. He is authorized only to be President of the Senate but interestingly, he is prohibited from voting except in the event of a tie vote.

By tradition, he has little influence in the Senate. This was illustrated dramatically when President Johnson served as Vice President. Although he had previously been one of the most powerful majority leaders in Senate history, he had little Senate influence once he became Vice President.

Mr. HUMPHREY is important only to the extent that President Johnson permits him to be. On those occasions he is important as the spokesman for the President, not by virtue of his office as Vice President.

The next Vice President—like many of his predecessors—may have no responsibilities whatever delegated to him by the President.

Therefore it would seem totally unnecessary, certainly way beyond the responsibility and authority vested in the Vice President by the Constitution, to authorize this expensive residence.

Mr. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, in his message to Congress yesterday on consumer interests—and I applaud him for a generally constructive and provocative statement in this important area of public policy—the President emphasized:

> Even the wisest consumer laws will not help the American public if their hard-earned dollars and savings are eroded by inflation.

I completely agree.

As the President knows, however, and as our colleagues are aware, inflation has already arrived and the process of erosion of purchasing power has already set in. Wholesale prices, for instance, rose at an annual rate of 6 percent in the period from last October through January. Many manufacturers report that the prices of the goods they buy have increased much faster than the price indexes—an observation most homemakers

have confirmed especially in the area of food prices.

Last week's report of the Joint Economic Committee—the expert group of our colleagues on which we rely for sound economic advice—also called special attention to the threat of uncontrolled inflation. The majority members of the committee unanimously suggested that price pressures may prove stronger than the administration expected and they recommended providing standby authority to raise taxes upon approval of a joint resolution as well as reducing Federal expenditures which are "for the benefit of those already well provided for." The minority members of the committee also recognized that tax increases may be necessary and strongly urged that Congress exercise restraint on administration spending requests and that the administration reduce the projected administrative budget deficit of $6.4 billion for the current fiscal year and produce a small surplus in fiscal 1967.

To me, Mr. Chairman, it is significant and encouraging that minority and majority Members are so close in agreeing on the dangers of growing inflation and on some of the steps the Government should follow in controlling it. At a time of high employment, spreading labor shortages, and close to maximum utilization of production facilities, the booming economy could be drastically affected—and prosperity gravely threatened—by continuing high budget deficits and their inevitably inflationary impact.

The time to start is now, Mr. Chairman. And the place to start, as our distinguished majority colleagues on the Joint Economic Committee have advised us, is with those expenditures "for the benefit of those already well provided for." I suggest that the proposed new mansion for the Vice President fits this description and should come within the majority's prescription.

This should not be a partisan issue. I have great respect for the Vice President and I do not oppose the basic purpose of providing a suitable residence for him and his successors. But I do oppose—at a time when inflation presents a clear danger to millions of lower and fixed-income Americans, when the cost of supporting our forces in Vietnam is mushrooming, and when the administration says we cannot afford loans for deserving college students or milk for the country's schoolchildren—spending three-fourths of a million dollars plus other millions in valuable land simply to provide a more convenient way to entertain official guests.

Since it does not constitute priority legislation, Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against the pending bill.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Chairman, when I think of Tom Marshall wishing, as Vice President, only for "a good 5-cent cigar," I concede that I have a nostalgia for the good old days.

However, times change and we now have the administration's high society—with poverty administrators getting over $20,000 a year and people earning $10,000 a year also drawing money from the poverty program. Who am I to stand in the way of this magnificence?

Now that the administration has lowered tariffs, why do we not bring in pink Italian marble and try for an American Taj Mahal—not only a living quarters but a memorial for all Vice Presidents.

This should have crystal chandeliers, gold service for the tables, escalators, and most of all, Mr. Chairman, an echo chamber. We all know that Vice Presidents are human. Some are great speakers. And what compulsive speaker has not looked in his bathroom mirror of a morning and delivered his speech for the day to test his voice and his gestures.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that we should specify an echo chamber as one of the important rooms of this palace. This would be better than any mirror for testing the voice, but we could have along its walls full-length mirrors for rehearsals in pointing with pride and viewing with alarm. I suggest that we name this "the Memorial Vice Presidential Palace" and remove the $750,000 limitation. After all, what kind of home can you get for three-quarters of a million in this period of administration inflation?

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to join my colleagues in urging the passage of this most worthwhile legislation. I am proud to stand on the House floor today and support legislation which will provide a long overdue official residence for the Vice President of the United States.

I am pleased and proud to support H.R. 12944 which would designate an official residence for the Vice President on the grounds of the Naval Observatory. This legislation has been carefully thought out and diligently researched and the proposed sites have been personally inspected by members of the Public Works Committee, and I therefore believe the recommendations in H.R. 12944 are most fitting and deserving of your support for a home for the second-ranking officer of our Nation.

I am particularly proud to support this legislation today because it would apply to my dear friend of long standing with whom I have worked shoulder to shoulder for almost 20 years, the present incumbent, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. But this legislation goes beyond any one man. It will be a home for the years to come for all of the Vice Presidents who will follow the present incumbent in office.

The first bill authorizing a Vice-Presidential residence was submitted some 18 years ago. Since then we have had five Vice Presidents, all of whom have had to bear the burden and responsibilities the office entails and none of whom was given the facilities to perform his duties.

Today, as we know from recent past and tragic experience, the Vice President is a standby President. Over the years the trend has been for the President to give additional responsibilities to his Vice President. The job has consistently increased in stature and has not diminished.

The Vice President is no longer capable of fulfilling his responsibilities as a public servant either in the social atmosphere where he must of necessity move or the workaday world without the use of an official residence, which should be located somewhere in the Washington area. The Vice President entertains foreign dignitaries from far and wide as well as the highest citizens of our land in his home. The gatherings of this type are such that they require a proper atmosphere and background for the Vice President's receptions.

With this background of support and work on the subject before us, I think the time has passed when a further study by a commission would do the job. This matter has been considered for a great number of years and has widespread support. While I have proper respect for commissions and their work, I believe there are times, and this is one of them, when direct action, such as that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] proposes in his bill, is the only solution.

The proposal before us today, Mr. Chairman, is one that I think will fit in with our modern concept of the office of the Vice President and one that, at the same time, will provide a home that will be fully in keeping with the high office held by the Vice President. I might point out that the legislation proposed is some $250,000 less than the original proposal for a commission to select the Vice President's residence.

Once again, may I say I am proud to urge your support of H.R. 12944, and I trust you will give the measure favorable consideration. I can assure you it will have my heartiest support.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, I will vote against H.R. 12944, for I do not believe that this valid but low-priority project should be allowed to absorb funds sorely needed this year for programs now threatened, such as the school milk and school lunch programs; the national defense education loan fund; and others.

While three-quarters of a million dollars out of a total Federal budget for the year of over $100 billion will seem a relatively small amount, nevertheless nonessential items such as this should be cut to justify our commitment of more substantial funds to continue the more vital programs.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, in analyzing S. 2394 now before the House, I have tried to determine whether the people of the United States should provide an official residence for all future Vice Presidents because of the nature of the office in relation to its importance to the Nation and not whether the present Vice President should have an official residence.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the decision to provide a home for our second most important Government official should not be motivated by the personality of Mr. HUMPHREY, his wants or his desires, but motivated only to further the dignity of the office, itself.

Furthermore, for security reasons, I believe the house should be located in an environment adaptable to the maximum amount of protection available for the Vice President and his family. The Naval Observatory on Massachusetts Avenue is such a site and thoroughly approve of the committee's choice in this connection.

It would appear that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle

would have you believe that construction of a house for the Vice President would begin next week or within the next 6 months. This is impossible. The fact is the appropriation will not be considerered by us today at all; only an authorization for an amount not to exceed $750,000.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] has indicated that only a $45,000 appropriation for architectural planning and designing will be requested at this time. This is the main reason, Mr. Speaker, that I shall vote for the bill.

An unusual feature that captured my imagination, Mr. Speaker, is the provision enabling foundations and the public to make gifts thereby reducing the overall cost of this project. If this bill becomes law, I propose to ask the chambers of commerce in my district to organize committees to collect funds for this worthwhile endeavor.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, if we can furnish homes for our generals, colonels, other military personnel, and ambassadors, I feel we can afford, even during war, to spend $45,000 for the planning of an official residence for the Nation's second highest official.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to plan, design, and construct an official residence for the Vice President of the United States in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GRAY (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The Administrator is further authorized to use as a site for such residence Federal land and property comprising approximately ten acres at the United States Naval Observatory, the specific area and boundaries thereof to be determined jointly by the General Services Administration and the Department of the Navy: *Provided*, That any roads and improvements thereon for which there is a continued need may be relocated and reconstructed.

SEC 3. The Administrator is further authorized to provide for the care, maintenance, repair, improvement, alteration, and furnishing of the official residence and grounds, including heating, lighting, and air conditioning, which services shall be provided at the expense of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened patiently this afternoon during the general debate and I have heard about everything in defense of this proposal. Among other things, I heard the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] refer to this $750,000 Taj Mahal as "peanuts."

That amount of money for one house may be "peanuts" in Virginia. I do know it is not "peanuts" in Iowa. And remember this, $750,000 is for a house alone, without one dime for a lot or any other land acquisition.

I wonder if it is proposed to use gold wallpaper as the freewheeling spenders did when they fixed up the yacht for Emperor Haile Selassie, of Ethiopia, and whether they are going to have gold-plated bathroom fixtures and fur-lined bathtubs. We get little specific information as to what they are going to have in this palace for $750,000.

I did hear the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] say, in effect, that we are the wealthiest and most prosperous country in the world. I say to him, that we are also the most debt-ridden nation in the world, with $1,260 billion of public and private debt. Maybe that, too, is "peanuts." Then there are those in this Government who say this country is reeking with poverty, and hundreds of millions are voted by Congress to take care of the poverty stricken.

You cannot exactly have it both ways. Which is it?

Perhaps the House ought to know something about the income of the Vice President of the United States. I have not heard this discussed this afternoon. He draws a salary of $43,000 a year. He has $10,000 expense allowance. He has $186,000 annually for office expenses. I could go on down the list, but I will only add the Cadillac and chauffeur which a benevolent government furnishes and maintains.

Vice President HUMPHREY is not exactly in dire financial straits. I think at this time, when the country is as debt ridden as it is, and we are told it is reeking with poverty, that the Vice President of the United States could live right where he is, in his own home, where the mortgage reportedly is paid. He is not suffering.

I suggest he might even rent a dining-room when he has to entertain an especially large group. He gets the money for that purpose—rather than saddle upon the backs of the taxpayers at this time $750,000 for one house, not a dollar of which is to buy land on which to build it.

In fact, the land is 10 acres. I ask again, since 10 valuable acres are to be used, is it proposed to establish a country club for HUMPHREY on the Naval Observatory grounds?

I am not exactly Johnny-come-lately to this business. I was here when an attempt was made to build a mansion in the Naval Observatory grounds for Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Congress at that time wisely shelved that proposition. That would have cost, as I remember, $360,000, or $380,000.

I urge you not do this to the taxpayers of this country now. Do not do this to the millions who, you say, are living in poverty.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. During the general debate, which I followed very carefully, I have become somewhat confused as to just what this will be. Will it be a monument, or a mansion, or a jail, or what?

Mr. GROSS. I have no idea. On one hand, we hear that the Vice President is spending most of his time traveling about in this country and over the world.

It has been indicated that he would not be there 50 percent of the time. On the other hand, we hear a Vice Presidential palace has to be on the Naval Observatory grounds in order to provide security. I come back to the days when it was a subject of serious discussion in the House as to whether we should construct more buildings here in the District of Columbia; whether the Government should not be dispersed because of nuclear weapons and their destruction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I object.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves that the Committee now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am serious about this. I hope there is a vote on the motion to strike the enacting clause. That is the kind of fate this bill deserves at this time. Yes, there were serious questions raised in the past about constructing more buildings in the District of Columbia. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] was here at that time. The building of additional important structures in the District of Columbia was questioned because a hydrogen or nuclear bomb might be dropped on the District of Columbia. What has happened? Is there no longer any fear of war? There was also a day, you know, when the authorization for buildings came to the House floor. All we see now is the backs of our necks. All we see is the appropriation for the building or buildings. The House has turned over to the Committee on Public Works a virtual blank check to approve hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of buildings.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I will. I mentioned the gentleman's name.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The Public Works Committee has done a splendid job in carrying out the Public Buildings Act of 1959 which was sponsored by President Eisenhower.

Mr. GROSS. Well, there may be some question about that.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida a question. Was any attention given to acquiring another site anywhere

in the District of Columbia for this mansion?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. I will say in response to the gentleman one of the points raised in our minority views was that it was our feeling adequate study of alternative sites should be made and other agencies that have an interest in this junior White House should have been consulted and an opportunity for a proper study should have been afforded. It is true, I readily admit, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois, along with Mr. Knott, of the General Services Administration, visited a number of sites and came to the committee and made this recommendation. However, so far as I am concerned, there has been no proper study made by the necessary people to determine the best site and the size of the facility needed and a true estimate given of what the cost might be. That is one of the points we make in our minority views.

Mr. GROSS. I understand, for instance, that Bobby Baker is not doing as well financially as he did at one time. He is reputed to have a pretty expensive piece of property out in Northwest Washington in an acceptable neighborhood. I wondered if the committee gave any thought to taking this off Bobby's hands.

Mr. CRAMER. If the gentleman will yield further, as a matter of fact, some of those very devotedly interested in providing a residence for the Vice President came before the committee and testified they were extremely unhappy with the proposed site at the Naval Observatory. Some suggested, for instance, the Glover Archbold park land as a possible alternative. So, I ask, why is there all this haste to say that this is the place and this is the amount? It has to be done now, they say, when there are many dissatisfied with this proposal.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. GROSS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I would like to ask the gentleman to answer, if he can, or to query further those responsible for the bill on the committee as to whether or not there have been any departmental reports from the Navy as to the use of this portion of the land. I find none in the reports or the hearings.

Mr. GROSS. There is nothing in the hearings. Apparently, the Navy does not count when the Committee on Public Works goes to work on a proposition.

Mr. HALL. The Department of Defense is not even commenting.

Mr. GROSS. I want to be corrected if I am wrong, but I am sure I am right that there is not a word in the hearings from the Navy as to whether this poses any problems for them.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman know what proportion of the Navy property out there at the Naval Observatory is being taken over by this 10 acres?

Mr. GROSS. No. I imagine there is a total of about 20 acres, although I would not know. It is interesting, too, that it is proposed to move it from the site they first selected which was overlooking a playground. I do not know whether the Vice President does not want to watch children at play, or what the story is.

Mr. HALL. As far as the selection of sites is concerned, if the gentleman will yield further, do you know whether there has been any test boring made or anything to find out if this ground will support this junior-Gray-White House or not?

Mr. GROSS. The hearings say there have been no test borings.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state emphatically that the Department of the Navy does not object. Because of the time element involved, the Department of the Navy has not sent down an official report. However, I have a verbal report to the effect that they do not object to this bill.

We did not move the site location——

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will withhold for just a second, I would not expect that the Navy would object. I expect any admiral who made a protest or remonstrated in any way would be made to walk the plank the next day.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of this bill as an unnecessary and flagrant raid on the taxpayers of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The motion was rejected.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to most of the debate here today, which has alternated between serious discussion of a very important matter and a rather humorous comment or two concerning this proposed project.

Mr. Chairman, I heard someone a moment ago on the floor of the Chamber say that we were discussing the proposed authorizing legislation for the "VP's teepee." I had not heard that description before, but to be more serious, let me make an observation concerning the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

I listened very carefully to his speech to us a moment ago. On the one hand, he said all the proponents were seeking was $45,000. And, then, later in his remarks he said the time is now to build this project this year. If you build it this year, it is going to cost more than $45,000. It will cost the $750,000 which is called for in the authorization and appropriation in this proposal.

Then, it has been mentioned during the debate that in 1948 a bipartisan commission recommended the acquisition and construction of a home for the Vice President, and no action was taken. Then it was indicated that in 1956 a very generous offer was made for one of the finer homes in the District of Columbia, and that was not accepted.

My good friend, the distinguished majority leader, said that in 1958 President Eisenhower in his budget message asked for a home for the Vice President. I do not believe it is unfair to ask at this point why was not affirmative action taken in 1958 by the Congress, which was then controlled by the Democrats, majority party today in the Congress? That would have been a far more auspicious time. We were not at war. We were not faced with the problems of inflation. But, nevertheless, the majority party took no affirmative action to push this legislation through the House or through the other body. It was left dormant.

Mr. Chairman, in all honesty and sincerity I wonder why in time of war, why at a time when we are facing the ravages of inflation, this project is now called off the shelf and brought before the Congress for action?

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I urge the defeat of this proposal.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. During the debate and during the hearings on the bill it has been my objective to try to find out who really wanted this residence, who was pushing for it. The President did not recommend it, he did not recommend it in his state of the Union message, he did not recommend it in his budget message or subsequently. Who does want it?

Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that the Vice President is not demanding it. I think it is quite clear that the wife of the Vice President is not demanding it. In the New York Times of December 17, 1964, she is quoted as saying, when being pressed about whether the Vice President's family should move to a larger home, Mrs. Humphrey replied:

> We are very happy here. We would like to stay put. We can entertain very nicely and informally here.

Mr. Chairman, does that sound like the Vice President's wife wants to take on the responsibility of this additional mansion?

Then let us take the quote of the Vice President himself which incidentally was cited in the hearings by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], in which it was stated by Mr. HUMPHREY, "I have to admit I love that house I have. It is paid for."

So what I am trying to find out is—who in the executive branch of the Government feels that this is a matter of such a high priority and urgent matter that it should take in effect a war priority classification which is what is being asked for by this legislation today?

Mr. ALBERT. Does the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Chairman, believe that legislation considered by the House should initiate or originate only in the executive branch of the Government?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, that is a very interesting observation because, as I recall, time and time again when the executive branch of the Government sends a message down, that is it—that is the law—do not cross a "t"—do not dot an "i".

When the Executive says he wants something, that is what the Executive should get, as the general rule.

The Executive so far as I know has expressed hardly any interest whatsoever in this legislation.

I say that in a time when we are fighting in Vietnam and with a $13.6 billion additional appropriation just last week, now is the time for the Congress of the United States to say "no" when it comes to starting priorities for these frill programs—not needed now—and programs that cannot be justified now, if we are going to have any consideration for the taxpayers or for the person who suffers from deficit financing and continuing inflation. This is the place to start. This is symbolic. Now is the time to act. If we do not turn this down, then I say the chance of turning anything down of any consequence this session, that is not needed, and that does not have a high priority is very slim.

That is why this fight is being made. That is why this is a symbolic issue. That is why the people of this country understand what we are talking about relating to this issue. That is why the people of this country, in my opinion, are not in support of this proposal.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Am I correct in my understanding that the funds necessary to implement this authorization are not budgeted in President Johnson's budget which he sent to us in January?

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is correct. He did not ask for this, and the President did not put this in his budget so this is another deficit spending project.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In other words, then the fact is that those who vote for this authorization of the funds in effect are voting to breach the line of the already excessive spending that has been recommended by the President. In other words, this will be another effort on the part of the Congress to spend more even than the President is recommending?

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is correct.

A lot has been said about the Vice President, and about the needs of the Vice President. But what is the need here involved? The Vice President seemed to be happy with his home and it is paid for. His wife likes it. He does not want a new home. He has an office. He is not asking for a new office. He has one hundred and sixty and some odd thousand dollars for office expenses. He is not asking for that.

What is being proposed here is an entertainment palace. He has everything else—4,000 square feet to entertain and the cost of construction is minimal compared to what the cost of entertaining in the future is going to be which will run into the millions of dollars.

That is the issue we are faced with and I say, if we are to act responsibly, we should turn it down.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to apologize for taking these 5 minutes, but we have had four or five speakers on the other side and they continue to tell the Members of the House that we propose to spend $750,000 this year and unbalance the budget and they tell us that this is going to cause inflation and so on and so forth.

I want to be fair and I want to be objective. We have worked long and hard on our Committee on Public Works so that the Members of the House of Representatives could take pride in this historic day. I do not want the RECORD cluttered by the kind of statements that have been made here which are not borne out by the facts.

The minority leader said a while ago that we ought to move forward with our military housing. That is an item involving $655 million. But according to my dear friend from Michigan, that will not cause inflation. But he stands here and tells you that a $750,000 authorization, if we appropriate it all, will cause inflation. The $655 million he proposes we spend now is 800 times more than the $750,000 appropriation that we will not need for a year or more and they argue is going to cause inflation. I say to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, How can he reconcile his position?

Now they ask the question, Who is for this? The people are for this. I will not quote anyone in my home State. I do not want to be personal about this. But the minority leader has seen fit to address the House on four separate occasions today—this being such an important matter. But I have the testimony before our committee from an outstanding professor at the University of Michigan—a Republican if you please. He has been on the faculty as a professor of political science at the University of Michigan since the year I was born—40 years. Here is what he said before our committee:

> In many leading countries official residences are provided for certain cabinet officers in addition to the residences regularly provided for the heads of states and prime ministers. It is certainly no extravagance—

And mind you, this is a Republican speaking now—

> It is certainly no extravagance—and in fact it is a necessity—for the greatest country in the world to provide a proper residence for its second ranking official, who now performs so many official and ceremonial functions for the President.
>
> S. 2394 is a very modest recognition of the present needs for the Vice President and I trust that it will be passed.
>
> JAMES K. POLLACK,
> *Murfin Professor of Political Science, The University of Michigan.*

Why is it that the people who are here in the House of Representatives on the minority side cannot recognize we are only asking for $45,000 to plan this House for the next year—not $750,000.

There is a very good chance that donations will come in from people who do take pride in the proposal to build this very necessary residence for the Vice President of the United States.

We may not have to ask the taxpayers for a dime to construct this house. As I mentioned, in 1957, when President Eisenhower was in the White House and Mr. Nixon was Vice President, one foundation offered a $250,000 cash gift toward the construction of a home for the Vice President.

We have not spent $750,000. We will not cause inflation. We have not raised the public debt. We are merely saying, "Let us proceed on that long journey of a year to plan this house." Let us then see how many donations we get, and then we can make a judgment as to whether we want to go ahead and start construction of this home at that time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Michigan, since I used his name.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I think the gentleman from Illinois would have to agree that this legislation which we are considering today and involving $750,000 would affect the living quarters of only one family at the present time, whereas the funds for military housing which Congress appropriated last year for fiscal year 1966 would improve the housing for 8,500 men and women in the military. So there is some difference in equity, I think.

You are comparing the benefits to one family with the benefits to 8,500 families in the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

The gentleman from Illinois takes great solace in the fact that only $45,000 is being requested for this fiscal year. I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Illinois whether he would agree to an amendment to knock out the $750,000 authorization.

Mr. GRAY. Since the gentleman has asked the question, I will be honest in trying to answer it. The $750,000 authorization was placed in the bill for one reason and one reason only. Frankly, I thought it was to please my friends on the minority side, because every time our committee reports out a bill, whether it is for the third Library of Congress, which we passed last year with only 5 negative votes, or some other proposal, the minority always gets up and says, "Look at the Rayburn Building. We started out by authorizing $60 million and it cost us $100 million."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

The Chair hears none, and the gentleman is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. We were trying to tell the American people that the design plans, the architect's fees, the furnishings, the relocation of roads, and the construction

of that house could not cost the American taxpayers more than $750,000. That is merely a maximum ceiling. I do not see the cost of that house being $750,000. But we want a maximum in the bill so that when you go home you can tell your folks the last dollar amount it could cost. That is the only reason the $750,000 is there.

If you take it out, we might later decide that a $10-million house would be suitable. The figure is in there for your benefit, and I hope you will support the bill.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this entire debate. I have said very little, except to ask a question or two that I considered very pertinent—such as on the selection of the site, whether or not this has been properly engineered, whether or not a commission and/or self-appointed people have done such things as to consult an architect.

Certainly I have listened to all of the questions as to whether or not there would be security protection for the Vice President, whether or not there might even be fallout protection, which has not been mentioned, and the question of priorities to be established.

I have heard that we are going to violate the traditions of the Congress and allow gifts to be accepted for this house, which might or might not be appropriate under the circumstances. Certainly I have heard it proved that we are trying to follow both roads, of priority establishment and of fiscal responsibility, at the same time. I believe the chairman of our Ways and Means Committee said, over a year ago, that we could not follow both roads, but we must establish priorities, which is within the ken and the judicious duty of this legislatve branch.

I have heard much discussion about, "what is the reason?"—and I will tell you what the reason is. The reason is to get it while there is an overpowering majority in this Congress with which to do it, from those who believe in spend, spend, spend, and elect, elect, elect. But, Mr. Chairman, I have not heard enough.

Mr. Chairman, I have not heard enough about why, now, we should be precipitate, especially in view of a document I have in my hand, of over 24 pages on both sides, which lists in detail the deferrals of military construction, the deferral of military appropriations.

It is bad not to have the committee which has jurisdiction consulted about taking away part of the Naval Observatory, which serves a prime function in the military around the world, and not to have the departmental comments from Department of the Navy in either the report or the hearings. Here we have an assumption of power by the General Services Administration, the belief that they can take anything under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Public Works and the Public Buildings Act without consulting the agencies which, under the Constitution, are required to care for the defense of this country.

The Secretary of Defense lists installations page after page, Mr. Chairman—first by the Army, second by the Navy, and third by the Air Force—by States, if you please, and by locations overseas.

These include such things as hospitals, necessary quarters, POL facilities, instructional and training rifle ranges, enlisted men's barracks, and dental clinics. Yes, for the Army, then for the Navy, and then for the Air Force; domestically, by State, and then overseas; weapon storage buildings, enlisted men's barracks, necessary road construction; access, egress, and ingress; auto C-com switches; air defense areas; and classified areas that are being deferred as essential to the military progress in the interest of priorities under the 1966 fiscal appropriation, if you please, Mr. Chairman.

Ladies and gentlemen, let us not do this. Let us act with some rational thought. If indeed the Secretary of Defense is going to defer these essential projects and if no one in the executive branch will establish necessary priorities for the construction of anything at this particular time in the history of the United States, when we owe billions of dollars, then let the legislative branch which, according to the Constitution, must issue priorities, assume the necessary budgetary acumen and do it here and now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. The Administrator of General Services is further authorized to accept cash gifts, furniture, and furnishings and other types of gifts on behalf of the United States for use in constructing and furnishing the official residence but without further conditions on use, all such articles thus given to become the property of the United States.

SEC. 5. There is authorized to be appropriated to the General Services Administration, the sum of $750,000 for planning, design, construction, and costs incidental thereto, including the cost of initial furnishings.

SEC. 6. There is further authorized to be appropriated to the General Services Administration, annually, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of section 3.

Mr. GRAY (interrupting the reading of the committee substitute amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2394) to provide for the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States, pursuant to House Resolution 774, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 197, nays 184, answered "present" 1, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

YEAS—197

Adams	Giaimo	Olson, Minn.
Addabbo	Gibbons	O'Neill, Mass.
Albert	Gilbert	Patman
Anderson, Tenn.	Gilligan	Patten
	Gonzalez	Pepper
Annunzio	Gray	Perkins
Ashley	Green, Pa.	Philbin
Ashmore	Grider	Pickle
Aspinall	Griffiths	Pool
Beckworth	Halpern	Price
Bingham	Hanley	Pucinski
Blatnik	Hansen, Wash.	Randall
Boggs	Hathaway	Reuss
Boland	Hays	Rhodes, Pa.
Bolling	Hechler	Rivers, Alaska
Brademas	Helstoski	Rodino
Brooks	Hicks	Rogers, Colo.
Brown, Calif.	Holland	Rogers, Fla.
Broyhill, Va.	Howard	Ronan
Burke	Hull	Roncalio
Burton, Calif.	Hungate	Rooney, N.Y.
Burton, Utah	Ichord	Rooney, Pa.
Cabell	Jacobs	Rosenthal
Callan	Jennings	Rostenkowski
Carey	Joelson	Roush
Casey	Johnson, Calif.	Roybal
Chelf	Jones, Ala.	Ryan
Clark	Karth	St Germain
Clevenger	Kastenmeier	St. Onge
Cohelan	Kee	Scheuer
Conyers	Kelly	Schisler
Corman	Keogh	Schmidhauser
Culver	King, Calif.	Senner
Daddario	Kirwan	Shipley
Daniels	Kluczynski	Sickles
Dawson	Krebs	Sikes
de la Garza	Kupferman	Sisk
Delaney	Leggett	Slack
Dent	Long, Md.	Smith, Iowa
Denton	Love	Smith, Va.
Dingell	McDowell	Staggers
Donohue	McFall	Stalbaum
Dorn	McGrath	Stratton
Dow	Macdonald	Stubblefield
Dulski	Machen	Sullivan
Duncan, Oreg.	Mackay	Teague, Tex.
Dyal	Madden	Tenzer
Edmondson	Mahon	Thompson, N.J.
Edwards, Calif.	Mathias	Thompson, Tex.
Edwards, La.	Matsunaga	Trimble
Evans, Colo.	Meeds	Tunney
Everett	Miller	Tupper
Evins, Tenn.	Minish	Tuten
Fallon	Mink	Udall
Farbstein	Moorhead	Ullman
Farnsley	Morgan	Van Deerlin
Farnum	Morrison	Vanik
Fascell	Moss	Weltner
Feighan	Multer	White, Tex.
Flood	Murphy, Ill.	Wilson, Charles H.
Foley	Murray	
Ford, William D.	Natcher	Wolff
	Nedzi	Wright
Fraser	O'Brien	Yates
Friedel	O'Hara, Ill.	Young
Gallagher	O'Hara, Mich.	Zablocki
Gettys	Olsen, Mont.	

NAYS—184

Abbitt	Andrews, Glenn	Ayres
Abernethy		Bandstra
Adair	Andrews, N. Dak.	Bates
Anderson, Ill.		Battin
Andrews, George W.	Arends	Belcher
	Ashbrook	Bell

Bennett	Greigg	O'Konski
Berry	Gross	Ottinger
Betts	Grover	Passman
Bolton	Gubser	Pelly
Bow	Haley	Pike
Bray	Hall	Pirnie
Brock	Halleck	Poage
Broomfield	Hamilton	Poff
Brown, Ohio	Hanna	Quie
Broyhill, N.C.	Hansen, Idaho	Quillen
Buchanan	Hansen, Iowa	Race
Byrnes, Wis.	Harsha	Redlin
Cahill	Harvey, Mich.	Reid, Ill.
Callaway	Herlong	Reifel
Carter	Horton	Reinecke
Cederberg	Hosmer	Rhodes, Ariz.
Chamberlain	Huot	Rivers, S.C.
Clancy	Hutchinson	Robison
Clausen, Don H.	Irwin	Rogers, Tex.
Clawson, Del	Jarman	Roudebush
Cleveland	Johnson, Okla.	Rumsfeld
Collier	Johnson, Pa.	Satterfield
Colmer	Jonas	Saylor
Conable	Jones, Mo.	Schneebeli
Conte	Jones, N.C.	Schweiker
Cooley	Keith	Secrest
Corbett	King, N.Y.	Selden
Craley	King, Utah	Shriver
Cramer	Kornegay	Skubitz
Cunningham	Kunkel	Smith, Calif.
Curtin	Laird	Smith, N.Y.
Curtis	Landrum	Springer
Dague	Langen	Stafford
Davis, Ga.	Latta	Stanton
Davis, Wis.	Long, La.	Steed
Derwinski	McCarthy	Sweeney
Devine	McClory	Taylor
Dickinson	McCulloch	Teague, Calif.
Dole	McDade	Thomson, Wis.
Dowdy	McEwen	Tuck
Downing	McMillan	Utt
Duncan, Tenn.	MacGregor	Vigorito
Dwyer	Mailliard	Vivian
Edwards, Ala.	Marsh	Waggonner
Erlenborn	Martin, Ala.	Walker, N. Mex.
Findley	Martin, Nebr.	Watkins
Fino	May	Watson
Fisher	Michel	Watts
Flynt	Mills	Whalley
Ford, Gerald R.	Minshall	Whitener
Fountain	Mize	Whitten
Frelinghuysen	Moeller	Widnall
Fulton, Pa.	Moore	Wilson, Bob
Gathings	Morse	Wyatt
Goodell	Morton	Wydler
Grabowski	Mosher	Younger
	Nelsen	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Powell

NOT VOTING—49

Baring	Hardy	O'Neal, Ga.
Barrett	Harvey, Ind.	Purcell
Burleson	Hawkins	Rees
Byrne, Pa.	Hébert	Reid, N.Y.
Cameron	Henderson	Resnick
Celler	Holifield	Roberts
Diggs	Karsten	Scott
Ellsworth	Lennon	Stephens
Fogarty	Lipscomb	Talcott
Fulton, Tenn.	McVicker	Todd
Fuqua	Mackie	Toll
Garmatz	Martin, Mass.	Walker, Miss.
Green, Oreg.	Matthews	White, Idaho
Griffin	Monagan	Williams
Gurney	Morris	Willis
Hagan, Ga.	Murphy, N.Y.	
Hagen, Calif.	Nix	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Monagan against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. O'Neal of Georgia against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Hardy against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Talcott against.

Mr. Barrett for, with Mr. Gurney against.

Mr. Karsten for, with Mr. Fogarty against.

Mr. Mackie for, with Mr. Lipscomb against.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Walker of Mississippi against.

Mr. Nix for, with Mr. Harvey of Indiana against.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee for, with Mr. Henderson against.

Mr. Todd for, with Mr. Lennon against.

Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Baring against.

Until further notice:

Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Roberts with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Morris with Mr. Reid of New York.

Mr. Williams with Mrs. Green of Oregon.

Mr. Cameron with Mr. Matthews.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Hagen of California.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Resnick.

Mr. McVicker with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Stephens.

Mr. Burleson with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Rees.

Mr. HORTON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act authorizing the planning, design, construction, furnishing, and maintenance of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 13546. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, for other purposes.

RENT SUPPLEMENT CUT

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my dismay at the report in yesterday's New York Times that the administration's request for $30 million for the rent supplement program has been cut by 60 percent to $12 million by the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee.

From the very beginning of debate over this rent subsidy program, I have contended that the administration's $30 million request was far too modest in the face of the Nation's overall housing needs. This latest setback for this much beleaguered program for providing better housing to low-income families is especially disappointing.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development, President Johnson pointed out earlier this year in sending his rent subsidy request to the Congress, has already received preliminary proposals from sponsors to construct nearly 70,000 low-income units under the rent supplement plan.

Cutting back the $30 million to a meager $12 million amounts to gutting the subsidy program. President Johnson has said that the need for the rent supplement program is "obvious—it is the need of the poor and the disadvantaged."

Public housing officials estimate that nationwide some 500,000 families are on waiting lists for public housing units. In New York alone more than 125,000 families are on the waiting list.

Yet existing legislation and current authorizations provide at best for some 35,000 new public housing units a year. In New York State, because of percentage limitations written into present housing laws, this would amount to only 5,250 new units a year, and there would be much less for New York City.

This at a time when we should be building on the order of 200,000 new units a year.

The rent supplement program, while not nearly ambitious or massive enough in funding, would be an important tool with which the Federal Government in partnership with private developers could begin to meet the staggering need for more and better low-rent housing.

Mr. Speaker, I can only hope that before the bill comes to the floor the Appropriations Committee will restore the funds that reportedly have been cut from the program so that we can then proceed with the important task of providing decent and economical housing for all Americans.

I include at this point in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in today's New York Times:

RENT SUBSIDY REBUFF

The damage done to the President's low-income housing subsidy bill by a House Appropriations Subcommittee can and should be repaired before it is too late.

Mr. Johnson asked $30 million for the project last year and the same amount this year. In 1965 he was granted an almost meaningless appropriation for administrative purposes; and this year if the subcommittee has its way—and the House will probably follow its lead—the sum will be $12 million, well under half of what surveys have shown is needed if the experiment is to have substance.

The idea behind the plan is that the Federal Government would pay the difference between the real rent charged to very poor families and the rent the families themselves pay at a rate of one-quarter of their incomes. No one would loll in luxury, but many present slum-dwelling families would thereby be enabled to live in decent surroundings. There could be no private profiteering because the subsidies would go only to buildings owned by such nonprofit or limited-dividend organizations as unions, churches, and settlement houses.

The plan would be an economic stimulus and at the same time a preventive of social

degradation. Government already subsidizes—directly or otherwise—many forms of housing. Included are facilities or guaranteed loans for the poor, for veterans, for middle-income families. Rent subsidies, as envisioned by President Johnson, are simply a more direct employment of funds designed to take the Government out of the costly landlord business and to encourage groups other than those motivated solely by profit to do the building and renovating.

Hope for salvaging a more substantial portion of the program lies with the Senate. If the Upper House votes the full sum the President requests, the $12 million figure can possibly be revised upward in conference.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOLS IN FEDERALLY IMPACTED AREAS

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, the Congress recognized its responsibility to communities throughout the Nation where Federal activities imposed special financial burdens and it enacted Public Laws 874 and 815 in 1950. These laws provide financial assistance for school operations and maintenance, and construction of facilities in federally impacted areas.

While this legislation was designed to be of a temporary nature, the burden imposed on local communities has proved to be permanent. I do not feel the Congress can consider a reduction of these funds unless it provides adequate legislation to meet the demands made upon local school districts because of the lasting impact of Federal activities.

In my congressional district, where there are 5 military installations, 37 school districts will be drastically affected if the proposed reduction in appropriations to carry out the provisions of Public Law 874 is agreed to by the Congress. Approximately $2.4 million for which these school districts have budgeted will not be forthcoming unless the Congress enacts needed legislation $416 million the Office of Education estimated will be needed to maintain present levels of assistance during fiscal 1967. But the budget calls for appropriations of only $183.4 million—$233 million less than the estimated requirements. The suggested cutback in the program is harsh indeed.

At this point I insert excerpts of a newspaper clipping from the Sun-Telegram, San Bernardino, Calif., datelined February 9, 1966:

FEDERAL AID LOSS OF $600,000 SEEN FOR SCHOOL DISTRICT

BARSTOW.—The new Barstow Unified School District faces the possible loss of $600,000 in Federal financial assistance unless funds are appropriated under the Public Law 874 program, C. Dean Hammans, chairman of the district's board of education, told the Barstow Chamber of Commerce yesterday at the Holiday Inn.

"I would like to call this to your attention, but not in an alarming way," said Hammans.

He explained that Public Law 874 helps local school districts which have military installations nearby. Both the Barstow Marine Corps Supply Center and Fort Irwin are located within the Barstow Unified District.

"The money previously allocated under 874 has not been done at this time," said Hammans. "It usually has been allocated in a routine manner."

He reported that if the funds aren't available, the local district would either have to curtail portions of its program or it would take an additional 71 cents per $100 assessment in the tax rate to replace the $600,000.

He added that Dr. Warren Linville, superintendent, will be in Washington, D.C., next week to talk to Congressman DYAL and Federal leaders about the program.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly feel there must be a continuation of the present funds under Public Law 874 and the current administration of same to permit proper planning and adequate budgeting at the State and local levels.

Under Public Law 815, the vital construction assistance program will also be slashed. In the past, Public Law 815 has been funded at an annual level of approximately $50 to $60 million. The fiscal year 1966 funds will be at the lower figure, and for the next year, the requested appropriation is expected to be approximately $23 million.

Public Laws 874 and 815 are essentially concerned with the burden placed on local school districts by Federal activities while Public Law 89–10 is concerned with the general quality of education, especially in economically depressed areas. If there is a retrenchment in programs to meet the ever-growing needs of local school districts caused by Federal activities, we will be violating our ultimate goal in that every student shall have an opportunity to participate in our educational programs. All of our plans for the future are of no avail unless the coming generations are to receive the best possible education, one preparing them for the world which they shall inherit.

REFUSAL OF RENTAL ACCOMMODATIONS

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, we have a new legislative assistant in my office. He is a young man who was born and well educated in Indianapolis. He is exceptionally intelligent and pleasantly polite.

If he were German or Irish or Belgian, I would not have occasion to mention it or him. But God and nature decreed that this young man be a Negro. And simply because of this, and no other reason, he and his wife and child were refused rental accommodations by the Cherry Hill Apartments at Hyattsville, Md.; the Forest Hills Apartments at 1405 Southern Avenue, Oxon Hill, Md., and the Fairview Terrace Apartments at Tacoma Park, Md.

This is what is commonly known as a "gentlemen's agreement." But my young assistant is a gentleman. And he does not agree.

And whether or not it is gentlemanly of me to bring this up, I do not agree, either.

Fifteen years ago I was not allowed to check in at a hotel because of a gentleman's agreement that servicemen would cheapen the place and I was an 18-year-old marine in uniform.

That is the only time a thing of that kind ever happened to me. But when you have it happen to yourself just for being yourself, you begin to understand the crushing feeling of futile rage that comes with being told by someone in authority that no matter how good you might be, you are not good enough, simply because of what you are wearing—clothes or skin.

It is hard to believe that any place of public accommodation would have been so unpatriotic as to exclude an American citizen simply because he was an American serviceman. Unfortunately, it seems we must still await the day when it will be hard to believe that a place of public accommodation would be so unpatriotic as to refuse an American citizen simply because of his race.

My father used to paraphrase Solon by saying:

Civilized society is impossible until the unconcerned are as outraged as the victim.

Young Americans of all races can—and do die together in Vietnam. Why must some of their elders make it so difficult for them to live together in America?

This is America, all right. I just wish more people in our Nation's Capital realized it.

STATUS OF PROPOSED 200-BILLION-ELECTRON-VOLT ACCELERATOR

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, near the beginning of this session of Congress on January 25, 1966, I last made a statement concerning the status of the proposed 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator. This followed up my previous statements in the last session on July 9 and July 26, 1965, regarding the proposals made to the Atomic Energy Commission for sites for this accelerator. Today the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has received from the Atomic Energy Commission the report of the National Academy of Sciences' Site Evaluation Committee. This report is being made public today.

The Site Evaluation Committee of the National Academy of Sciences, after extensive study, has selected six sites which they believe on balance to be clearly superior. These sites are Ann Arbor, Mich.; Brookhaven National Laboratory at Upton, Long Island, N.Y.; Denver, Colo.; Madison, Wis.; Sierra Foothills, near Sacramento, Calif., and South Barrington—or Weston—near Chicago, Ill.

At the conclusion of my remarks I shall insert the summary of the report of the National Academy of Sciences' Site Evaluation Committee and the Atomic Energy Commission's announcement relative to the submission of this report to the Commission.

I wish to again remind my colleagues, as I did last year and again last January, that neither the construction of the 200-Bev accelerator nor its architect engineering design has as yet been authorized by the Congress or recommended by the joint committee. In fact, the President's fiscal year 1967 budget makes no request for such authorization. However, on page 83 of the fiscal year 1967 budget message of the President the Congress was informed:

Design funds for the 200-Bev machine will be requested once a site has been selected and the design has been authorized.

On March 10 of this year in the course of the joint committee's hearings on the AEC's fiscal year 1967 authorizations, Commissioner Tape, of the AEC, when asked concerning the length of time it would take the Commission to review the Academy's list and come up with a final selection as to a site, stated:

It will probably take 3 months, and that is a short period of time, and I expect it could run as much as 6 months.

My colleagues will recall that the National Academy of Sciences' selection of these 6 sites was made from a list of 85 proposals representing more than 150 different locations in 43 States. The 85 proposals considered by the National Academy had been narrowed down by the AEC from 126 proposals representing more than 200 sites in 46 States.

It is my belief that the wide interest in this project will continue and I shall endeavor to keep the Members of this House informed of all major developments or activities regarding this proposed accelerator in the coming months.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1966.

Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR CHET: As you were informed by my letter of September 14, 1965, the National Academy of Sciences was asked to make a detailed evaluation of all proposed sites for the 200-Bev accelerator which met the basic criteria applicable to the proposed facility.

I am pleased to inform you that the Academy has completed its evaluation and has submitted its report to the Commission. Copies of the Academy's report are being transmitted with this letter. I am also enclosing for your information copies of a public announcement which we plan to distribute at 10:30 a.m. today concerning receipt of the Academy's report.

We have not had an opportunity to study the report in detail since it has just been received from the Academy. We plan to move as expeditiously as possible in carrying out any further studies which may be required. In this connection we expect to keep you informed of our plans and our progress in making a final site selection.

Should you desire discussions concerning the Academy's report we would be pleased to meet with you or the committee at your convenience.

Cordially,

GLENN T. SEABORG, *Chairman.*

THE REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES' SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Construction of the Nation's largest scientific instrument is now under consideration. It is an accelerator designed to explore the fundamental structure of matter. It will produce beams of protons with energies of 200 billion electron volts (Bev), more than six times the energy of particles produced by any existing accelerator.

The Site Evaluation Committee of the National Academy of Sciences was formed to assist the Atomic Energy Commission in the evaluation of sites offered for location of a national center to house the proposed accelerator. After extensive study, aided by many experts, the Committee has selected six sites which, on balance, are clearly superior. Five sites are principally characterized by having either the nucleus of a strong accelerator design group, or one of the Nation's outstanding universities nearby. These are: Ann Arbor, Mich.; Brookhaven National Laboratory, N.Y.; Madison, Wis.; Sierra Foothills near Sacramento, Calif.; and South Barrington (or Weston), near Chicago, Ill. The sixth site, Denver, Colo., has neither the university strength nearby nor the existing design group that is considered desirable. However, the Committee is of the opinion that the combined advantages of excellent geology, accessibility, good climate, and an area already available which is sufficiently large to accommodate any conceivable experiment or expansion are such as to make the site merit serious consideration.

The Committee's principal concerns have included the physical properties of the site, the problems of assembling an outstanding staff, and accessibility for visiting scientists who will conduct about 75 percent of the experiments. While none of the recommended sites is ideal, each is excellent in at least one of the most important features and within acceptable limits with respect to others.

SIX SITES RECOMMENDED TO AEC FOR 200-BEV ACCELERATOR FACILITY

The Atomic Energy Commission has received a report from the National Academy of Sciences recommending six possible locations for the AEC's proposed 200-billion-electron-volt (Bev) proton accelerator.

The locations, recommended without ranking by the Academy are: Ann Arbor, Mich.; Brookhaven National Laboratory at Upton, Long Island, N.Y.; Denver, Colo.; Madison, Wis.; Sierra Foothills near Sacramento, Calif.; and South Barrington (or Weston), near Chicago, Ill.

In response to a public announcement last April, the Commission received 126 proposals for siting the planned accelerator center. These recommended more than 200 locations in 46 States.

After a review of all proposals, the Commission asked the National Academy of Sciences to evaluate each proposal on which there was sufficient information to indicate the location met the minimum site criteria. There were 85 such proposals suggesting more than 150 different tracts in 43 States. The criteria specified at least 3,000 acres meeting certain conditions with respect to water, power, geology, and other factors.

The NAS evaluation was performed by a 10-member special committee headed by Dr. E. R. Piore of New York, vice president and chief scientist of the International Business Machines Corp.

The Commission now plans to carry out additional studies as may be necessary. The completion of this work and analysis of the resulting data may take several months.

The President's budget for fiscal year 1967 contains a request for $2.2 million in operating funds to continue studies on the accelerator. These are being conducted primarily at the AEC's Lawrence Radiation Laboratory in Berkeley, Calif. As the budget states, design funds will be requested after a site is selected.

The accelerator would be the main facility in a proposed new national accelerator center. Cost of the project is estimated at a total of about $375 million. That figure includes approximately $300 million for construction, $40 million for additional research equipment to be installed during the first year of operation, and the remainder for a particle detection unit. Construction would require 6 to 8 years.

The proposed laboratory would employ about 2,000 people and would have an annual operating budget estimated at about $60 million.

A summary of the NAS report is attached.

SECURITY SYSTEM FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, no self-respecting village in America would put up with the so-called security system that is used in the House of Representatives.

Professional training is not required of the officers. Many of them are college students who have no interest whatever in a police career.

Almost all of them get—and keep—their jobs under an unbelievable system of personal patronage. Under it, senior Congressmen are each assigned a police position and given the privilege of selecting the person to fill it. This makes effective discipline impossible. If superior police officers attempt to require standards or impose punishment for infractions, it is an easy matter for the officer involved to run to his patron for intercession.

Although a number of the present officers are excellent—indeed superior—much of the force is indifferent, inefficient, unqualified, and of little security value.

The present force is also badly understaffed and underpaid.

It consists now of 225 officers. Considering the property which should be patrolled 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, the force should be at least double in number.

Capitol Hill policemen work 6 days a week but get less pay than Washington Metropolitan Police who work only 5 days.

I am today urging these changes to the Committee on House Administration:

First. That the personal patronage system be abolished completely, and all policemen selected on the basis of professional competence and aptitude by a House Police Board on which both political parties will have proper representation.

Second. That all present members of the force be required to complete successfully the 6-week course in the Washington Metropolitan Police Academy at the earliest possible date, and that all new members of the force be required to complete successfully the same course before going on duty.

Third. That pay, workweek, and benefits be placed and kept at the same level as the Washington Metropolitan Police.

Fourth. In filling future vacancies as elevator operators, preference be given to college students who may lose their jobs as the result of these new police standards.

Perhaps the best policing in the world would not have prevented the unfortunate incident last night in which Representative JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Republican, of New Hampshire, was injured. However, the incident should serve as a timely reminder that the Capitol Police force is not all that it should be, and hopefully spur the House to long-overdue improvement.

Another reminder occurred just a year ago when a costumed member of the American Nazi Party got to the well of the House of Representatives and made a brief speech before he was taken into custody.

I have developed these recommendations over the past year as a member of the Minority Employees Committee of the Republican Conference. This committee assists Minority Leader FORD in filling the 10 police positions assigned to the Republican side. In filling these positions, Republicans have endeavored to select qualified men seeking police careers.

PANAMA CANAL SITUATION: PROPOSED TREATIES MUST BE DEFEATED

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a statement by Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, since the bloody Red-led Panamanian mob assaults on the U.S. Canal Zone in January 1964, the sovereignty of our country over that territorial possession has been the object of incessant attacks by radicals in Panama in which they have been aided and abetted by elements in our Government and, with a few notable exceptions, by an administration policy of managed news in the mass news media.

In spite of these difficulties, the people of the United States have gradually become better informed and right now are far ahead of the legislative and executive branches of their Government in evaluating the situation and understanding what is at stake—the security of the entire Western Hemisphere, including the United States.

The statesman who more than anyone else is responsible for this public enlightenment is our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD]. In and out of the Congress over a period of years, he has courageously presented the issues in thoroughly documented addresses and statements. These supply invaluable source material on the more significant aspects of the overall interoceanic canal problem and they are being increasingly used by students in our colleges and universities in writing theses and by more thoughtful publicists seeking reliable information.

On October 31, 1965, Representative FLOOD, over the "Manion Forum" network, added another statement to his long list of constructive contributions in which he called for the display of only one flag over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal, the flag of the United States, and for the defeat of the proposed canal treaties in the U.S. Senate.

The indicated broadcast featuring Dean Clarence Manion and Congressman FLOOD, with comments by other distinguished Members of the Congress and an able writer assailing the proposed surrender, follows:

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Manion Forum, Oct. 31, 1965]

SENATE MUST DITCH PROPOSED PANAMA TREATY—U.S. SURRENDER WOULD OPEN GATE TO RED SUBVERSION OF LATIN AMERICA

(By Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, Member of Congress for Pennsylvania)

Dean MANION. Two short years and 4 months ago, Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, opened his address over this microphone with these words: "Wake up America. Your house is on fire. Indeed the very foundation of your house—the Panama Canal Zone—is smoldering and every so often is spurting forth flames. For it is the Panama Canal which is the key target of the world revolutionary movement in the Caribbean." (Manion Forum broadcast No. 453).

In the course of that address, this able and courageous man brought us up to date on the kindling and development of the dangerous fire that he was announcing. He warned us about the destructive conflagration that was sure to come unless we did wake up, sound the alarm, and put the smoldering fire out.

Unfortunately, we didn't wake up to the fire in Panama. Too many exciting and diverting things were happening elsewhere; the war in Vietnam; the assassination of our President and the election of another; the subsequent preoccupation of the new Congress with the hasty fabrication of the Great Society.

Meanwhile, in January 1964, there were bloody Communist inspired riots in Panama. Our new President, Lyndon Johnson, hastily assured us that "the United States cannot allow the security of the Panama Canal to be imperiled." Relieved by that assurance we all turned our attention to the presidential campaign. Eleven months later (Dec. 18, 1964), those who were listening were disturbed to hear President Johnson say that his special envoys who had been negotiating with the Panamanians since the January riots had promised them that we would negotiate a revision of our 1903 Treaty with Panama, the treaty which ceded the Canal Zone to the United States in perpetuity.

The President went on to say that the negotiators would reconsider and redefine American sovereignty over the Canal Zone which had been expressly affirmed without qualification by the treaty of 1903. Finally, on last September 24, President Johnson announced that the United States and Panama have agreed to abrogate the 1903 treaty and to write an entirely new document which will "effectively recognize Panama's sovereignty over the area of the present Canal Zone."

This shocking announcement marked the climax of retreats and concessions to Panamanian revolutionaries that have continued straight through our last three presidential administrations. Unfortunately, the tragic implications of this misguided Panama policy have been all but completely smothered in the American press and thoroughly misrepresented by left wing apologists for what they call "the inevitable social revolution" in Latin America.

Thanks to the continuing research, eloquence and patriotic dedication of Congressman FLOOD, every step in our humiliating retreat from Panama has been promptly and fully described in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Periodically, since 1960, (Manion Forum broadcast No. 298) he has summarized these reports over this "Manion Forum" microphone. When he heard the President's announcement last September, the Congressman ventured a prophecy in the course of his speech of protest to the Congress (September 27). "I predict," he said, "that the expressed willingness to surrender control over the canal will be taken as a signal for accelerated activity among communistic revolutionaries all over Latin American and the Caribbean."

I am delighted to tell this audience that Congressman FLOOD is here with me now, when we need his advice very badly, believe me. Congressman, welcome back to the "Manion Forum."

Congressman FLOOD. Thank you, Dean Manion.

Dean MANION. Congressman FLOOD, the big question is what can the American people still do about the Panama Canal?

Congressman FLOOD. Of course, the question arises about the joint statement that was issued by the Presidents of the United States and Panama on areas of agreement reached in current canal treaty negotiations, but the thing that concerns me is what in the world were our diplomats doing during the 18 months of these negotiations? Certainly they were not playing very good diplomatic poker as far as the welfare of this Nation was concerned.

When they sat down around that table with the Panamanians, the Americans held all the cards. We have an absolutely sound juridical position in the treaty of 1903. The sovereignty in perpetuity of the United States in the Canal Zone was guaranteed and assured by that treaty, and certainly the defense and the operation and maintenance of the canal was in our hands; the great humanitarian and good works that have been done for the people of Panama by this country ever since the canal has been opened; and even more than that, the well-known fact that a new canal must be constructed.

UNITED STATES MISPLAYS HAND

We very well could have used this as one of our strong cards—the ace in the hole—in these negotiations. But, what happened? Well, our people instead of playing diplomatic poker must have been playing Old Maid or tiddlywinks because everything the Panamanians asked for the Panamanians got and in return the United States got absolutely nothing at all.

When the Panamanians sat down they demanded that the treaty of 1903 be abrogated, so the Americans agreed. The second point made by the Panamanians was that sovereignty be established in the Republic of Panama over the Canal Zone Territory and the Americans agreed. Third, the Panamanians insisted that the tolls be raised and a greater profit come to them with increased payments from the canal, and the Americans agreed.

So, in effect, the Panamanians insisted that we throw in our hand or we would be blackmailed by threats of more riots. And this, while it's not a very nice word—it's a very ugly word—constituted on our part, in my opinion, abject and total appeasement to the demands of the Republic of Panama and against the best interests and the welfare of the United States.

The Panama Canal was never intended to be a moneymaking proposition. We have never raised the tolls. As a matter of fact that's a very delicate point, because we have always declared that the United States of America stands in a fiduciary relationship to the other maritime nations of the world to maintain and defend and properly operate the Panama Canal.

Now sovereignty is an absolute thing. You can't be just a little bit sovereign. You can't be almost sovereign. You certainly can't be half-sovereign. You are either sovereign or you are not. And, I repeat, under our treaty of 1903 with Panama, the United States was sovereign in perpetuity, and is today. If this is changed, I submit that it's impossible to establish jurisdiction and maintain authority if you do not at the same time have the necessary sovereignty upon which you can base that jurisdiction and that authority.

The grant of complete jurisdiction by Panama over the Canal Zone means that all the laws made by the U.S. Congress for the government of the Canal Zone and the operation and maintenance of the canal may be scrapped at any time by Panama and superseded by Panamanian law. This also means that all civil activities of the Canal Zone—courts, police, fire departments, schools, roads, public utilities, everything—will be taken over by Panama.

That certainly is not very much to look forward to when you realize that since 1955 Panamanians have not been able properly *to collect* the garbage in their own capital city of Panama, or in Colon either. When Panama has secured completely all of its claims, you can be sure they will inevitably demand all control over the canal enterprise with the withdrawal by the United States. And I warn that if such abetment occurs, Panama and all of Central and Latin America could be faced with the prospect of active Communist infiltration and activity.

With the President's announcement of the Panamanian position and of our position, this constitutes what I think is a very sad day for the United States, although I am sure it will bring rejoicing in Peiping and Moscow because one of the great targets of international communism from the very beginning has been the control and domination of all interoceanic canals. This is vital and important to world conquest by international communism. And one of these great interoceanic canals and one of communism's chief targets is the domination and control of the Panama Canal, because it is essential to the national defense of the Western Hemisphere. The Panama Canal is the jugular vein of our defense structure in the Western Hemisphere.

Now the Panama Canal as it exists today is certainly obsolescent. In 15 or 20 years it will probably be approaching saturation. So there is need for a new canal to be dug in that general area of Central America. But under all the circumstances, considering the diplomatic and political blackmail to which this country has been subjected by several succeeding republic governments of Panama and by their presidents, certainly Panama is the last place in the world where such a new canal should be dug, whether it be a sea level canal dug with nuclear power, or a new lock canal, or what have you. And this should have been one of the great cards, a trump card in our negotiations—one which we never played.

There should be only one flag over the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone—a flag of the United States. And I hope and pray the proposed treaties are defeated in the U.S. Senate.

Dean MANION. Thank you, Congressman DANIEL FLOOD, for this frank statement of a dangerous and important truth.

My friends, over this microphone a few weeks ago you heard the humiliating story of our retreat from the Communists in the Dominican Republic, where our diplomats used American troops to kidnap and deport the leader of the Dominican anti-Communist forces. ("Manion Forum" broadcast No. 575.) Our foreign policy people have now planned another humiliating retreat from Panama. How long will it be before they tell us to turn and run from the Communists in South Vietnam?

Congressman FLOOD has asked you to fight against ratification of this perfidious Panama treaty in the U.S. Senate. Your Senators are back home now. Line up your pro-American, anti-Communist neighbors and go to work on these Senators. We have a valid legal right to continued control of the Panama Canal. Don't let the State Department give it away.

CONGRESSMEN, COLUMNIST ASSAIL OUR SURRENDER

"The U.S. Government has completely capitulated to the demands of Panama concerning the canal and we have come home from the so-called negotiations like a whipped pup with its tail between its legs. The country of Panama owes its entire existence to the United States, and we have continually given friendship and economic support to it * * *. This Nation has paid Panama the full indemnity and annuities agreed upon by the two nations, has completely carried out the terms of the treaty and stands on firm moral and legal footing in this dispute, and under no circumstances should it have conceded to the Communist-inspired demands of Panama. How do we expect other nations to have any respect for the United States when we do not even have enough self-respect to stand firm when we are on solid legal and moral footing?"—Congressman WILLIAM HARSHA, of Ohio.

"In Panama we are preparing to haul down the American flag. President Johnson has abrogated the 1903 Panama Canal Zone treaty to surrender sovereignty to Panama, a nation which owes its existence to the United States. The United States performed all its responsibilities under the treaty, building and guarding the canal, and developing and maintaining the Canal Zone, which was bought with American tax dollars.

"The Communists have long wanted the United States out of the canal. When Fidel Castro took over in Cuba, almost his first act was to launch an expedition against the canal, which proved abortive.

"Now the United States is giving up on its own * * *.

"Grave military questions are involved, but no one in the services dares to put his head under the ax of White House displeasure. We are reportedly to continue to guard the Panama Canal, but just how effective this can be when sovereignty has been abrogated is a grave problem. A nation that hauls down its flag can expect to be invited to take its troops out any time."—WALTER TROHAN, in the September 29 Chicago Tribune.

"Only 62 years ago, there was no Republic of Panama. It was created by a popular revolt from the nation of Colombia. The United States had been negotiating with Colombia for a 10-mile wide strip to dig a canal from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Colombia rejected the offer. Fearing the canal would go to Nicaragua, the people set up their own Government of Panama and the United States granted diplomatic recognition. The following year, 1903, President Theodore Roosevelt signed a treaty which granted to the United States: 'All the rights, power and authority within the zone—which the United States would possess and exercise if it were the sovereign * * * to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any sovereign right, power or authority.' "—Congressman RICHARD POFF, of Virginia.

PROTECT ANIMALS USED IN RESEARCH

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, for years unscrupulous individuals and firms have been preying on pet owners across the Nation by stealing cats and dogs to provide animals for scientific research. Once stolen, evidence indicates, these animals, and those bred or obtained from other sources, are often treated inhumanely before they are turned over to the laboratories.

While there are many legitimate dealers in research animals, dealers who give their charges good care, there apparently are hundreds of others who make their living by stealing family pets. Recently, as evidence of this has accumulated, the public has begun to demand that legislation be passed to control this growing problem.

Hardly a day passes that I do not receive letters from several constituents who want something done and done quickly. They are angry and they have a right to be.

At least 22 bills aimed at correcting this situation have been introduced in this House. Last week an amended version of one of them, H.R. 12488, was recommended favorably by the Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains of the House Committee on Agriculture. The subcommittee, under the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], held extensive hearings and reached the firm conclusion that legislation is indeed necessary.

The subcommittee's version of the bill basically would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used in research or experimentation. Dealers and researchers would have to keep complete records of each sale or purchase involving such animals. These records would be available for inspection by the Secretary, who would also have the power to prescribe the humane standards under which the animals would be kept and transported. Failure to comply with the standards could, after a hearing, result in suspension or revocation of a dealer's license, or withholding of Federal aid for research projects involving the use of animals.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there are serious problems in the way in which we presently allow these animals to be treated. And we all know the anguish the loss of a family pet can cause.

Therefore, I introduced yesterday a bill to regulate the dealers and their treatment of animals intended for research. It incorporates the subcommittee's recommendations and would in no way interfere with the research itself. This

measure is needed and I hope it will be passed speedily by this House and the other body.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a speech by Senator RUSSELL of Georgia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, the Honorable RICHARD B. RUSSELL, last December made a thoughtful and comprehensive speech to the annual convention of the Georgia Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts held in Macon, Ga.

During the course of this fine speech, Senator RUSSELL said:

> We climbed aboard the program at an early date and are now 1 of the 25 States in which soil conservation districts cover every acre of our geography.

Mr. Speaker, let me submit for the RECORD that it was Senator RUSSELL himself who provided early support for the program and sparked the drive for Georgia's magnificent climb.

One of the first programs I worked for after becoming a Member of Congress was the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954. It has been a great source of pride to work with local and State officials in developing programs under this act. Of the 36 projects in Georgia authorized Federal assistance under the act, 15 are in my district, the Ninth Congressional District. And 14 of the 17 projects authorized Federal assistance under the Flood Control Act of 1944 are partially or wholly within my district.

These projects are superior examples of local, State, and Federal Governments working in unity for improvement of our land and water.

Mr. Speaker, conservation of our soil and water is a matter in which each of us should be deeply concerned. Senator RUSSELL's remarks show how Georgia has vigorously moved forward in its conservation and land treatment programs, and I believe Members of the Congress will benefit from the opportunity to read his speech:

REMARKS OF SENATOR RICHARD B. RUSSELL, DEMOCRAT, OF GEORGIA, AT THE CONVENTION OF THE GEORGIA ASSOCIATION OF SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICTS, MACON, GA., DECEMBER 6, 1965

I am honored to meet again with the leaders of conservation in Georgia and to salute you for the outstanding work you are doing for our State and Nation.

No activity is more vital to the welfare of our people and to the future of America than the development and conservation of our resources of soil and water.

These precious and irreplaceable gifts of nature are part of our common heritage as Americans. They are the bedrock of our national strength and the source of much of our national wealth and prosperity. And they are the rightful inheritance of generations of Americans yet unborn.

In these times of international peril, it is hardly necessary to remind the people of this country that we must be on guard constantly against the continuing threat from the world-wide Communist conspiracy. We must resist this implacable foe of our liberty and our security with all our strength and vigor as freemen.

We also must constantly be on guard against the forces of man and nature that would denude and destroy our heritage of land, forests, and water. For these national assets are as essential to America and to her future as are the awesome weapons we possess to stay the hand of Communist tyranny.

Indeed, one of the significant advantages we enjoy over our adversaries of the Communist world is the vastly superior resources of American agriculture. Thanks to the efficiency of our farmers and the bounty of our land, we Americans are the best-fed and best-clothed people on the face of the earth. Our country is also the breadbasket of the free world and the mainstay of millions of near-starved people in the so-called undeveloped lands.

Compare that, if you will, with the continued failure of Russian and Chinese agriculture and the threat of famine that stalks vast areas of the globe today—notably in China, India, and some parts of Africa and South America.

In former times, there were many among us who looked upon conservation as essentially a rural problem and no particular concern to city dwellers. No idea could be more erroneous or dangerous. Conservation is the concern of everyone who eats food, drinks water, and rears a family—in short, it is the concern of all mankind.

It is a matter of pride to me that in Georgia, more than in some areas, the cause of conservation has long enjoyed a considerable basis of public support. The farmers and landowners of this State, together with many other far-sighted individuals interested in the welfare of Georgia, have pioneered in the soil and water conservation movement.

Today, Georgia's conservation districts are among the most active in the Nation. We climbed aboard the program at an early date and are now one of the 25 States in which soil conservation districts cover every acre of our geography. The work performed in these districts has yielded dividends to the entire community as well as to the individual farmers, far in excess of the modest investment involved.

Georgia is also one of the top two or three States in the country participating in the small watershed program.

I have always been a strong advocate of the comprehensive watershed approach to the interlocking problems of soil and water conservation. I am proud that I was able to have the Coosa River project included in the 11 original pilot projects authorized in Congress in 1944 to test the watershed idea.

On the basis of the demonstrated success of the Coosa and other pilot projects, Congress enacted the present and permanent small watershed program. Georgia now has 34 of these projects underway in every part of our State—a number exceeded only by Texas and Oklahoma. A hundred other Georgia watershed projects are in various stages of application and authorization.

In measurable dollar benefits alone, it is estimated that these watershed projects are returning $3½ million per year in prevention of flood and sediment damage, erosion control, water supplies for small cities and towns, and recreational activities for our people.

During my years in the Senate—all of which I have spent as a member either of the standing Committee of Agriculture and Forestry or the Senate Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, or both—I have championed the cause of conservation with all the ability and energy I could muster. I am proud of what has been accomplished in Georgia and in the Nation.

Of the conservation and agricultural programs that I have been privileged to help establish and shape, I must confess to some pride of sponsorship for the agriculture conservation program—commonly called ACP. This program, as those of you here are well aware, provides Federal financial and technical assistance to private landowners to help them establish needed conservation practices which in many cases would be too costly to be performed by the farmer alone.

I am pleased that our Georgia farmers have participated extensively in this program. In the past 10 years alone, some $150 million worth of land treatment and conservation practices has been accomplished under ACP in our State. For example, Georgia landowners have planted 713,000 acres in pine trees in the past decade, which is one-third of all land planted in trees throughout the country under ACP.

Georgia's leadership in pine tree planting is resulting in a threefold advantage for our State. It prevents and controls soil erosion; it takes marginal and unneeded farm land out of crop production and substitutes profitable tree farming; and it enhances Georgia's standing as a leading producer of a growing variety of forest products ranging from naval stores to paper and newsprint.

We have made impressive gains in the years since the Nation started to become conservation conscious in the midthirties. But we must intensify our efforts ahead if we are to feed and clothe our own growing population and help meet the needs of a hungry world, which gains 160,000 new people with each rising of the sun.

Our past progress has not always been easy. There have been attempts in Congress and in the executive branch to hamper and curtail conservation funds and programs.

In the past 10 years, the Senate on five occasions has voted to increase funds voted by the House to carry on the imperative work of the Soil Conservation Service. In 3 of those 5 years, the amount appropriated by the Senate was more than had been recommended by the President.

There also has been a continuing effort, starting with the arrival on the Washington scene of Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, to slash funds for the agriculture conservation program. Fortunately, we have had the votes in Congress to thwart these efforts.

I assume you are familiar with the attempt in the past session of Congress to hamstring the conservation program. The Bureau of the Budget sought to reduce the Soil Conservation Service appropriation by $20 million and proposed that farmers pay for technical assistance rendered by the Service. This proposal not only would be grossly unjust to farmers but would jeopardize the entire conservation movement.

The activities of the Conservation Service constitute a normal and regular function of the Federal Government. They are supported by tax dollars paid in part by the farmers themselves. If the farmer is going to be required to pay for soil conservation services, why should not the same principle be applied generally to all services of the Federal Government? It would make just as much sense to make a farmer pay for technical conservation assistance as it would to require a school dropout to pay for the job training he receives under the Great Society's poverty program.

I was vigorously opposed to this proposal soundingly. I shall continue to oppose this scheme if it is brought back to Congress next year.

I sometimes have been called a zealot on the subject of soil conservation—a charge to which I readily plead my guilt. But I am also a dreamer—and my dream is of a

Georgia whose land is as lush and green as the day the first plow stirred its soil * * * a Georgia whose rivers and streams run as clear as when only the Cherokee and Creek knew them * * * and of a Georgia whose water is as pure as a mountain brook pouring from the Blue Ridge and as sweet as the water bubbling from Radium Springs.

So long as the opportunity is mine, I shall continue to work in concert with such dedicated groups as this association to make this dream a reality.

Tomorrow, December 7, marks the 24th anniversary of one of the blackest days in the history of our country. On that peaceful Sabbath morning in 1941, bombs rained from the skies on an unsuspecting Pearl Harbor to begin the bloodiest test of arms ever to confront the American people. Almost 300,000 American men paid with their lives so that the rest of us might enjoy the blessings and freedom of this great land.

It grieves and saddens me—as I know it does you—that on this anniversary of infamy, American men once again are fighting and dying on a foregn field of battle to resist the forces of aggression and slavery.

For more and more American families, the harsh reality of the bitter fighting in Vietnam assumes personal meaning. We have now lost more than 1,300 of our finest young men in the jungles and rice paddies of Vietnam, and 6,000 other U.S. servicemen have fallen wounded in the conflict. I expect that these grim statistics have touched the families and friends of some of you, just as they have my own. The casualty list is bound to grow ever longer as the war continues and intensifies.

I have stated on many occasions that, in my view, we made a tragic mistake in 1954 by committing our national honor, our flag, and the lives of American men to the struggle in Vietnam. But that is now moot. We are in Vietnam, and I believe we must take whatever considered means are necessary to bring the conflict to a satisfactory conclusion as soon as possible. We must bring an end to the killing and wounding of American boys.

The President of the United States faces grave and momentous decisions in the days and weeks ahead. His decisions will determine whether there is to be a substantial step-up in the level of American participation in the fighting and a further deepening of our commitment on the mainland of Asia.

It is difficult to see what realistic alternative the President has. It daily becomes more evident that greater force must be applied and more punitive action must be taken against the Vietcong. There apparently is no other way to convince the Communist leaders in Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow that we mean to stand firmly behind our commitment in Vietnam and that we intend to punish the aggressors until they sue for peace.

It is unthinkable that we turn back now. We must demonstrate to the Communists everywhere—in Asia, in Europe, and in Latin America—that the American will to resist tyranny is as resolute today as it was on December 7, 1941.

We must convince the Communists that the tiny handful of Vietcong flag wavers and draft card burners in our midst do not represent the great masses of the American people. We must prove by steadfastness, courage, and sacrifice that the true spirit of America is represented by our soldiers in Vietnam and that this bastion of democracy remains "the land of the free and the home of the brave."

FARM POPULATION DECLINE

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, over and over again we hear the administration repeatedly cite the statistic that per capita farm income is up. Of course it is, mainly because farm population is down.

On April 1, 1960, there was a farm population of 15,635,000.

Latest estimates indicate that as of April 1, 1965, the farm population was 12.4 million.

In the last 5 years some 3.2 million people have left the farm.

In January 1960 there were 3,949,000 farms in the United States.

On January 1, 1966, farm numbers had declined to 3,286,000.

In the last 6 years some 663,000 individual farms have been swallowed up.

These facts must be kept in mind as we assess the administration's rosy statements about farm prosperity.

CURTIS AND WIDNALL INTRODUCE BILL TO ESTABLISH AN ECONOMIC COUNCIL TO ADVISE THE MINORITY

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, this year, at the 20th Anniversary Symposium of the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am ranking House Republican, I proposed in a speech—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 28, pages 4209–4211—that a Minority Economic Council be established to enable minority party representatives in Congress to analyze and present better minority alternatives to administration economic policy decisions and to propose more creative, more comprehensive programs to meet the Nation's pressing needs.

The response to this proposal has been very gratifying. Therefore, today, I am introducing a bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish such a Minority Economic Council. I am pleased that my very able colleague from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], who is a member of the Joint Economic Committee, and ranking Republican on the Banking and Currency Committee, is joining me in sponsoring this bill.

Mr. WIDNALL and I believe that a Minority Economic Council is an urgent need. It would enable minority party the necessary functions of developing sound legislation through the process of thorough study and informed debate accompanied by cross-examination and rebuttal.

The three-man Minority Economic Council would be appointed by and be responsible to a board of directors comprised of the leaders of the House and Senate not of the party of the President, and ranking members of the Joint Economic Committee, House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees, and House and Senate Banking and Currency and Appropriations Committees not of the party of the President. For example, when one party controls both Congress and the White House, the control of the Minority Economic Council would go to the minority in Congress. But when one party controls Congress and the other controls the White House, the control of the Minority Economic Council would go to the minority party in Congress because it does not have access to the economic advisory resources of the President. When one House is controlled by one party, and the other House by the other party, the same rule applies: the majority in one House and the minority in the other House which are of the party other than that of the President, will control the Minority Economic Council.

The Minority Economic Council would be funded by Congress and would serve all minority Members in Congress with sound economic research and proposals. It would have headquarters in Washington and a full-time staff, and would establish continuing consulting relationships with academic and other economists from all sectors of the economy.

Debate on economic issues is today not extensive enough or thorough enough. Better debate requires a better informed, institutionalized challenger able to refine and clarify economic policy issues. The result of an organization created to assist the minority in Congress would be better national economic decisionmaking.

The size and diversity of the economy and of the Government's role in it require better means of understanding. The executive branch has at its command vast internal resources and a strong attraction for private advisers, but the minority party in Congress by comparison has no such resources, nor innate attraction.

In 1948, 2 years after the Employment Act when the economy had cooled off after the years of wartime spending, the gross national product—in 1958 dollars—was $323.7 billion and the fiscal year 1948 Federal administrative budget was $32.955 billion. In 1965 gross national product was $609 billion in 1958 dollars and the fiscal year 1967 Federal administrative budget is an estimated $112.847 billion. The budget for this tremendous amount, to which should be added for completeness trust fund account expenditures of $32.153 billion, is both an economic document of very great complexity and a political document of great importance. Adequate understanding of the economic impact of the budget as a whole is as important as understanding it program by program, item by item, yet congressional facilities do not exist for analyzing the effects of the total budget.

The Employment Act's sponsors correctly saw the need in 1946 for proper procedures through which to manage the huge new economic power of the Fed-

eral Government. Correspondingly, the President's Council of Economic Advisers has become accepted as one of the most important offices in the executive. Though the Council is itself small, it can draw on the almost limitless statistical and program resources of the other 14 executive departments and countless other agencies. The Council of Economic Advisers, rooted in academic institutions, has kept open its lines of communication with academic and other economic thinkers. It and the executive departments which also retain consultants are lodestones for professional economists throughout the country.

This is a problem of the preponderance of executive branch knowledge, combined with power, over the minority, and, essentially, this problem is an institutional one. The minority in Congress must have the research resources necessary to suggest workable alternatives to Government policy in all important economic areas. We believe there is considerable dissent in our society, within its broader consensus. Our problem is how to channel that dissent—to create a way to bring informed dissenters together to devise and propose creative alternatives based on their expert knowledge.

The losers under the present system, in terms of the better performance of our economy, are American men and women—scholars, workers, businessmen, and farmers. The effects of national economic decisions touch everyone, and everyone must be concerned that these decisions are the best decisions.

The legislative year 1946 was a time of great ferment. It saw passage both of the Employment Act and also of the Congressional Reorganization Act. Twenty years later the substantive and institutional problems facing us are as great as they were then—they require equally bold solutions, and we are convinced that what we propose would help solve them.

The text of this bill follows:

H.R. 13784

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1021 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby created a Minority Economic Council. The Minority Economic Council shall be composed of three members who shall be appointed by the Minority Economic Council Board hereinafter referred to as "the Board" and each of whom shall be a person who, as a result of his training, experience, and attainments, is exceptionally qualified to analyze and interpret economic developments, to formulate and recommend national economic policy to promote employment, production, and purchasing power under free competitive enterprise, and to appraise programs and activities of the Government in the light of this policy. The Board shall designate one of the members of the Minority Economic Council as Chairman and one as Vice Chairman, who shall act as Chairman in the absence of the Chairman. The members of the Minority Economic Council shall be appointed within five days of the first day of the first session of each Congress, and shall serve for the remainder of such Congress. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each member of the Minority Economic Council shall be paid annual compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Board.

"(b) The Minority Economic Council is authorized to employ, and fix the compensation of, such specialists and other experts as may be necessary for the carrying out of its functions under his section, without regard to the civil-service laws, and is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws, to employ such other officers and employees as may be necessary for carrying out its functions under this section.

"(c) It shall be the duty and function of the Minority Economic Council—

"(1) to assist and advise the Board on national economic policy;

"(2) to gather timely and authoritative information concerning economic developments and economic trends, both current and prospective, to analyze and interpret such information in the light of the economic policy it believes to be in the national interest for the purpose of determining whether such developments and trends are interfering, or are likely to interfere, with the achievement of such policy, and to compile and submit to the Board studies relating to such developments and trends;

"(3) to appraise the various programs and activities of the Federal Government in the light of the economic policy it believes to be in the national interest for the purpose of determining the extent to which such programs and activities are contributing, and the extent to which they are not contributing, to the achievement of such policy, and to make recommendations to the Board with respect thereto;

"(4) to develop and recommend to the Board national economic policies to foster and promote free competitive enterprise, to avoid economic fluctuations or to diminish the effects thereof, and to maintain employment, production, and purchasing power;

"(5) to make and furnish such studies, reports thereon, and recommendations with respect to matters of Federal economic policy and legislation as the Board may request.

"(d) The Minority Economic Council shall make an annual report to the Board in December of each year.

"(e) In exercising its powers, functions, and duties under this section—

"(1) the Minority Economic Council may constitute such advisory committees and may consult with such representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, consumers, State and local governments, and other groups, as it deems advisable;

"(2) the Minority Economic Council shall, to the fullest extent possible, utilize the services, facilities, and information (including statistical information) of private research agencies, in order that duplication of effort and expense may be avoided.

"(f) To enable the Minority Economic Council to exercise its powers, functions, and duties under this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary.

"(g) As used in this section the term 'Minority Council Board' means—

"(1) in the case where at the beginning of a Congress a majority of the Members of both Houses are of a political party other than that of the President, a board of directors consisting of the following: (A) the majority leader of each House, (B) the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, (C) the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, (D) the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, and (E) the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee.

"(2) in the case where at the beginning of a Congress a majority of the Members of both Houses are of the same political party as that of the President, a board of directors consisting of the following: (A) the minority leader of each House, (B) the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, (C) the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, (D) the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, and (E) the ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee.

"(3) in the case where at the beginning of a Congress a majority of the Members of one House are of the same political party as that of the President and a majority of the Members of the other House are of a political party other than that of the President, a board of directors consisting of the following members: (A) from that House the majority of whose Members are of a political party other than that of the President, the majority leader, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives or the chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, as the case may be, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency; and (B) from that House a majority of whose Members are of the same political party as that of the President, the minority leader, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives or the ranking minority member of the Committee of Finance of the Senate, as the case may be, and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency; and (C) the ranking majority member of the Joint Economic Committee from the House the majority of whose Members are not of the same party as that of the President, and the ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee from the House a majority of whose Members are of the same political party as that of the President.

CHICAGO HEADSTART FOR THE NOT SO POOR

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, Operation Headstart, fashioned along the lines of a proposal offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, Representative ALBERT H. QUIE, and the gentleman from New York, Representative CHARLES E. GOODELL, back in 1961, is supposed to help preschoolers from poor families.

Out in Chicago, however, our investigation shows that the poverty program is doing a little bit more by giving a "headstart" to the not so poor.

Officials there admit that 27½ percent of the 23,804 children in the program are from families whose standards exceed the poverty level. Our investigation also shows they do not even know the family incomes for another 20 percent of the children.

This means another 5,000 children from truly disadvantaged homes could have been helped if the poverty warriors had stuck to their own guidelines. The Quie-Goodell proposal for an opportunity crusade would require adherence to strict poverty standards, meanwhile tripling the funds available.

How can Chicago justify the fact that more than one-fourth of their children in Headstart were above poverty standards? How can the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington justify the clear violation of their guidelines? When I visited Chicago recently, I was told that Washington ordered Chicago poverty officials to expand in 10 days Headstart from 4,000 to 24,000. I was also informed that very little solicitation was done in several hard-core poverty areas because teachers were afraid to enter those sections of the city.

Seven urban progress centers are in operation by the Chicago Committee on Urban Opportunity. One center showed 41.1 percent of enrollees over the income requirement, one showed 31.8 percent in excess, one 28.3 in excess; and outside of the urban centers, 36.8 percent reported income over requirements.

Thousands of impoverished youngsters were overlooked by Headstart recruiters in their frantic efforts to build impressive statistics. And these youngsters, children of hard-core poverty victims, are precisely the ones for whom this program was developed.

We cannot continue careless neglect of such a good concept as Headstart. We certainly cannot justify to the thousands of children unable to participate in Chicago's Headstart program the spending of Federal poverty money for those who are not poor.

The Quie-Goodell opportunity crusade offers a way out of the wasteland of bureaucratic confusion and callousness that has marked OEO's administration of the Headstart program.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, Jr.] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for the rollcall vote yesterday on H.R. 13448, to provide faster, more efficient, and less expensive mail service to our servicemen overseas, inasmuch as I was taking an annual physical examination at Bethesda Naval Medical Hospital and was unable to get back to the floor in time to vote. However, I was paired in favor of it. Having been in service in Korea and recognizing the value of prompt mail delivery, I would have voted "yea" on this measure had I been on the floor. I was assured this bill would pass without the necessity of my vote. I am pleased that the record shows it passed unanimously, even though I regret I was not recorded as being present to vote for it.

PROVISION TO INCLUDE VOICE RECORDINGS IN FREE MAILING PRIVILEGES FOR SERVICEMEN IMPORTANT STEP

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, because of some longstanding commitments to fill speaking engagements in Kansas, it was necessary for me to be absent from the House floor on Monday when H.R. 13448 was up for consideration.

I regretted having to be absent on the day this bill came up for a vote, but I was pleased with the unanimous support the bill received from the Members present and voting. Had I been present I would have joined in this unanimous support.

Incorporated in H.R. 13448 is a proposal which I made to the Subcommittee on Postal Operations of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to include voice recordings of personal messages in the free mailing privileges for our servicemen. My own bill is H.R. 12930.

I was gratified by the reception this suggestion received from the subcommittee which led to its inclusion in the bill reported out by the full committee. I want to personally thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] and the members of his subcommittee for their consideration and adoption of this proposal.

This proposal grew out of a suggestion of a newspaper friend of mine, Bill Colvin, editor of the Manhattan (Kans.) Mercury. Mr. Colvin was in Vietnam in December of last year and when he returned he wrote to me as follows:

> Through firsthand knowledge, I was utterly surprised at the number of tape recorders being used by our servicemen and the extent to which they are being used. I, from personal experience again, know the great warmth, and indeed inspiration, that comes to these servicemen as they listen to the voices of their wives, children, mothers, fathers, or other relatives in that very remote and frustrating area of the world. It is not really a matter of how much it costs to send the tapes back to their relatives and other loved ones that concerns the servicemen to whom I talked, but rather the principle of the thing, if you please. They feel, and rightly so, that if letters and postcards are to have free mailing privileges, it is simply logical that taped messages, which are really nothing more than live letters, should have the same privilege. I would stress the fact that peculiar and sometimes very small things have a profound effect upon the morale of our men, and this one regarding taped messages seemed to be one that they mentioned many, many times, and as a result of the free mailing, I think it would not only heighten their morale but also increase materially the use of this type of communication.

Everyone to whom I have talked about this proposal agrees with Mr. Colvin, so I was glad to see the Post Office and Civil Service Committee put its stamp of approval on the suggestion and have the House vote unanimously for it.

Letters reaching me from the wives and families of servicemen testify how important these taped messages are to all parties concerned. I would expect that Members of the Senate will also be in agreement and will approve this legislation, so that the tapes can be airlifted between here and Vietnam and make possible a broader and more rapid exchange of these valuable voice letters.

THE LATE AP NEWSMAN G. MILTON KELLY

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Associated Press Newsman G. Milton Kelly died Tuesday, and with his death the country lost one of its finest reporters. Mr. Kelly covered the U.S. Senate and always turned in excellent work.

I have a special feeling for Milt, as his friends called him, because Milt was a native of Hancock in Michigan's Upper Peninsula and worked for AP in my hometown of Grand Rapids as well as in Lansing, the State capital.

Milt was assigned to Washington in 1939 by the AP after serving in Michigan and in New Delhi, India.

Here he wrote some of the best stories of his career, doing an outstanding job in covering a series of Senate investigations that made top news throughout the country—the Army-McCarthy hearings, the Bobby Baker case, the TFX plane investigation, and the Labor Rackets Committee hearings.

One of the finest pieces Milt ever wrote was one about the nicknames of some of the characters summoned before the Labor Rackets Committee—men with such colorful names as "Greasy Thumb" Guzik. It made page 1 wherever newspaper deskmen were on the alert for a great feature story.

The journalism profession is the poorer for Milt Kelly's death. So is Washington, and so, too, is the Nation.

SAME TUNE, DIFFERENT WORDS

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not recall a time in our history when there was more crirticism of government on every level than there is today. Why this should happen in a Republic where each citizen has the privilege and the responsibility to actively participate in government, I do not know. But, I do know the adults of our Nation are setting a poor example for younger generations to follow. Mr. John Heller, editor of the Fort Meade Leader, one of the fine weekly newspapers in my State, describes this problem well, in his editorial, "Same Tune, Different Words," which follows. As Mr. Heller suggests, to find the cause and the solution one needs only to go back to the mirror:

SAME TUNE, DIFFERENT WORDS

Isn't it terrible the way some groups of young people show their immaturity by protesting against the war in Vietnam? Certainly these young people should know that the wonderful privileges and opportunities of freedom cost—they cost in time and money and effort.

It is particularly surprising the way these young people act in light of the fine example set by the more mature, more responsible adults throughout the country.

All one has to do to see these fine examples is to visit with some regularity the city commission meetings, the county commission meetings, the school board meetings, and the PTA meetings.

Here, they will see real democracy in action. The vibrant, driving force that propels a great nation to new, dizzy heights of greatness. Throngs of concerned, informed citizens, taking an active interest in their government at work.

NUTS

The only people who go to the meetings of governmental bodies, generally, are those who go for a specific, selfish reason. They go to get something done for number one. When they get that done, they forget all about government until they want something else done for them, or when they get a tax statement.

And yet the same lazy, indifferent citizens have the nerve to complain about others who are showing the same immaturity that they show by their indifference.

If the end results were not so deadly serious, it would be comical. The apathy of so-called free peoples let Socrates be falsely condemned, let the Roman civilization crumble, let the British Empire deteriorate into second rateness. And yet those same disinterested, indifferent citizens in the dress of the 20th century, are doing the same thing again.

Oh yes, it can be blamed on big government, and we can go back to the television set. It can be blamed on big business, and we can go back to the fish pole. It can be blamed on too many Communists in high places, and we can go back to our own little niche.

It can be blamed on a lack of guts, and we can go back to the mirror.

THE AMERICAN-AFRICAN AFFAIRS ASSOCIATION AND ITS DETRACTORS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I recently read a very bitter attack on the American-African Affairs Association by Carl Rowan, former USIA Director and member of the Kennedy administration. His column carried so many inaccuracies and direct untruths that it is hardly worthy of reply. On the other hand, Mr. Rowan so well represents a vocal group of American liberals who use the smear but are the loudest to attack and charge others with this tactic. Mr. Rowan uses guilt by association with classic ingenuity but always attacks McCarthyism.

In his column he personally attacked Dr. Max Yergan, a fine gentleman whom I am pleased to count as a close personal friend. Mr. Rowan blithely brands American Negroes who do not go along with his brand of liberalism as reactionary or worse. Of all of his unfortunate charges, his attack on Dr. Max Yergan and George Schuyler is the most vicious and regrettable. I traveled with Max Yergan. I know and marvel at the breadth of his understanding, the wisdom of his philosophy and the depth of his compassion. To attack a good and just man in such a way is reprehensible—all the more so because Mr. Rowan tries to convince the American Negro community that this man, his fellow Negro, is a Judas to their cause.

Carl Rowan found Max Yergan a thorn in his side when we were involved in the Congo and Katanga fiasco. Max Yergan exercised judgment in that episode and has been vindicated by history. Even the State Department has come around to the position that Dr. Yergan, myself and others advocated at that time. In his best guilt-by-association form, Carl Rowan, then Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, gave the following tirade at a December 27, 1961, speech in Philadelphia:

It is an extremely revealing thing to look at the sources of support for Tshombe and his policy of secession. In the United States, we have a conglomeration of arch conservatives; people who oppose the income tax; avowed defenders of racial segregation, opponents of fluoridation of water; those who want to destroy the Supreme Court, largely because of its ruling on school segregation, and so forth. * * * It should be of special interest to this audience that a couple of well-known Negroes, George Schuyler and Max Yergan, have been busy spreading the Struelens line. But, then, I guess Negroes are entitled to produce a few reactionaries, too.

I could at this point categorize those who oppose AAA in the same way but the preferable course is to appeal to reason. During the investigation into this matter, Mr. Rowan was presented an opportunity to explain his views. The report of the Senate Judiciary Committee states:

Mr. Rowan offered no evidence to back his charges that support for President Tshombe came primarily from an amalgam of political extremists, including those who opposed the income tax and those who opposed the fluoridation of water. Mr. Rowan was not prepared to place any one in any of his several extremist pigeonholes.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, it is easy to go around the country labeling people like Max Yergan, Bill Rusher, and myself by smear words of racist, reactionary, extremist, or the like. This is the usual posture of all too many liberals. They are long on accusations but short on facts when confronted.

As one who strongly supports the work of the American-African Affairs Association, Inc., I found his statement that this organization is "primarily interested in defending South African apartheid and Rhodesian racism" a blatant lie which must not go unchallenged.

The American-African Affairs Association, Inc., has its offices at 550 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. It has been approved by the Treasury Department and all contributions are tax deductible. Its leaders are as follows:

Cochairmen: Mr. William A. Rusher and Dr. Max Yergan.

Treasurer: Mr. Robert R. Richardson.

Secretary, Mr. Theodore Lit.

Directors: Mr. Lawrence Fertig, Hon. Loy W. Henderson, Mr. Leon Weil, Dr. Thomas Molnar, Prof. Charles E. Rice, Mr. George S. Schuyler, Prof. Ernest van den Haag.

A partial list of its membership includes such illustrious Americans as Mr. Arthur J. Andersen, Prof. James D. Atkinson, Prof. Patrick M. Boarman, Prof. Anthony T. Bouscaren, Mr. L. Brent Bozell, Dr. Karl Brandt, Mr. James L. Buckley, Mr. Jameson G. Campaigne, Mr. John Chamberlain, Dr. Philip M. Crane, Mr. Ralph de Toledano, Mr. John Dos Passos, Dr. Donald M. Dozer, Dr. Stephen Enke, Mr. Clifford Forster, Mr. William J. Gill, Prof. Jerzy Hauptmann, Mr. Henry Hazlitt, Dr. Walter Darnell Jacobs, Mr. Frank J. Johnson, Dr. Walter H. Judd, Dr. Russell Kirk, Mr. George F. Koether, Mrs. Irene Corbally Kuhn, Gen. Thomas A. Lane, Prof. Reginald D. Lang, Mr. Victor Lasky, Mr. Neil McCaffrey, Mr. Edwin McDowell, Mr. J. Daniel Mahoney, Mr. Frank S. Meyer, Rev. Vincent P. Micell, S.J., Mr. D. Thomas Miller, Prof. Gerhart Niemeyer, Mr. Michael A. Padev, Dr. Melchior Palyi, Prof. Sylvester Petro, Mr. Henry Regnery, Mr. William F. Rickenbacker, Prof. David N. Rowe, Prof. Edward J. Rozek, Mr. William S. Schlamm, Prof. William S. Stokes, Prof. Stephen J. Tonsor, Mr. Nathaniel Weyl, Prof. Francis G. Wilson.

These are distinguished Americans who have a common purpose. Most of them I count as personal friends. Those whom I have not had the good fortune to know well have my admiration and respect. How, for example, can you demean a great man like Dr. Walter H. Judd, one of the most beloved Americans of our time? Mr. Rowan and his type should have one one-hundredth of the understanding and respect of a Walter Judd.

In the statement of purposes of the AAA, the following language depicts what it is trying to do:

The road to true progress for Africa lies through the diligent development of its own resources, in an orderly political and economic atmosphere. Here is where America can help: by precept, by example, and by judicious extensions of practical aid. Certainly it is in America's own interest to do this. But who deserves our help, and who does not? Which tendencies in Africa are

working constructively toward the betterment of its peoples, and which are divisive or purely destructive? These are the sort of questions that the American-African Affairs Association proposes to investigate and to answer.

My good friend, Bill Rusher, the target of Mr. Rowan's poison pen summed it up pretty well when he concluded:

Evidently Carl Rowan fears those questions and their answers.

I might add, Bill, that the State Department and the liberal establishment are equally fearful as is Mr. Rowan, our chief detractor. For my part, I will work harder than ever to encourage the work of American-African Affairs Association. Over the years I have found that it is a pretty good rule of thumb to conclude that, when an organization elicits the smear campaign of the left, it must be hitting close to dead center. For that reason I will also double my contribution to this fine group and encourage my friends to do likewise.

SOUTHERN RHODESIA

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the President and Secretary of State are to be commended for their efforts, in support of the Government of the United Kingdom and of the resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly and Security Council, to prevent Southern Rhodesia from becoming another South Africa, an established bastion of racial discrimination and persecution.

It has just come to my attention that at its biennial convention in December, the AFL–CIO adopted a resolution in support of this policy. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include herewith a copy of this resolution, dated December 16, 1965:

RESOLUTION OF THE 1965 BIENNIAL CONVENTION OF THE AFL–CIO

Believing in the fundamental right of peoples to free themselves from alien rule and their inherent right to self-determination on the basis of majority rule;

Aware of the explosive situation in Rhodesia stemming from the illegal seizure of power by the Ian Smith racist clique;

Conscious of the possibility of a race war in Rhodesia which will plunge the whole of Africa in a blood bath and poison race relations the world over; and conscious of the positive role and duty the free labor movement has in averting this human tragedy;

Reaffirms its support of the struggle of the people of southern Africa (South Africa, South West Africa, Rhodesia, Angola, Mozambique) and other colonial territories in their fight for just and real equality;

Calls upon the U.S. Government to initiate moves that will help quarantine the Ian Smith racist regime and bring to a speedy end the pretentions of this insane, power-drunk clique;

Urges President Johnson to call upon their ally—Great Britain—on the occasion of the visit of Prime Minister Harold Wilson to the United States, to begin immediate and exploratory conversations with the African nationalist leaders with a view to the introduction of a constitution based on majority rule;

Calls upon the free labor movement to give all possible humanitarian and material assistance to the people of Rhodesia in their fight to secure majority rule and racial justice.

THE LAWYER AS A LAWMAKER

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to place in the RECORD the article entitled "The Lawyer as a Lawmaker," which appears in the February 1966 issue of the American Bar Association Journal.

This article is of considerable interest to all the Members of this House as it outlines the vital function and role played by the legal practitioner in fashioning the law through his representation of clients before the courts and the administrative agencies.

Its author, Prof. Edward D. Re, is especially qualified to speak and write on this aspect of a lawyer's professional responsibility as a lawmaker.

He is presently the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, having been appointed to that position in 1961, and reappointed for a 3-year term in 1963. Under his leadership, the Commission, in its administration of the various laws under its jurisdiction, has made outstanding and considerable contributions to the field of international law.

Mr. Re himself is an authority on international law and his tangible contributions in this area of the law consist of, among other things, authorship of "Cases and Materials on International Law," 1955; "Foreign Confiscations in Anglo-American Law," 1951—with Lester B. Orfied. He is also a frequent contributor of articles to various legal periodicals.

The above-mentioned article follows:

THE LAWYER AS A LAWMAKER

(NOTE.—Mr. Re declares that lawyers perform a vital function in fashioning the law when they represent clients before courts or administrative agencies. The counsel's brief, for example, should contain the articulated points, and perhaps even the language, on which the tribunal may support its decision. By representing his client competently, the lawyer contributes to the progress of law.)

(By Edward D. Re, Chairman of the U.S. Foreign Claims Settlement Commission)

All lawyers by education and training are made keenly aware of the many aspects of their professional responsibility. From its inception, the legal education of the lawyer is designed to inculcate a sense of responsibility. Specific reference is made to the duties owed to the client, the judiciary and the public. In addition, the organized bar has performed valuable public service through a number of programs and projects on local, State, and Federal levels. In recent years in particular, a great deal of constructive work has been done in affording competent legal services to the indigent. Bar associations also have shown commendable leadership in the defense of unpopular causes and the civil rights of citizens.

An extremely important, although often overlooked, phase of professional responsibility is the role of the lawyer as a lawmaker. I do not refer to the lawyer as a legislator. One may easily gage the importance of lawyers as legislators by noting their number in the Congress and the legislatures of every State. Nor do I refer to the role of the lawyer in assisting legislators in the drafting of legislation. Rather, I mean the lawyer as a practitioner of his profession, as an advocate in the daily practice of the law and his contribution to the judicial process, the judicial opinion and the law itself.

Alexis de Tocqueville in his famous book, "Democracy in America," observed that "In all free governments, of whatever form they may be, members of the legal profession will be found in the front ranks of all parties."[1] The accuracy of this observation can be proved by recalling that of the 56 signers of the Declaration of Independence, 33 were lawyers; and of the 55 participants in the Constitutional Convention, 34 were lawyers.

My purpose in recalling these facts is not solely to honor the legal profession, but rather to highlight the role that it has played in the fashioning and development of the American form of government. With the ever-expanding complexity of government, the importance of this role has indeed increased.

Mr. Justice Cardozo in "The Nature of the Judicial Process," stated that "the work of deciding cases goes on every day in hundreds of courts throughout the land."[2] Although the statement is still true, today the work of deciding cases goes on daily not only in hundreds of courts throughout our land, but also in many hundreds of administrative agencies, boards, and commissions.

In the modern world of increasing governmental activity the judicial function is not limited to the courts. Hence, the contribution of the lawyer to the judicial process is not limited to the lawyer's professional work in the courts. The contribution today is broader and is made by the lawyer in the daily representation of his client, not only before the courts, but also before the numerous administrative agencies at all levels of government.

For instance, take one aspect of the lawyer's work—the writing of briefs.[3] The brief submitted by counsel ought to help shape not only the judicial opinion but also the law itself. George Rossman, a former justice of the supreme court of Oregon, has noted, "If better briefs are written, the courts will produce better decisions."[4] This statement highlights the responsibility of the advocate who in the first instance must prepare the case and submit his authorities for adjudication. Mr. Justice Brandeis stated the point most candidly when he said, "A judge rarely performs his functions adequately unless the case before him is adequately presented."[5]

All of these statements indicate that by properly fulfilling his responsibility to the client and by the competent and thorough presentation of his case counsel simultaneously is fulfilling a higher and more noble

[1] De Tocqueville, "Democracy in America," 274 (Bradley ed. 1956).

[2] Cardozo, "The Nature of the Judicial Process" 9 (1921).

[3] See materials on advocacy in "Re, Brief Writing and Oral Argument" (third ed. 1965).

[4] Rossman, "Appellate Practice and Advocacy," 34 Oregon Law Review 73 (1955).

[5] Brandeis, "The Living Law," 10 Illinois Law Review 461, 470 (1916).

function by helping to shape the judicial opinion and the law.

Whitney North Seymour, a former president of the American Bar Association, in an address entitled "The Bar as Lawmaker," emphasized this responsibility by reminding the bar that "the advocate has played a part in the law-making process through the persuading of judges to decide cases in particular ways. Thus, in any treatment of Marshall's contribution to American constitutional law, it would be wrong to omit reference to Webster and the other great advocates whose arguments were accepted and became a part of the ultimate warp and woof of the law.[6]

The reference to the contribution of Daniel Webster recalls the famous decision of Chief Justice Marshall in "McCulloch v. Maryland," 4 Wheat. 316 (1819). For the specific contribution of Webster to that decision one ought to read the contentions of counsel set forth in the official report of that famous case. Not only does the Court follow closely the questions presented and the arguments of counsel, but it adopts several statements made by Webster. Indeed, his statement, "An unlimited power to tax involves necessarily a power to destroy," becomes Chief Justice Marshall's famous utterance that "The power to tax involves the power to destroy."[7]

There are many examples of the specific contribution of the advocate to the judicial opinion. This is a fascinating field of legal research designed to uncover the origin of passages and phrases that are so well-known to historians and lawyers. The origin of these familiar statements often is attributed without question to judges. As in the case of Chief Justice Marshall's remark, research may reveal that many famous phrases represent the skill and handiwork of counsel who submitted the case for adjudication.[8]

This has practical significance to the lawyer in the active and daily practice of his profession. It brings to mind the suggestion made by the late Karl N. Llewellyn, who speaks of "the proffered, phrased opinion-kernel." Professor Llewellyn in "The Common Law Tradition," states: "What is wanted is a passage which can be quoted verbatim by the court, a passage which so clearly and rightly states and crystallizes the background and the result that it is recognized on sight as doing the needed work and as practically demanding to be lifted into the opinion."[9]

All lawyers know that there is no substitute for careful and painstaking preparation. Although the immediate objective is to win the particular case, enough has been said to prove that the contribution of the lawyer goes far beyond the success of the moment. By the assistance that he grants to the adjudicator, be he judge, commissioner, or trial examiner, he will be contributing to the decision that will be rendered. And in a system in which precedents play so important a role in the shaping of the law of the future, the lawyer, too, will have played a part in molding and perhaps improving the law of the land. This realization gives a new dimension to the indispensable requirements of thorough preparation and the competent handling of cases before the courts and administrative tribunals.

The lawyer, by applying his professional skills, will succeed in accomplishing several goals. First, he will discharge his duty to his client. Second, he will help the judge or other adjudicator make a well-reasoned and well-written decision. Third, he will contribute to the substantive aspects of that opinion or decision. Fourth, he will play a vital role in giving impetus and guidance to the law itself. Indeed, the process proves that the lawyer, by the competent practice of his profession, is also truly a lawmaker.

[6] Seymour, "The Bar as Lawmaker" in Paulsen, "Legal Institutions Today and Tomorrow," 174 (1959).

[7] For an interesting discussion of this case in its historical context, see "Marke, Vignettes of Legal History" 42–46 (1965).

[8] See, for example, *Greene* v. *McElroy*, 360 U.S. 474 (1959), wherein Mr. Justice Harlan in a separate opinion wrote: "It is regrettable that my brother Clark should have so far yielded to the temptations of colorful characterization as to depict the issue in this case as being whether a citizen has 'a constitutional right to have access to the Government's military secrets' * * *." Id. at 510. Mr. Justice Clark in a footnote to his dissent replied: "My brother Harlan very kindly credits me with 'colorful characterization' in stating this as the issue. While I take great pride in authorship, I must say that in this instance I merely agreed with the statement of the issue by the Solicitor General and his cocounsel in five different places in the brief for the United States." Id. at 511.

[9] Llewellyn, "The Common Law Tradition," 241 (1960).

HAWAII: OUR 50TH STATE

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the week just past marked the seventh anniversary of the passage of Hawaii statehood legislation through the U.S. House of Representatives. To the words of my colleagues who have risen in praise and appreciation of Hawaii, our beautiful 50th State, I would like to add my tribute.

In retrospect, it seems incredible that the Congress of this country should have felt the need to deliberate so long over territorial Hawaii's admission to our sisterhood of States. Despite her unmatched charm, democratic spirit, and compelling material bounty, a century lapsed before the jubilant day of March 12, 1959, when the House cleared her way for statehood.

As early as 1854, the United States had negotiated a treaty of annexation with Hawaii, a treaty which provided for the immediate according of statehood. But the selfish opposition of certain vested interests in the country caused the treaty to be rejected by the U.S. Senate. Years of repeated reverses followed, but the people of the islands kept alive their hope.

On June 14, 1900, following passage of the Organic Act, Congress designated Hawaii as an incorporated territory and an integral part of our country. Her annexation was voluntary and long sought. After 100 years of independence the people of the Hawaiian Islands chose to cede to this country their lovely and abundant domain. It was a tremendous compliment to this Nation and to democracy.

It is a regretful part of our history that, though we were willing to accept her lands, we were not yet willing to grant her citizens the full and equal status of citizenship. For 59 years following annexation, the gracious and industrious islanders worked and built toward that dream. An estimated 50 pieces of legislation dealing with statehood were introduced into Congress during those years, while, at the same time, Hawaii thrust her economy forward toward exemplary prosperity. Already our most shining example of the democratic spirit of harmony and racial tolerance, she became the richest territory ever to seek admission into this Union.

Finally, the patient and determined quest after justice, equality, and dignity for the Hawaiian people was climaxed in 1959 by an overwhelming vote in both Houses of Congress creating our 50th State. It is doubtful that the citizens of any other State are more imbued with a living sense of responsibility for their own government and that of this Nation. The statehood petition presented to Congress in 1954 contained the signatures of an impressive proportion of Hawaii's adult population, men and women vitally interested in assuming the full responsibilities of U.S. citizenship. And, we can look to our youngest State for leadership and example in solving one of our oldest national problems.

The full dignity and equality of every human being, regardless of race or national origin, has been a most fundamental dream of American democracy. But it has been a dream which has too often eluded reality. Tolerance and brotherhood must come from the heart. The peoples of our island paradise offer to all a living example of the spirit and friendship which may someday give real tangibility to the great American ideal.

Hawaii, today, has more than fulfilled our expectations as an equal member of the United States. Her political maturity has been ably demonstrated by the outstanding contributions of Hawaii's elected representatives to these halls. The ability of our esteemed colleagues in the House, the Honorable PATSY MINK, and the Honorable SPARK MATSUNAGA, has earned the respect and admiration of us all. Their keen minds and gracious aloha spirit have made our work as legislators more rewarding.

America is justifiably proud of her 50th State, and as we remember the joyous day that culminated the years of dedicated effort to achieve statehood for Hawaii, let us express our humble appreciation for the precious gifts which she has added to this land.

THE NEED TO PROVIDE FOR A NATIONAL CEMETERY IN EVERY STATE

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the bill which I have introduced (H.R. 13879) would amend the act of June 29, 1938

(52 Stat. 1233), "to provide for a national cemetery in every State," by making mandatory the establishment by the Defense Department of a national cemetery whenever land for the purpose has been donated to the Federal Government. The language of the act as it now stands is not mandatory, but is merely directory.

The Defense Department opposes this bill on the ground that its policy is not only to refuse to establish new national cemeteries, but to close existing ones. It argues that, since national cemeteries are already inequitably distributed, to establish new ones would merely add to the imbalance of their distribution. Why should this be so? Newly established national cemeteries might help to correct the admittedly unfair distribution that now exists. That a situation is bad is hardly a reason for arguing against steps that might partially correct it.

But there is more to this problem than a shortsighted policy on the part of the Defense Department. There is gross unfairness to those bereaved by the death of men who have valiantly served our country. For example, in the New York Herald Tribune of March 9, 1966, the grief of a father whose son lost his life fighting for his country in Vietnam is described. The article states:

On Monday, when notified of his son's death, Mr. D——— decided that he wanted his son to lie in the New Jersey national military cemetery at Beverly.

But then the father received another shock. An economy program started in the final months of the Eisenhower administration is closing out the national military cemeteries. New Jersey's shut its gates officially a month ago. Burials which were occurring at the rate of five a day have dropped to two a day, limited to the immediate families (spouses or minor children) of servicemen or veterans already interred.

When a reporter relayed the story to * * * the New Jersey adjutant of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, he interceded with cemetery officials yesterday and obtained an exception.

I am glad that an exception was obtained in this completely deserving case, but I am concerned that in other cases, equally deserving, exceptions will not be granted, or, for that matter, even asked for. Grief-stricken parents, wives, or children of those who have recently died or been killed are usually unable to take the steps necessary for obtaining such exceptions.

They should not have to ask that exceptions to this absurd policy be made. The policy should be changed. Instead of closing them down, we should expand the size and the number of our national military cemeteries. Relatives of the deceased should not have to travel incredible distances for the burial of their loved ones or to visit their graves. The very least that we can do for men who have served their country so well is to bury them properly, near their loved ones, in a national military cemetery.

Whenever land is donated for the purpose of establishing a national military cemetery it should be accepted by the Defense Department and such a cemetery should be established, immediately. I have received communications in support of such a policy from many interested citizens and from many veterans' organizations. It is just about time that the Defense Department's indifference to this vitally important matter be corrected.

MILLENNIUM OF POLAND

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday afternoon, March 13, in Miami, Fla., there was a great celebration commemorating the millennium of Poland. There was a beautiful pageant depicting the great history of Poland and an inspiring program. The author, producer and narrator of the pageant was a lovely lady, a distinguished attorney and an eminent American, Mrs. Lillian J. Miciak. The presentation made by Mrs. Miciak so perfectly captured the glorious and great history of Poland, the dynamic and determined spirit of the Polish people and their long reverence for religion, and was so eloquent and moving, that I believe it deserves incorporation in the RECORD for the edification of the Members of the Congress and of all who read the RECORD. I therefore incorporate in the RECORD immediately following my remarks:

A SALUTE TO POLAND ON HER MILLENNIUM PROGRAM HELD IN MIAMI, FLA., ON MARCH 13, 1966, SPONSORED BY THE FLORIDA DIVISION OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, MRS. MARIA DAMBSKI, PRESIDENT

(Written, produced, and narrated by Attorney Lillian J. Miciak)

To tell the story of 1,000 years' growth and development is a difficult task to say the least—but a task of love—for Poland's history is a love affair, a love story, a nation's love affair with God the Creator of all nations.

Poland belongs to the family of western Slavs and her original homeland was in the regions located north of the Carpathian Mountains and the Pripet River. From this center the western Slavs migrated in various directions but moving westward they were stopped by the Germanic peoples and these Slavs were the ones responsible for the founding of Poland and Bohemia.

The first mention of the northern organization of Slavic tribes under the Ruler Mieszko was in 963. Mieszko was the ruler of the Polanie tribe. The strongest and the most influential tribe in the organization of Polanie. He succeeded his father as the fourth member of the Piast dynasty and began his reign in Gniezno.

In 965 Mieszko, the pagan ruler of Polanie, married the very good Christian, Catholic Princess of Bohemia named Dobrawa, also called Dabrowska. She was the daughter of King Boleslaw of Bohemia. Historic accounts of this meeting tell us that Dobrawa, along with her brother, chaplain, and knights of the court, met Mieszko in the land of Polanie and after the wedding agreements were met they married.

The year 966, however, marks the momentous conversion of Mieszko and his baptism. Mieszko according to records of history was baptized a Catholic on April 14, 966, and along with him a great number of the Polanie court and the people of Polanie became Catholics.

Going back to historic accounts prior to Mieszko's baptism, we are told that as early as 885 A.D. the Slavic rite of Cyril and Methodius was blooming in nearby Bohemia (now Czechoslovakia) and the southern part of Polanie (now Poland) was greatly influenced by their teachings. No doubt Christianity was being practiced there since that time. But it was in A.D. 966 when the Ruler Mieszko I himself was baptized, that the nation accepted Christianity and became a member of the Church of Rome.

While it is true that there were many political reasons for Mieszko to marry Dobrawa, it is agreed without any argument that Mieszko's baptism was due to the influence of his good Christian, Catholic wife. By this conversion Poland forever alined herself with the Western World and the Latin rite and culture affected the educational, cultural, and political growth of all Polish living from that time on.

THE WAYSIDE SHRINES OF POLAND

During this year we celebrate the anniversary of Mieszko's baptism and Poland's entrance in a lifelong friendship with God. For without his love of God, his faith, the Pole would not be a Pole. For without hope and courage Poland would have ceased to exist. Mieszko and the pagans he ruled were plain dwellers—Polanie—and before Mieszko's conversion the idea that the Poles had of God was that of an all and powerful being. They worshiped the Swiatowid, but with the coming of the Catholic Faith the shrines of Poland were now dedicated to God, to the blessed Mother, and to the saints of the church. Shrines of various shapes and sizes sprang up around Poland like flowers of the fields. In every hamlet, town, and forest, from one part of Poland to the other, in the hills and in the mountains, near the rivers and on the fields, the shrines by the wayside sprang up.

Here we see a typical shrine—so well known to Poland in the past. Here the children and adults would stop and pray and give thanks to God. From the simple wayside shrine, to the coming of the Cistersians, the Dominicans, and Franciscans, and the Jesuits, the Polish soul blossomed and her great devotion to the Mother of God grew. Mary the Mother of God is honored by the Poles in Vilno as Our Lady of Ostrobrama; in Czestochowa as Our Lady of Czestochowa. Queen of Poland, she is called, and to her the millions of Poles call in their hour of need:

"Oh Mary, Mother of God, Queen of Poland, pray for us."

Poland is proud of her faith and it is no wonder that she has more hymns dedicated to the blessed Virgin Mary than any other nation in the world.

THE SAINTS OF POLAND

During its 1,000 years of Catholicism Poland has given the church millions of members, hundred of thousands of priests, bishops, monks, friars, nuns, and brothers. Its finest sons and daughters—the fairest flowers in the land served God and country.

The Polish nation has given the Catholic Church 76 religious congregations of men and women, from the Knights of Christ in 1228 to the Sisters of the Immaculate Heart of Mary in 1959.

Poland has defended the faith against the Tartars in 1241, the Turks in 1683, and in 1920 it defended the church and Poland against the Bolsheviks. Poland has supplied the College of Cardinals with 21 members from Zbigniew Olesnicki in 1421 to Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski in 1953, the present Primate of Poland.

Thus since Mieszko's baptism the life of the Polish people has been intimately linked with the Catholic Church in mutual ex-

change of devotion and service. Little wonder then that Poland has been called by the Holy Father the nation of saints.

Here we see St. Hedwig, Jadwiga, Princess of Slask, married to Duke Henryk of Silesia. It is written that she was an unusual woman having great compassion for the sick, the poor, and the unfortunate. She and he lived together happily for a great many years doing spiritual good works. They had six children, and following her husband's death Hedwig, who founded the Cistercian Order in Poland, joined the convent, taking the religious habit of the Cistercian nun where her daughter Getrude was the Abbess. Hedwig died in 1243 and she was cannonized a saint in 1268. Her feast day is celebrated on October 16.

St. Kazimier, Prince of Poland, son of King Kazimier III, King of Poland, was educated in the royal court but he had a horror of luxury and practiced many mortifications. Under the care of the great holy Canon John Dlugosz, Kazimiers grew in holiness. Kazimier (Casimir) is one of the patrons of Poland. He died in 1482 and was cannonized a saint in 1522. His feast day is on March 4.

The boy saint, St. Stanislaw Kostka, was a young Polish nobleman whose father was a very rich man. Stanislaw was brought up at court amid much splendor and riches. Early in life however, he dedicated himself to the Blessed Virgin Mary and God. He decided to join the religious—the Jesuits—and he walked from Poland to Vienna and thence to Rome where he was accepted into the Jesuit Novitiate. His life was short but all of it was dedicated to God. He was 18 when he died in 1568. He was canonized a saint in 1726. His feast day is November 13.

St. Andrew Bobola, born of the wealthy family of Bobolow in Poland in 1591, showed great devotion to God and early in life went to Vilno and entered the Jesuit Order. He worked with the young and became the spiritual director of the Legion of Mary. He was a great preacher and did missionary work for over 20 years. The Kozaki—the Cossaks—captured him and cruelly murdered him because he would not deny his faith. He died a martyr for his faith on May 16, 1657. He was cannonized in 1938.

Among the saints of Poland there were Jacek, St. Stanislaw the Bishop, Kinga, Czeslaw, Jan Kanty, Wladyslaw, Jolenta, and many more too numerous to mention now. Small wonder that Poland earned from the church the title "Mother of Saints," and after the Turks were crushed by the Poles in Vienna and Europe saved by the Christian armies of King Jan Sobieski of Poland, the Holy See called Poland "Bulwark of Christendom."

Today a 1,000 years after Mieszko's baptism in 966, there are some 40 million Catholics of Polish descent throughout the world and we salute Poland on her millennium. And although the majority of the Poles are of Catholic faith, Poland as a nation early in her history granted religious freedom to all faiths—the Protestants, the Jews all found haven in Poland—and both religious and civic rights were guaranteed to all in Poland by its constitution of May 3.

GREAT MEN AND WOMEN

Poland's great men and women were many, but to mention only a few now.

Music: Who in the world does not know of or hasn't thrilled to the music of Frederick Chopin, Ignacy Jan Paderewski, Wienawski, and Moniuszko.

Literature: The greatest sea story writer in the world is a Pole—Joseph Conrad, born Joseph Korzeniowski—and Adam Mickiewicz who wrote the great epic, "Pan Thadeus." And what about the great writers—Maria Konopnicka, Joseph Kraszewski, Zygmunt Krasinski—the great Polish painters—Jan Matejko, Brandt, Wyspianski, and the Gierymski's.

Here now we see:

Copernik: Born Nikolaj Kopernik in Poland in 1473 in the northern city of Torun, almost 500 years ago, Kopernik discovered that the earth was not stationary but orbited along with the other planets around the sun. Great priest, scientist, humanist, and great pole—Copernicus.

And the Polish Nobel Prize winners:

Wladyslaw Reymont: Polish novelist and poet, born in 1863 in Warsaw, Poland. He received little education and tried his hand at many different jobs, but found himself in writing. His novels—over 20 of them—were published in Russian, French, German, Swedish, Spanish; and then came his greatest work, "The Seasons: Spring, Summer, Autumn, and Winter," and for this he received the Nobel Prize in literature.

Maria Sklodowska Curie: Born in Warsaw, Poland, scientist, physicist, teacher, wife, and mother. She and her French husband won the Nobel Prize in physics in 1903; but after his death she continued her work and research in radium and in 1911 she won the Nobel Prize in chemistry. Her love for Poland was great and although she lived and worked in France she named one of her new elements after Poland—Polonium.

Henryk Sienkiewicz: Born in Poland in 1846, educated at the University of Warsaw, author of many books, famous all over the world. "With Fire and Sword," "The Deluge," "Knights of the Cross," the world-renown "Quo Vadis," and "Whither Goest Thou," which won for him the Nobel Prize in literature in 1905.

It is impossible to tell of a 1,000 years in so short a time. We can only tell of the names familiar to the world at large, but there are thousands upon thousands of great men and women of Poland who have contributed to Poland's growth.

Ignacy Jan Paderewski said in 1939 that Poland's greatest misfortune was her geographical situation—at the extreme European end, with no natural boundary between her and the turbulent East, Poland was predestined to be always the first to receive the shocks of the Tartars, the Mongolians, the Turkish invasions. Poland's first 500 years of existence were filled with these shocks. For the greatest part of her history Poland has been invaded or has been defending European countries. Considering such abnormal circumstances it is really astonishing how intense and how important has been her intellectual and artistic life.

Anna Maria Zajac Gacek, a great Polish American poet, teacher, and clubwoman wrote a special "Ode to Poland" for this Poland millennium and I would like to quote from it:

"Beloved land of the white eagle, land that fought so valiantly for its freedom in Warsaw, Narvik, Tobruk, Monte Cassino, Ankara, Falaise, Breda, Arnheim, and wherever freedom of liberty-loving nations was at stake—on land, in the air, and on the sea—firmly believing that out of the present chaos a better world would evolve wherein would abide charity for all and malice toward none—to thy impoverished, parched lips the big three raised a chalice filled with bitter gall—drink they say—drink to the Poland that was—drink to the Poland that hath ceased to be.

"Can it be beloved Poland that thou art doomed to be no more. Is the world so blind that it doth not see that there can be no compensation for thy great loss. Land of my forefather I do not believe such a thing will come to pass. Who has earned a right to live as an independent nation with a government of thine own choice—if not thee whose men and women with grenades in hands fought [the Nazis] for 63 days alone in Warsaw and with a handful of precious Polish soil clutched tightly in their blood drenched hands died with the words on their lips—Jescze Polska nie szginela. Poland is not yet dead. He who fell thrice on the road to Golgotha will not forget thee. Thou shall also be reborn and bring light unto this war-torn world. A nation that has given so much of the world cannot die. It will not die as long as freemen know of thee. Poland, land of my forefathers, we salute thee on this 1,000th anniversary of your conversion to Christianity.

"Poland, land of many arts, land of the white eagle, God grant you freedom to fly again as freely as the eagle does and may your next 1,000 years bring you peace joy and God's blessings on you—Poland."

MRS. MILLER: THE SPEAKER OF THE YEAR AWARD FOR 1965 BY THE PENNSYLVANIA SPEECH ASSOCIATION

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great and grand ladies of America is Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller. Mrs. Miller is the sister of one of the most distinguished men who ever served in the U.S. Senate and one of the most dedicated and devoted of Democrats, the Honorable Joseph F. Guffey, of Pennsylvania. I had the honor to serve with Senator Guffey in the Senate for many years. He and his three talented and lovely sisters were among the closest friends Mrs. Pepper and I had and we have cherished those friendships over the years. Mrs. Miller, now over 90, remains a dynamic, active, and eloquent lady and leader. She is surely the grand lady of American democracy and truly one of the most outstanding women America has ever known.

Last October Mrs. Miller was awarded the Speaker of the Year Award for 1965 by the Pennsylvania Speech Association at its annual convention. This address, replete with charming reminiscences of this distinguished and noble lady, is informative, inspiring, and delightful.

I commend it, Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues and to those who will read it immediately following my remarks in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY MRS. EMMA GUFFEY MILLER

Dr. Holtzman, Dr. Haakenson, officers of the association, and members of the association, you'd scarce expect one of my age to speak in public on the stage. I was born over 91 years ago on a family property at Guffey Station, Westmoreland County, and was brought to Greensburg as a small child and there I grew into my being.

Greensburg was a typical country town, although it was the county seat of Westmoreland County. But it had no running water, no city paving, no electricity, gas of a sort, illuminating gas of a sort but lamps gave a far better light. And so I have

come a long way since those early days. I entered politics in 1880 when I was 6 years old. And I wore proudly the button of the Democratic candidate for President in those days. I won't ask who he was, because I've stumped every history professor I've met. But alas, my cheers when I saw this wonderful parade, I've never seen anything like it since, an old fashioned torchlight procession, and my cheers then changed to tears. However, I soon forgot my disappointment because I started to school. With the slate bound in red flannel and a slate pencil and a tin cup around my neck in order to get a sanitary drink out of a common bucket in the corner. My teacher was a woman of doubtful age. She'd been teaching so many years. We didn't call her Miss This or Miss That, *we called her* Aunt Belle. And Aunt Belle give me my first lesson in spelling because she had a large chart on which little pictures of animals—d-o-g, dog; c-a-t, cat; r-a-t, rat; and so forth. However, she succeeded in getting something into my head, for before long I had a primer.

There were children of all types in that school. There were children of well-to-do parents, there were children of poor parents, there were children of different colors, but it made no difference to any of us. That was my first introduction to democracy. I wish you could say we had it everywhere in our Nation yet, but we're on the way.

Well one day coming down from school the following year, I heard the newsboy cry that the President had been assassinated and that he was likely to die. I went home and rushed to my father and said, "Now if President Garfield dies, won't Hancock be President?" He said, "No." And then I got my first introduction to law. I knew what politics was but I didn't know anything about law before that. However, he said, "Wait, and you'll see a Democrat yet in the White House." And so I did and the 4 years later brought one.

In the meantime, I was not only busy at school, but playing around with my little friends in the South Main Streets of Greensburg. And one Sunday my mother said to my brother Joe, "I want you to take this kettle that's filled with the Sunday dinner down to Mrs. So and So." Explaining to him where she lived. So we carried this down to this poor woman. I recall the house as if it were present right here. The house was not a poor house, it seemed well built. But we had to walk over, some distance, a boardwalk because underneath the boardwalk it was very swampy. Well we waited until she had emptied the pail and then my brother said, "Now on the way home, we'll stop to see Jimmy,"—a friend of his. "And you can play with his little sister." Well, we stopped at Jimmy's house but his sister wasn't home. So I had to listen to the erudite talks of these 10- or 11-year-old boys.

I said, "Why does Mrs. So and So, why is she so poor?" And Jimmy spoke up and said, "Well she can't read nor write." I was utterly dumbfounded to think that there was anyone who couldn't read and write. So after they talked it over they decided it probably was due to that.

Well, the President expressed those same sentiments when he was talking to Pope Paul just recently. It's the fact that people couldn't read and write kept them on the lower scale of the ladder.

One day as I was playing around I saw a wagonload of men, a wagon filled with men, not sitting down but standing up. And I wanted to know who they were. "Oh," they said, "they're bringing them in from the county home to vote." Later on I learned that idiots, women and children couldn't vote, but at any rate they were voting. And I wanted to know why there were no women in the wagon. "Oh," they said, "women don't vote." "No, they don't vote." And that puzzled me because I knew down at the county home, I had been taken there once by my mother who apparently knew the superintendent's wife, and there were some very kind women down there. But there were no old women's homes, there were no children's homes. So everybody that was left adrift, ended up at the county home.

And then I learned that the courthouse, which was several blocks upstream, as we said, belonged to the people. Anyone who wanted to make a speech, start a cause, or tell about something unusual that had come over the telegraph—that's the only means of outside communication we had—could ring the courthouse bell and then all the men ran to the courthouse to see what was happening.

In the campaign of 1884, the courthouse bell was rung, vigorously the night after the election. And the leader of the Republicans, a well-educated man and a good writer for the Republican paper, was so overcome with the joy that he thought Bland was elected that be began his speech like this, "The courthouse bells have rung." "The people have spoken and we're going to have another Republican president." Well my older brothers, of course, had rushed to the courthouse to see what was going on. And they came down and told my father. And he had a quizzical look on his face and he said, "The Old Boss, (that's what this man was called) better wait a day or two." So 2 days later the courthouse bell rang again and that time we were all pleased.

Well, there were no women's clubs in those days. The only time women gathered together by themselves, was in church society. Well, there were no DAR's or Colonial Dames. Although I suppose half, or probably more than half of the people who lived in Greensburg at that time, that we were all descended from colonial and revolutionary ancestors. But we didn't think anything about it. Everybody was just the same. No difference if they came in to travel down, to dig coals, or travel down on the Southwest Railroad. But one day there was a notice put up that a certain woman was going to talk on votes for women in the courthouse one afternoon. Why, it shocked the community. Many of the men refused to let their wives attend. But my mother attended. The woman that gave the talk was a very brilliant woman. I suppose she was the best Bible scholar in Greensburg. And she brought up a fine family. When my mother came home, my father said, "What did Mrs. So and So have to say?" So mother began to relate.

The different things she had said and the different reasons she had given why women should vote. And father said, "She has a point, she's proved her point." And I have always remembered that, knowing that in my early days, my father stood by the women.

Well, I went up grade by grade in school till I reached the high school. And then on Friday afternoon, if any of you are old enough, you will remember that you had entertainment on Friday afternoons. Some of the children recited poems. Some of the children sang. Sometimes the teacher read us very interesting stories and I think my love of poetry was due to the reading that one of the teachers gave us every once in a while. Well, I got into the debating society in the high school. I can't tell you what the first debate was about but I won it from a boy that was quite a talker. He later became a well-known judge in Westmoreland County.

The next time I had to debate on States' rights. I lost that one.

Well, due to moving and illness in the family when we went to Pittsburgh, I lost about a year and a half schooling, but I entered a preparatory school there and I entered Bryn Mawr College in 1896. Now there had never been a political meeting at Bryn Mawr College. Some of us decided we'd have one. So it was the first year that Bryan ever ran. And we had a hard time getting a group together. It was the most interesting group as I look back on it. There were some very good things in that 1896 platform. Of course none of us knew anything about "silver and 16-to-1" except one girl, and she was the daughter of the silver Senator from Nevada.

So he coached her; she could speak on the silver. There were two sisters who later became very distinguished in welfare work in New York State and they talked on the welfare planks which are considered, oh, socialistic, to a degree. And then there was a good civil service plank. And didn't we have the daughter of the president of the Civil Service League at Bryn Mawr at that time? So she talked on civil service. And then they gave me the end to wrap up. I had a difficult time but I did my best. There were six of us that night who sponsored the meeting and who evidently believed in the Democratic Party. The next day when the college voted, we got 15 votes. Never since have I doubled a vote like that.

Of course, then, I took up real suffrage for women. Our president was the late M. Terry Thomas, who did more for women's education and its advancement than anyone in this country. When she started out, she was made dean of the new college that just started at Bryn Mawr in 1885. She went around to get the best professors she could find. She wanted nothing but young Ph. D's. She found one in Virginia. He later became President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson. She went up to Harvard and she found a number of brilliant men there. But the great Dr. Eliot, who made Harvard the great university which it is today, said, "Why Miss Thomas, you don't expect girls to learn biology and chemistry." She said, "I not only expect it, but they will." Two years later he apologized.

We had self-government at Bryn Mawr, the first college in the country to have self-government. And at the end of my freshman year, I was elected to the self-government board. And I defeated a very charming woman, charming girl then, who later married one of the great Federal judges of the United States. It always amused me.

Well, I got my degree, my majors were politics and history. And then I tutored 6 months, or rather I substituted 6 months, at a little private school on the North Side. I don't know how much the children learned while I was substituting, but I never forgot what one 12-year-old wrote. She was right, I was teaching, or trying to teach mythology. And I told them to write the story of women. And I have never forgotten her answer which I think is wonderful. She said, and this is all she wrote, "Apollo gave her music, Venus gave her beauty, Minerva gave her wisdom, and woman was made."

Then the next year I went over to Japan to visit a friend whose husband was with the Standard Oil Co. there. And there, of course, I found an entire new life and entire new interests. Having played basketball at Bryn Mawr, we organized a basketball team and, believe it or not, the school in Tokyo in a short time took up basketball.

Well, I was fortunate enough to marry a young Virginian, a graduate engineer of Stevens Institute of Technology who came over to Japan to look over a proposition in Osaka, Japan, where a group of New York industrialists were considering erecting a large gas plant. They had some electricity there, but it was the largest manufacturing city in Japan and the manufacturing was all done in the houses, the little wooden shacks that they lived in.

Well, later I came home and later he came home and we were married. And then went back and forth for 8 years. But I can remember we were there during the Japanese-

Russian War and I had been interested in donating something for the benefit of the soldiers, the wounded. So some Japanese friends, women, took me down one night to the train where we handed out flags and boxes of food to the soldiers that were going through.

Now most of these Japanese women, and they were very high class, most of these Japanese women, you might say, had never left the house before. And I recall writing home to my mother and saying, "The Japanese women have finally burst through the paper doors and eventually they'll go somewhere."

Well now they just have the same ideas as we have. In fact, I believe, a greater proportion of the Japanese women vote than we do. And they're taking an interest in public affairs, they're appearing together on the streets, the boys and girls, hand in hand, and it never was thought of when we lived there.

On our last trip over which was just before the war, just before it was declared, we were almost captured by the Russians. We were filled with contraband. All anybody had to do was to look at the boat. The deck was piled high with railroad rails. But fortunately the fog came down and we proceeded to end up in Japan.

After the birth of my oldest son in Osaka, where we saw Russian prisoners at that time, and I have thought of it many times since because those Russian prisoners were such a forlorn lot. And they seemed very pleased that they were settled in some other country for a time. And the Japanese were giving them very good food. But they had to stop giving them melon (that's a form or orange) because they were making boats out of it.

So they took away the fruit and gave them potatoes and they made it out of that. So you know the Japanese are clever, as we know it.

Well, then we came back to this country and we settled in Providence, R.I., for a few years. There I got into the suffrage movement again. And any of you who are old enough to be in the suffrage movement, I don't think any of you are, will recall we had various organizations. The American Suffrage Association, the College Equal Suffrage League, and I think there was the United States Association. There were various associations.

Well since we lived in a college town that was rather strict in those days, you professors will recall that just lately a former president of Amherst College was dismissed from Brown University. My husband and I didn't know why. We read the newspapers, but he was a great liberal center and later he became president of Amherst and died just recently, along after his retirement.

Well I became very equal in this College Equal Suffrage League and to this day I still marvel that there were women who didn't want to vote and who thought it was a wrong thing for women to vote. Who kept saying, "Well, our husbands vote". And I kept saying, "There are a lot of women without husbands; can't they vote? They pay taxes." "Oh, never mind, we don't want to vote." And I was very much amused, a few years ago here in Pittsburgh, where a woman who had been president of the Antisuffrage League passed away. She was a lovely woman and she was a business woman. But when her children gave out the information about her life, they said she was active in the suffrage movement.

Well, we then went to Illinois, and there I became interested in parent-teachers work. In the meantime I was raising a family of four satisfactory sons.

Came back to Pittsburgh in 1918, and by 1920 we had suffrage won. And there I went to the Democratic Convention of 1924, and there, with a minority, I fought for an anti-Klan plank. Well, last year we got it. So don't give up trying.

In 1924 and 1928, that period, I was attacked wholesale by Klan members in western Pennsylvania and eastern Ohio. Their papers just mushroomed. They weren't against colored people then. They were only against Catholics and Jews. You never heard of any opposition to colored people.

Well, this died out, I'm glad to say, I think in Pennsylvania, and I hope the same is true of Ohio. But I was written up so vigorously and so violently that my husband kept a loaded revolver in his room. And one of the writeups said, "She says she has a husband and four sons; we don't doubt the sons," which amused the family very much. And one night they burned a cross on a hill just beyond us, because it could be seen by both the village and our farm, except we were all away. There was nothing but the charred remains when we came home, much to the disappointment of the boys, who had such a good time, they said, cutting it down.

Well, we have that trouble still, but gradually I'm sure we'll get the better of it.

Then in 1930 I entered the antiprohibition movement. If people were going to be kept sober, I decided after 10 years that that was no way to do it. And again I was attacked by the so-called dries. And I recall that one of the letters said, "Well, you may mean well, you may be sincere, but I'm tired seeing your picture in the paper." And my husband said, "That part I agree with."

Then by 1932 came a new regime and I think we've been following it, more or less, ever since. And then I went on the State board of education; I went on the State board of the welfare board and I enjoyed that work very much because it seemed to be in line. It seemed to follow the things that I had wanted and that I had believed in. Then I was made chairman of the Advisory Committee of the National Youth Administration.

Not many of you, perhaps, can remember the National Youth Administration in the 1930's, but it did a good work and it was one of the most rewarding things, to me, that I have ever entered into. I made frequent trips through the State and to Harrisburg. We had paid workers, but we had a wonderful board, of which I was chairman. As my husband said, I could collect more nonpaying jobs than anybody he ever did know. However, as I say, it was most rewarding. And the dropout idea now is a sort of a followup of the National Youth Administration.

I recall that in Philadelphia we made ammunition boxes for the Navy, and discovered that the girls had better eyesight than the boys. The girls could do everything but press one lever, which made the grooves in the lid of the boxes fit down on the box to close it. Well, presently, they had a machine that did that. By that time we were in war and the boys were ready to enlist and it was carried forward by the girls. There was some objection to the young women working there because they said, "They won't be safe on the streets at night." I said, "That isn't the fault of what they're doing or the National Youth Administration; that's the fault of your city administration." So they were allowed to continue.

You can see from this that I've been interested in welfare and education all my life. And I am still a member of the board of trustees of Slippery Rock College. I have been on the board under five Governors. When the legislature adjourns as a holdover, I suppose I'll be out. But I have seen the college grow from 750 to about 2,700. I have seen it grow from a teachers college to a regular college, a State college. I have seen it grow from merely training teachers but being able now to give an M.A. degree and presently, I believe, we will have the beginning of a medical degree. We have various plans to go forward.

Now, in 1933, a lot of us women began to realize that the vote was only a political right, it wasn't a legal right, if women were discriminated on account of sex. And so we began to campaign for the equal rights amendment. The National Women's Party wrote and has backed ever since this amendment which reads, "Equality of rights under the law shall not be abridged or denied by the United States or any State on account of sex." I was 4 years as chairman; I retired as chairman last year. Then they made me president for life. We're very successful, although we have labor opposing us. I don't mean all labor, but during the war a Senator called me from California (he was one of the eastern Senators).

They were trying to increase the output of ammunition and the ammunition factories were filled mostly by women. And they found out that if they could increase them, their working hours 2 hours a week, from 48 to 50, it would mean that much more ammunition. At that time, the League of Women Voters was opposed to the amendment. But they said that they would forget it during the war. They've forgotten it now, they don't oppose it. Neither does Mrs. Roosevelt, who once opposed it. Neither did she when she was representing our country on the United Nations.

Well, the law in Pennsylvania read, "The women could work 50 hours a week." And the law would last for 6 months there, after the end of the war. No sooner did President Truman announce that the war was over than the head of the labor department in Pennsylvania rushed to the Governor, Governor Duff I think it was, and said, "Abrogate that law immediately or the women will be taking our jobs." I don't want to deprive a man of a job if he's doing a good job. But if a woman can do as good a job, and many times a better job, I say let her have it. Don't discriminate on account of sex.

There is a group in the country that says, "All this may come someday, but we have to wait and see what the Supreme Court says." Well, I can tell them right now what the Supreme Court has said half a dozen times. In the 14th amendment, women, white women, are not considered equal to men. We had that decision several times. So the only way we can become equal in every respect legally, is to pass the amendment. And so that's what I'm doing now, as far as I can to end the discrimination.

Well, I've had a long life, and you can tell. Ninety-one years is a long time to spend living. But it's been an interesting life, a satisfactory life. There have been ups and downs and pleasures and sorrows. But if I had to relive it, I'd live it just as I have. The first time I ever heard the word "comet" must have been more than 85 years ago and they were having quite an argument in the family. And father ended it by saying, "Never mind, wake her up, put a blanket around her and carry her down so she can see the comet. She'll never see the like of it again."

I know perhaps it will be back, I don't know. And so I was bundled up and carried down a very short distance to a house on the corner. It was a two-story house in front and then had a long one-story addition. And there right over, as I kept telling them when I came back, right over Miss Shea's washhouse was the comet. Never before in all my travels have I seen anything to compare with it and I'm sure you haven't either. It was there that I heard such words as "magnificent spectacle," "marvelous," "wonderful." Well, I kept wondering for days what else was up there besides the comet. And

now we've reached the space age and we're learning a great deal about what else is up there. And then I said to myself, "I'll have to wait until I'm a big girl to find out." Well, now I'm an old person. I haven't found out, I know little about space, but I'm willing to wait. Thank you very much.

Of all the moments of distinction which have been given to me, I appreciate this one more than any one that I've ever had and I hope that I am able to say to you how gracious you are and how grateful and thankful I am.

NATIONAL SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL WEEK

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining several of my colleagues in introducing a joint resolution to designate the second week of May each year as National School Safety Patrol Week. I want to join them in paying tribute to the devotion and effectiveness of the boys and girls who give of their time to insure the safety of their fellow school children. Thousands of children in my district and millions all over America travel to school more safely because the members of the school safety patrol are willing to get up earlier in the morning, eat lunch faster, and get home later, and to assume the responsibility which being a school safety guard entails. Membership in the patrol in this way serves a useful function above and beyond the vital one of safety for our youngsters. It also serves as a valuable initiation into the tradition of voluntary public service which provides much of the leadership for the communities and organizations of our society.

CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 1966, the President, through the Secertary of Agriculture, transmitted to us the proposed Child Nutrition Act of 1966. It is apparent in this message that Congress long ago began a task that we have left only partially finished. A generation ago, when some of my colleagues here today were still in public schools, Congress initiated a program to encourage schools to provide lunches for school children on a regular basis.

Today, more than a generation later, there are still school children who are not able to benefit by this effort of our predecessors because their schools do not have the facilities to provide them with one good meal per day. In conversations with teachers from even some of our more fortunate school systems, it has been revealed to me that some students obtain their only warm meal of the day from the school lunch program. Surely, children in the same dire need must live in school districts where they do not have the school lunch program because they have no equipment to furnish a meal. This single provision of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, to provide grants-in-aid to assist in providing the proper facilities, makes this proposal worthy of our most direct attention.

Another provision of the act, that of setting up a special milk program, is also aimed at the lofty, yet attainable, goal of raising a nation of children who have every possible chance to grow up to be healthy individuals. I ask that my colleagues in the House, in their efforts to represent their constituents in regard to the proposed budget cuts in the areas of school lunch and milk programs, do not overlook the possibilities that the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 holds. This could easily be one of the most important pieces of legislation that we have ever been called upon to examine.

As our President stated in his food-for-freedom message, "Hunger poisons the mind. It saps the body. It destroys hope. It is the natural enemy of every man on earth." I am positive that no Member here present wants our yet uncounted future generations to have their minds poisoned, their bodies sapped of strength, and their hopes of future accomplishments destroyed by hunger. This natural enemy of every man on earth is also the enemy of many children in our own country. I ask again that all of us, who have the power and the responsibility to do so, examine this act and see for ourselves if this act is not the weapon we so desperately need to stamp out hunger.

BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE REPORT REVEALS FEW BANKS HAVE FULL INDEPENDENT AUDITS

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance of the Banking and Currency Committee released a detailed staff analysis on bank audits. This analysis, based on a survey of 10,362 banks, reveals some startling information which plainly shows that most of the Nation's commercial banks do not employ outside independent audits of their operations.

The report reveals that only 10 percent of the banks employed accountants to make full and independent audits. Less than 5 percent had these audits annually. The report further showed that results of the few audits conducted are usually released only to the officers and directors and rarely made available to the stockholders or the public.

In my opinion this is a serious situation and one which cries out for action by the Congress. As you know, the Banking and Currency Committee now has pending before it two bills which would require the banks to have full independent audits conducted on a regular basis. The report released today points up the need for this type of legislation in very clear terms.

Mr. Speaker, without these audit reports, the banks operate behind a heavy veil of secrecy. This secrecy leaves the depositors, borrowers, stockholders, and the general public to operate on blind faith without the benefit of the most basic information about the banks' operations.

Full independent audits would do much to help the banking industry as well as the public. I am convinced that bad practices uncovered in some recent bank failures would not have gone so far had there been adequate independent audits of these banks' operations on a regular basis. Independent audits would reveal these bad practices before they become serious banking problems and threaten the solvency of the banks.

Mr. Speaker, the staff analysis published today contains a number of significant points. The information is based on answers furnished by the banks to questionnaires submitted to them by the Banking and Currency Committee. Among other things, the answers to the questionnaires revealed these points:

First. Approximately 96 percent of the respondents to the questionnaire did not have annual, unqualified, independent audits during the years 1960 through 1964.

Second. Approximately 90 percent of the respondents did not use independent public accountants for unqualified independent audits; that is, audits unrestricted as to scope and time.

Third. As of December 31, 1964, only 23 problem banks, or 13 percent of 178 insured State-chartered problem banks in the United States had annual independent audits.

Fourth. As of June 30, 1965, only 24 problem banks, or 13.3 percent of 180 insured State-chartered problem banks in the United States had annual independent audits.

Fifth. Unlike many publicly owned corporations, unqualified independent audit reports are generally distributed only to the directors of banks so audited, but not to all of the banks' officers, and to relatively few of the banks' stockholders. Distribution of audit reports to the general public was found to be minimal.

Sixth. Despite the fact that 66 percent of the respondents indicated that they used the services of public accountants for a variety of reasons, most of this total used public accountants for limited specialized services, such as the preparation of the bank's tax returns or advice to banks on tax matters.

Seventh. The average cost of an independent, unqualified audit ranged from $1,400 for banks in the under $5 million

assets category to $6,400 for banks in the $25 to $100 million assets category. Hence, the average cost of such audits in all categories does not seem to put an independent, unqualified audit outside the reach of most banks, especially considering the protection afforded to depositors, stockholders, and the public by such practices, as well as present levels of bank profits.

CIVIL RIGHTS PROTECTION ACT OF 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to be designated the Civil Rights Protection Act of 1966.

In 1964 and 1965, the Congress moved to correct certain inconsistencies and inadequacies in the body of civil rights law. In so acting, our hope was to provide the full framework necessary to allow all our citizens freely to exercise their constitutional rights. That goal, however, is not yet ours. Due process and equal protection of the law is still denied many of our citizens. Crimes of violence against Negroes and civil rights workers still occupy prominence in the news. People who seek the peaceful exercise of their constitutional rights are murdered with impunity. And this Congress cannot dismiss future obligations by justly praising itself for past accomplishments. We must have a civil rights act for 1966.

Justice delayed is justice denied. Our present delays are primarily the administration of just laws recently passed by the Congress. We do not wish to see the organization of the judiciary in this country tampered with or altered. This legislation is designed not to impose new arrangements but to stimulate the improvement of old procedures. States, in effect, are being asked to scrutinize and purify their own systems of justice. But the Congress should not permit unjust and unrepresentative courts to undercut the law of the land. For dereliction in the administration of justice threatens the rule of law.

To promote the just administration of the law, we must assure the equitable selection of juries in State and Federal courts. The manipulation of jury lists has been, for some time, a major weapon to obstruct the equal protection of the law in civil rights cases. Lily-white juries in the South are a disgrace to democracy. Often, they become accomplices to vicious and violent crimes against innocent citizens. Discrimination in jury selection procedures must stop. Accordingly, my legislation introduces a plan whereby population cross-sections are to be provided as the basis for equitable representatives of the citizenry on juries. Jury commissions in Federal district courts, working with the Director of the Administrative Office of U.S. Courts would assure the enforcement of such a procedure. Provisions are also contained to extend such procedures to the selection of juries in State courts.

Another title of the bill provides for the removal of defendants, in certain cases, from State to Federal district courts where their localities have segregated and discriminatory systems of justice.

Also included is a provision designating certain crimes as Federal offenses. At present, the killer of a civil rights worker is tried for depriving that individual of his constitutional rights. He ought to be tried for murder under Federal jurisdiction.

Title V of the bill provides for the civil indemnification of persons injured or killed in the lawful exercise of his civil rights. This would be administered through a special board under the authority of the Civil Rights Commission.

Most of the provisions have been recommended in the past by the Civil Rights Commission. They are designed to meet a terrible reality in this country—the continuing disobedience to established law in certain of our States.

All of us are too well acquainted with the nature of this disobedience—the victimization of citizens exercising rights we are sworn to defend, the murder of citizens seeking to help guarantee those rights for their fellows. Daily reports of these incidents have become commonplace. Now is the time to do something about it.

I do not believe that civil rights workers and other citizens can be hostages to gradualism. We cannot callously write off violence as the necessary cost of progress. Having passed laws we must assure their enforcement. Having guaranteed citizens certain rights we cannot tolerate their intimidation. For these reasons we must act immediately to pass the Civil Rights Protection Act of 1966.

THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY'S ROLE IN DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, recently my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, the Honorable JOHN C. MACKIE, addressed the 47th annual convention of the Associated General Contractors on the important subject, "The Construction Industry's Role in Disaster Relief." As former commissioner of highways, State of Michigan, former president of the American Association of State Highway Officials, and former director of the American Road Builders Association, JOHN is a recognized authority in the field of highways. I feel that my colleagues in the House of Representatives, as well as citizens throughout the great State of Michigan and the Nation, will appreciate the opportunity to read his excellent remarks.

The address follows:

THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRIES ROLE IN DISASTER RELIEF

(Remarks by the Honorable JOHN C. MACKIE, before the Plan Bulldozer Forum, 47th annual Associated General Contractors convention, March 17, 1966, Washington Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.)

Mr. Armstrong, distinguished panel members, members of the Associated General Contractors, and guests, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you this morning on a most important subject: "The Construction Industry's Role in Disaster Relief."

As highway commissioner for the State of Michigan, I have enjoyed a close relationship with the Associated General Contractors. As a licensed civil engineer and land surveyor, I am appreciably concerned with the largest of all single industries—the construction industry—and the role that construction contractors play in disaster relief.

As Jack Matich, chairman of the AGC national emergency planning committee has stated:

"The general contractor has an obligation to protect his community and his country in times of natural or manmade disasters. Only the contractor has the ability, experience, and equipment to plunge into such an emergency, clear the wreckage, and put a community back on its feet after disaster has struck. This is true regardless of the seriousness of the situation.

"Plan Bulldozer involves organizing our capabilities in advance of an emergency so that the construction industry will be able to step in and help without delay. If disaster strikes, all construction contractors may be called upon to put their community, their State, their country back into operating condition.

"Every Associated General Contractors' chapter has a responsibility of this kind and needs to have the plans, equipment, specifications, and a crew of men ready to do the job. Plan Bulldozer means that you put together the necessary leadership, equipment, and crew in advance, instead of waiting until disaster is upon you and all is confusion."

To this end, I believe the construction industry, through Associated General Contractors, has created a plan that will utilize its capabilities most efficiently to assure public safety. To the membership of Associated General Contractors, I congratulate you for conceiving Plan Bulldozer.

The Michigan chapter of Associated General Contractors, has developed and activated this program several times. On June 6, 1963, Michigan's capital city of Lansing was hit by 70-mile-per-hour winds and rain totaling nearly 3½ inches in 3 hours. Fires caused by lightning and broken powerlines broke out over the city, and a large number of buildings were flooded. Every piece of city firefighting equipment was placed into service.

Around 7 p.m., local and State officials contracted seven contractors for men and equipment to fight flooding. All were members of the Michigan chapter of Associated General Contractors and cooperators in the chapter's Plan Bulldozer. Within 45 minutes, the first of them had reported to Lansing fire station No. 1, ready for duty.

About 2 hours later, with authority from the fire chief and his staff, the contractors moved into 14 buildings and brought the flooding under control. A vital highway underpass was flooded and the Michigan State Highway Department asked that it be reopened by 7:30 p.m. The contractors opened the underpass to traffic at 5:45 p.m., well before the deadline.

The fire department and the city council of Lansing issued special commendations to

the Michigan chapter of Associated General Contractors and to the contractors who took part in the operation.

In April 1965, the Michigan chapter was called to activate Plan Bulldozer to clear extensive damage when tornadoes hit the Midwest. Michigan contractors worked with State police and reported receiving excellent cooperation from State labor organizations.

Plan Bulldozer provided further evidence of its effectiveness when it was implemented in North and South Dakota immediately following their hurricane-force blizzards earlier this month. Snow drifts as deep as 50 feet literally buried farms, livestock, trains, and towns, and presented one of the most critical livesaving snow removal tasks ever encountered in the Dakotas.

The result of the action taken by Plan Bulldozer in the Dakotas can best be described by quoting a small portion of a letter written to the Associated General Contractors of South Dakota, Inc., by the Director of the State civil defense in South Dakota, who wrote:

"The success of Plan Bulldozer is positively pleasing when I realize that this is the first time the plan was implemented. There is no doubt in my mind that as a result of the prompt reaction of the contractors that human life and many head of livestock were saved. The success is indicative of comprehensive planning on the part of the Associated General Contractors. The future potential of this plan is fantastic."

And a letter from the Governor of South Dakota, who stated:

"In my opinion Plan Operation Bulldozer for which you must be given the initial and fullest credit, proved to be a complete success."

Plan Bulldozer has been activated in many other States to aid in arresting damage and reestablishing an orderly physical environment.

Testimonials such as the Lansing disaster and others, merely reinforces what construction leaders have always maintained—that the industry has a vital contribution to make in disaster relief and control.

At the present time, 62 percent of the States have a Plan Bulldozer organization, and Associated General Contractors chapters in 36 percent of the States are developing the program which when completed would nearly give nationwide coverage.

Certainly, there is sufficient evidence to encourage the remaining States to organize a complete Plan Bulldozer program. The general public should be aware of the tremendous resources available in your industry, and your willingness to cooperate.

Emergency preparedness must be substantive. It should provide detailed information for public officials advising who to contact in the industry, how they can be contacted under emergency conditions, the resources available, and the operational criteria to perform disaster relief work.

All types of construction contractors should be interested in emergency preparedness, as well as subcontractors, equipment dealers, suppliers, and everyone related to the industry. The Associated General Contractors plan allows for all to participate.

Plan Bulldozer is indeed a logical program. Since the general contractor under the single contract system has undivided responsibility to manage a job, he is evidently, the logical source to coordinate the complex operation of disaster relief. He has the experience and the organization to manage a project whether it is building, heavy, or highway construction.

Cooperation must be a civic proposition where all heads of agencies work together, and political entanglements must be dropped when disasters occur. A coordinating group should set up rules of authority, such as under the Associated General Contractors plan, in order to assure an efficient operation. Plan Bulldozer has a very essential place in this type of activity since the program is available to all cooperating agencies. Emergency preparedness isn't a promotional scheme—it is a continuing job, and must be done if we are to assure public safety.

Do we need Plan Bulldozer? The average of 16 or 17 declared major disasters per year speaks for itself.

AMENDING TITLES II AND III OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to amend titles II and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act so as to permit the education programs authorized in those titles to be used to strengthen educational opportunities for the children of our overseas government and military personnel who must attend schools operated by the Federal Government in many foreign areas.

I am greatly disturbed by the findings of the Select Subcommittee on Education which visited these overseas school operations during the congressional recess. During the investigation of the select subcommittee, 327 dependent schools overseas were studied. These schools educate over 165,000 American children. The subcommittee was unanimous in its findings:

First. That there is a very serious disparity between the actual administrative and operating arms of the Department of Defense school network;

Second. That many schools are housed in improper facilities and suffer from a serious lack of necessary equipment and supplies—particularly so in the case of textbooks;

Third. That sufficient effort to recruit and retain experienced and qualified teachers is not expended, and that teacher salaries and compensation for teacher achievement and experience are woefully insufficient;

Fourth. That the number of students in most classrooms is exceptionally large, and that insufficient teachers and specialists are employed;

Fifth. That the schools do not take full advantage of the opportunities present for intercultural exchange with children of the host nation, and offer relatively few host national language courses;

Sixth. That there is a serious lack of uniformity in the quality and degree of education offered by the various schools;

Seventh. That the overseas dependent schools are ineligible to participate in Federal programs beneficial to many facets of education; and

Eighth. That there is an insufficiency of funds made available to the Department of Defense for the purpose of educating American dependents abroad.

In my observations concerning the operation of our dependent schools overseas, it is apparent to me that high on the priority list of deficiencies is the lack of textbooks and appropriate instructional materials. Title II of Public Law 89–10 seeks to strengthen educational opportunities throughout our Nation's schools by providing grants for the acquisition of library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials for the use of teachers and students in schools throughout the Nation.

Much of the testimony received by the General Subcommittee on Education last year in connection with the hearings on title II of Public Law 89–10 indicated that this was an area of elementary and secondary education in which much greater financial support was needed. A look at our dependent schools overseas indicates that the need there may be even greater than the need which prompted the enactment of title II of Public Law 89–10.

Great opportunities exist in overseas locations for the cultural enrichment of the elementary and secondary school programs through special education projects which would take advantage of the schools' unique locations in foreign countries. However, most of the schools studied were not taking advantage of these unique circumstances. The possibilities which exist for program enrichment of our elementary and secondary schools through title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—Public Law 89–10—most certainly should be made available to our overseas dependent schools. With the additional funds that could be made available under this title, the presently lost opportunity for special enrichment of elementary and secondary school programs in foreign areas may quickly vanish.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that it is extremely regrettable that the improvement in educational programs in our dependent overseas schools must be obtained in this manner. It would appear that where we have a program of education fully supported and administered by a Federal agency that there would be closer attention given to the provision of an educational program which is in keeping with the new developments and support being given education in the States. The quality of the offerings of our dependent schools overseas should to large extent parallel the improvement in quality and the innovation in instruction that are being afforded our stateside pupils.

I should like to make clear that the changes I propose to make in titles II and III of this act to make eligible our dependent schools overseas will not in any way reduce the measure of support that should be given the States and local school districts in the continental United States and in the eligible territories.

The General Education Subcommittee, of which I am a member, now has before it the proposed legislation for the 1966 amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. At the appropriate time I will introduce amendments to that legislation to increase the money authorization by an

amount sufficient to cover the cost of adding these children to titles II and III of that act.

STREET LIGHTING AND CRIME

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNSLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD several articles that recently appeared in the Lockport, N.Y., Union-Sun and Journal and the Evansville Courier, of Evansville, Ind., regarding the correlation of street lighting and crime:

[From the Lockport (N.Y.) Union-Sun and Journal, Feb. 10, 1966]

LIGHTS CUT CRIME

The city streets of Lockport are as a general rule well lighted and most of the time we take the lights for granted.

Good lighting is regarded as a deterrent to crimes of violence, the majority of which are committed at night. That is why many leave the lights in their home on when they go out at night and why many illuminate their backyards and driveways.

Figures prepared by the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service at the request of Representative CHARLES P. FARNSLEY, of Kentucky, indicate that the supposition is correct. Well lighted streets, not only reduce major crimes but also cut down the number of highway accidents.

During a 2-year period 1953–55 more than 5,000 new lights were installed along every mile of the streets in Gary, Ind. A tabulation of reported crimes showed that the number of criminal assaults reported declined more than 70 percent and robberies decreased more than 60 percent. The decrease occurred in spite of a 27-percent increase in the population of Gary during the 2-year period.

In larger cities, too, a reduction in crime has followed improved street lighting programs. In 1957, New York City officials decided to try an extensive street lighting program in a 111-block area in five of the most crime-ridden precincts. Crime statistics for a 3-month period following the installation of the lighting declined 71 percent. During the next 2 years the incidence of murder, assault, and rape dropped 49 percent in that district and juvenile complaints declined 30 percent.

Boston, Cleveland, Indianapolis, and other cities reported similar good results from increased street lighting.

In Nashville, Tenn., it was reported that following a street lighting program, the night traffic accident rate declined from 40 to 29 percent, despite a 50-percent increase in motor vehicle regulation. The fact that Chicago's Northwest Expressway is continuously lighted over its 16-mile length is given credit for the low traffic fatality rate on this highway.

Between 1953 and 1960 new lights were installed in nine locations in the State of Virginia. A study by the Virginia Department of Highways indicated that the number of traffic accidents at these locations decreased 38 percent and traffic fatalities dropped 90 percent.

Good lighting may not be the whole answer to curbing crime and traffic accidents, but the surveys indicate such lighting is money well spent.

[From the Evansville (Ind.) Courier, Feb. 21, 1966]

NEW STREETLIGHTS HELP DROP CRIME RATE

(By George Uselton)

The installation of new streetlights has helped Evansville reduce the crime trend here, according to Police Chief Darwin Covert.

Crime statistics in the city dropped drastically in 1965—the first drop in 6 years—and Chief Covert credited the additional lights.

The chief said the number of muggings, purse snatchings and molestings have shown a major decrease where adequate lighting has been installed.

Dimly lit areas of the city are the favorite haunts of thieves and burglars.

Mayor Frank McDonald recently said Evansville was the worst-lighted city in the State and added the streetlighting program is well behind schedule.

City Engineer Melvin Pohlkotte agreed with the mayor about lighting conditions here. He said deficiencies in streetlighting are terrific.

Pohlkotte previously handled lighting problems in Gary, Hammond, and Indianapolis.

He agreed that adequate street lighting is a crime stopper.

"There's no question about it. Crime on Gary streets decreased about 60 percent after proper lighting was installed," he said.

Federal Bureau of Investigation Chief J. Edgar Hoover has said, "It is axiomatic that darkness is an ally to crime. The thief, the arsonist, the rapist, the peeping tom and all other perverse individuals often depend on darkness to cloak their misdeeds and conceal their identities."

Twelve times as many crimes of violence are committed at night compared to the daylight hours. Major crimes that occur at night cost the Nation about $20 billion every year.

Chief Covert said, "Pretty good strides have been taken here during the last few years to get proper lighting."

Pohlkotte said between 700 and 800 streetlights were installed in the city during 1965 and that between 500 and 600 should be installed every year until Evansville is properly lighted.

At the present time there isn't a regular program for the installation of new and brighter lights, but the traffic engineer said he would like to see one established.

"Mostly it is the lack of finances and too few men to do the job," Pohlkotte said.

He said new lights have been put up on Lincoln and Washington Avenues and that crews are busy putting up lights on West Franklin Street.

The National Safety Council reported that of the 43,600 deaths that occurred in traffic accidents in 1963, 53 percent—or 23,100—resulted from night accidents.

Since nighttime traffic is only one-third that of daytime, the night death rate is 2½ times as great as the day rate, according to the council.

"Well-lighted streets cause reductions in accidents as well as crime," Chief Covert said.

[From the Evansville (Ind.) Courier, Feb. 25, 1966]

BETTER LIGHTING PROMOTES CRIME CONTROL

Light and vice are deadly enemies, says Shakespeare.

Evansville residents are getting quantitative measurements of that statement these days. The city is in the midst of a steady program for the improvement of street lighting. The result, according to Police Chief Darwin Covert, is a sharp cut in crime in all areas where improvements have been made.

There were 7,046 lights on Evansville streets at the first of this year, with more scheduled for installation. There has been a steady increase since 1960, when there were 4,406. Nonetheless, Mayor Frank McDonald told the city council recently that Evansville is the most poorly lighted city in the State. A continuation of the lighting program has been pledged.

It's costly. The city doesn't pay for installation or maintenance of street lights, but it pays an annual fee to the power company for each one. That means that each new street light represents a long-term item in Evansville's budget. The cost is now $314,000.

Still, it would be wrong to describe the payment as extravagant. Not only is there the testimony of Chief Covert, but also a report that a thorough lighting program in Gary cut street crime by 60 percent.

The connection between light and crime ought to have close relationship to the location of new lights. A certain number have to be installed on new streets. There is a temptation, too, to splurge on Evansville's best looking residential districts. Block-by-block crime reports, though, ought to establish priority for a certain number of installations each year. For example, frequent reports of molestations and burglaries probably would provide a legitimate claim for the section just southeast of the downtown district.

Street crime is a growing problem for U.S. cities. It was a minor issue in the last election and could be a bigger one in future campaigns. Along with frequent police patrols, adequate lighting is an obvious and effective step toward crime control.

STREET LIGHTING AND CRIME

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNSLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the rapid growth of crime and juvenile delinquency has become a subject of increasing concern to us all.

I have long believed there was a definite correlation between street lighting and crime and that adequate lighting in our cities and towns would do much to combat this problem.

At my request the Library of Congress prepared a timely and informative study which confirms the effectiveness of brighter lights as a crime deterrent, as well as an important factor in reducing traffic accidents.

Believing that this report will be of interest to you, I include it in the RECORD.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., November 2, 1965.

The Honorable CHARLES P. FARNSLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FARNSLEY: In answer to your request for a study on the possible relationship between street lighting and crime, the Education and Public Welfare Division of the Legislative Reference Service prepared and sent to you a memo dated April 28, 1965.

The interest shown by other Members of Congress in this subject has been so great that we decided to expand the material and issue it as a report. In this way we could

more easily answer the many requests we have received for the information.

Sincerely yours,

HUGH L. ELSBREE, *Director*.

THE IMPACT OF STREET LIGHTING ON CRIME AND TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS

(By Nancy Berla, Education and Public Welfare Division, Oct. 5, 1965)

J. Edgar Hoover has said, "It is axiomatic that darkness is an ally to crime. The thief, the arsonist, the rapist, the peeping tom, and all other perverse individuals often depend on darkness to cloak their misdeeds and conceal their identities." [1]

Twelve times as many crimes of violence are committed at night as in the daytime. *Major crimes that occur* at night cost the Nation about $20 billion every year. In Salt Lake City over 95 percent of all aggravated assaults take place at night. In Minneapolis 92 percent of the burglaries occur after dark. In Pittsburgh 85 percent of the stolen cars are taken at night.[2]

In a recent survey of police officials made by the Street and Highway Safety Lighting Bureau, it was reported by police chiefs that from two-thirds to three-quarters of all crimes are committed at night. Of these, an average of two-thirds took place in dimly lit areas.[3]

The daily average of burglaries in the months of December, January, February, and March of 1961 was 12 percent above the rest of the year. These are the months when periods of darkness are the longest. Another 1961 survey revealed that about 75 percent of the nighttime burglaries occurred in buildings where no lights were left burning.[4]

The National Safety Council reports that in 1963 43,600 deaths occurred in traffic accidents. Of these, 53 percent or 23,100 resulted from night accidents. Since nighttime traffic is only one-third that of the daytime hours, the night death rate is two and a half times as great as the day rate—10 deaths per 100 million vehicle-miles at night as compared with 4 deaths per 100 million vehicle-miles during the day.[5]

One expert has undertaken an analysis of the causes of traffic fatalities taking into account factors such as drinking, improper driving, and defective vehicles, which would be responsible for both daytime and nighttime accidents. After subtracting these accidents from the total, he estimates that in the year 1963 darkness on streets and highways apparently accounted for 8,030 fatalities.[6]

John E. Ingersoll, assistant director of the Field Service Division, International Association of Chiefs of Police, made this statement in a speech before a community lighting conference in Chicago, in 1962: "It is the considered opinion of many responsible law enforcement officials that well conceived and developed streetlighting programs have decidedly beneficial effects on crime and traffic conditions * * *. Most police chiefs would welcome some way to minimize the effect of darkness. Many of our problems would then be solved. Because we obviously cannot completely eradicate darkness, then we must look for ways to minimize its dangers to public safety. We must learn more, for example, about the effective use of artificial light."

In a number of studies undertaken during the past 10 years an attempt has been made to measure the effect of improved street lighting on the incidence of crime and traffic accidents. The specific conditions in each city mentioned below are different, but in all cases the conclusions reached are that fewer crimes are committed and fewer traffic accidents occur following a significant increase in the level of illumination.

STREET LIGHTING AND CRIME

During a 2-year period (1953–55) more than 5,000 new lights were installed along every mile of the streets of Gary, Ind. A tabulation of reported crimes showed that the number of criminal assaults reported declined more than 70 percent and robberies decreased more than 60 percent. The decrease occurred in spite of a 27-percent increase in the population of Gary during the 2-year period.[7]

In a comprehensive street lighting effort in McPherson, Kans., a light was installed for every 2½ homes in the residential area. The project resulted in a sixfold increase in brightness. The incidence of nighttime prowling, window peeping, and burglary in the area was reduced 92 percent. The relighting in Chattanooga, Tenn., of a 12-block district which had experienced a very high homicide rate was followed by a 70-percent reduction in major crimes committed there.[8]

In larger cities, too, a reduction in crime has followed improved street lighting programs. In 1949 officials in Cleveland began a comprehensive program to improve street lighting in that city. When one-third of the lights had been installed, a check of crime statistics showed that the number of assaults reported had declined by one-third. Purse snatching had been reduced 78 percent, and the incidence of other night crimes was down 17 percent.[9]

The program in Indianapolis, Ind., involves the installation of 1,000 new lights each year. Crime and traffic reports are used to pinpoint those streets most in need of new lights. In 1960, there was a 60-percent reduction of nighttime crime on the streets which had the new lighting.[10]

In 1957, New York City officials decided to try an extensive street lighting program in an 111-block area in 5 of the most crime-ridden precincts. Earlier efforts to reduce the crime rate, such as saturating the area with plainclothesmen, had been only partially successful. The improved lighting fixtures provided 125 percent more light. Crime statistics were kept for the 3-month period following the relighting program to be compared with these prior to installation. In this 3-month period, there occurred a 71-percent reduction in the number of crimes reported.[11] During the next 2 years, the incidence of murder, assault, and rape dropped 49 percent in this district, and juvenile complaints declined 30 percent.[12]

A study made in Boston in 1959 used a different method but obtained the same results. A neighborhood committee in the south end, where a high crime rate exists, pinpointed the exact location of 104 offenses, from purse-snatching to assault, committed between August and December 1959. The results showed conclusively that on the blocks which had modern lighting fewer crimes were perpetrated.[13]

One writer [14] agrees with others that street lighting is an important factor in crime prevention and traffic safety, but he also points out that many variables are involved in compiling statistics of this sort. Such factors as which types of crime are considered, whether crimes taking place in the lighted areas or throughout the whole city are used, and whether crimes occurring both during the day and night are included can have a significant effect on the resulting statistics.

He cites a study made in one city where an increase of 250 percent in lighted streets took place from 1950 through 1954. When comparisons were made between the percentage of crimes committed at night, no reduction occurred in the categories of rape or larceny. A slight reduction appeared in highway robbery and burglary, and a significant decrease (17 percent) in auto thefts was recorded. However, a comparison of certain crimes during the peak month of October before and after the lighting was installed showed reductions of 16 percent in assaults, 33 percent in robberies, 5 percent in auto theft, and 10 percent in burglary.

"In this study, incidentally, great opportunity existed for misuse of statistics. The ones which I have quoted show the reductions found by measurements of the percentage change in night crimes. Had the actual change in number of night crimes been used (without regard to the number occurring during the daylight hours) then assaults could have been said to have been reduced from 24 night crimes in October 1945 to only 13 in October 1954. This would have been an apparent reduction of 54 percent.

"Similarly, robberies were numerically reduced from 26 at night in 1954 to only 6 at night in 1954. This reduction would have amounted to 77 percent. I have given these somewhat confusing figures to you solely for the purpose of illustrating the care which must be taken in applying statistics." [15]

The editorial writer for the Christian Science Monitor concludes: "These studies made in blight-threatened neighborhood 'laboratories,' should provide valuable information for city councils, city managers, and voters in all communities debating the usefulness of this weapon for preventing crime. Lights are not, of course, the whole answer, but they are an important and relatively inexpensive beginning to an overall attack." [16]

STREET LIGHTING AND ACCIDENT RATES

In many of the cities experiencing lower crime rates after street lighting was improved, a drop in the number of traffic accidents was also noted.

In Nashville, Tenn., it was reported that following a lighting program, the night traffic accident rate declined from 40 to 20 percent despite a 50-percent increase in motor vehicle registration over the same period.[17] Indianapolis noted a 54-percent decrease in night traffic accidents, after the initiation of a comprehensive street lighting program.[18]

The fact that Chicago's northwest expressway is continuously lighted over its 16-mile length is alleged to be responsible for the

---

[1] A Brighter Las Vegas. Las Vegas Sun, Jan. 10, 1965.

[2] Don Murray. "How Bright Lights Reduce Crime." Coronet, February 1960, p. 30.

[3] Police chiefs say "Light Deters Crime." Distributed by Street and Highway Safety Lighting Bureau, 55 Public Square, Cleveland, Ohio.

[4] John Edgar Hoover. "The Lighted Way." General Federation Clubwoman magazine, February 1963.

[5] J. Parker Heck. "Traffic Accidents Claim 43,600 Lives in 1963." Street and Highway Lighting, 1964 third quarter, pp. 12–13.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Don Murray. Op. cit., p. 33.

[8] Ibid., p. 32.

[9] "Lighting Can Cut Crime." The American City, May 1964, p. 131.

[10] "Planned Light Prevents Crime and Reduces Accidents." The American City, March 1963, pp. 125–126.

[11] Hyman Goldberg. "Crimes of Darkness." Cosmopolitan, April 1959, pp. 60–65.

[12] "Lighting Can Cut Crime," op. cit., p. 131.

[13] Editorial. Christian Science Monitor, June 27, 1959.

[14] Paul C. Box. "Accident and Crime Prevention Experience with Modern Roadway Lighting." A paper presented at the Roadway Lighting Forum, reprinted in Street and Highway Lighting, 1964 second quarter, pp. 19–27.

[15] Paul C. Box, op. cit., p. 21.

[16] Christian Science Monitor, op. cit.

[17] A Brighter Las Vegas. Op. cit.

[18] "Planned Light Prevents Crime and Reduces Accidents." The American City, March 1963.

low traffic fatality rate on this highway. In 1961, there were .74 deaths per 100 million vehicle-miles on the Chicago expressway, as compared with a national average of 2.3 deaths per 100 million vehicle miles on all expressways.[19]

An additional benefit occurred in the case of Hartford, Conn., drivers. Improved street lighting which cost the city $20,000 was followed by a lower number of traffic accidents which in turn resulted in the reduction of insurance rates by 8 percent over a period of 5 years. This saved 22,500 car-owning residents $4 each per year.[20]

Between 1953 and 1960, new lights were installed in nine locations in the State of Virginia. A study made by the Virginia Department of Highways indicated that the number of traffic accidents at these locations decreased 38 percent and the traffic fatalities dropped 90 percent.[21]

In its reporting of 1963 traffic fatalities, the Montana Highway Patrol classified the fatal accident statistics according to whether they occurred in daylight, in darkness where the street was lighted, or in darkness on an unlighted street. The results are shown in this table:

	Accidents	Total fatalities
Daylight	5,532	75
Lighted streets and highways	1,113	15
Unlighted streets and highways	2,285	88

These statistics show that the ratio of deaths to accidents on dark streets was 1 death per 25.9 accidents, while the ratio of fatalities to the number of accidents was virtually the same in the case of daylight accidents (1 to 73.8) and streets lit at night by artificial lighting (1 to 74.2).[22]

LIGHTING STANDARDS AND COSTS

The Illuminating Engineering Society (IES) is the authoritative source of technical knowledge on lighting in the United States and Canada. The IES has the responsibility for establishing a standard practice for street and highway lighting. Such a code is then submitted to the American Standards Association (ASA) for acceptance, rejection, or modification. Once approved, a standard practice represents a guide to minimum good practice, taking into account current technical knowledge and prevailing economic factors. The most recent Standard Practices in the area of street lighting were published in 1962.

According to J. Parker Heck, education director, street and highway lighting bureau, fewer than 100 of the more than 18,000 incorporated towns and cities in the United States meet minimum lighting code standards prescribed by the ASA.[23] The Edison Electric Institute has estimated that not more than 15 percent of the downtown streets in the Nation are adequately lighted, and only about one-tenth of 1 percent of the streets in residential areas meet the ASA minimum standards.[24]

According to the Edison Electric Institute, "the chief deterrent to adequate street lighting is one of cost."[25] It is difficult to make a cost esimate for improving street lighting in a city, State, or the Nation due to the many variables involved. Experts from the Edison Electric Institute have stated:

"So much depends on the existing local conditions that such an estimate if it were to have a semblance of validity would have to be made for each individual community. For example, the present level of street lighting intensity varies greatly not only between cities, but also between areas in the same city. There is also a wide variation in the type and cost of fixtures used to obtain the same level of illumination. Some communities own all the street lighting equipment and contract with the utility for electricity and also inspection and maintenance. Others only buy electricity. In still others the utility charges include provision for ownership of some or all of the equipment as well as inspection, maintenance, and electricity."[26]

Various cities have undertaken comprehensive street lighting programs and have given broad estimates of the costs involved. Beginning this year, 3,000 street lights are to be installed on 73 miles of Las Vegas streets. The cost is estimated to be between $1.5 and $2 million.[27] In Seattle, Wash., 24,000 new fixtures are needed to bring 1,225 miles of residential streets up to IES standards. The cost of this project is $4 million.[28] The street lighting program in New York City, described above, required an expenditure of $500,000 to buy and install the new equipment. However, it was found that the new lamps use $9 less electricity apiece each year and give more than twice as much light.[29]

In the case of highway lighting, illuminating engineers say the lighting cost is generally less than 1 percent of the total cost of the highway. Installation of adequate lighting is considerably cheaper if it is done at the time the highway is constructed.[30]

The police chief of Gary, Ind., justifies such expenditures this way, "A good street light is as valuable as a good policeman, and a lot cheaper."[31]

"Only in recent years have case histories provided proof positive that proper street lighting can cut nighttime fatalities by 50 percent. For the entire nation, this means a saving of 20,000 lives annually, plus an economic savings estimated to be $2 billion per year."[32]

THE DODD BILL AND THE WAR AGAINST CRIME

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNSLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in an editorial that appeared in the Louisville Courier-Journal on March 11, 1966, strongly endorsing the President's proposals for a nationwide war against crime.

The paper terms the proposals a "mixture of immediate steps, experimental projects, and long-range programs to strike at the social conditions that breed lawlessness."

In the area of immediate action the paper feels that nothing is more important than ending the "easy availability of deadly weapons to professional criminals, to delinquent youth, and to the disturbed and deranged."

Knowing that it will be read with interest, I include this editorial in the RECORD.

THE DODD BILL AND THE WAR AGAINST CRIME

President Johnson's proposals for a nationwide war against crime are a mixture of immediate steps, experimental projects and long-range programs to strike at the social conditions that breed lawlessness.

In his message to Congress, the President charted an ambitious and far-ranging campaign against both organized and spontaneous crime. He spoke in tones of urgency.

Crime, he said, exacts a high cost in money and an even more widespread cost "from millions in fear * * * fear that can turn us into a nation of captives imprisoned nightly behind chained doors, double locks, barred windows * * * fear that can make us afraid to walk city streets by night or public parks by day * * *. These are costs a truly free people cannot tolerate."

He does not exaggerate. The trouble is there are no easy answers, no pat solutions. The sweep and variety of his proposals reflect an awareness of the complexity involved.

Among other things, the President wants to speed up the administration of justice in the courts, to reform the bail system so that the poor are not its principal victims, to have drug addicts treated as sick people rather than criminals, but to deal severely with pushers.

Certain steps are recommended to Congress for immediate attention. One is a doubling of Federal assistance to local police departments for improved training and other purposes. Another is the modernization of laws to "facilitate the prosecution of criminals."

In the area of immediate action nothing is more important than ending the "easy availability of deadly weapons to professional criminals, to delinquent youth and to the disturbed and deranged."

This is simply a renewed plea for passage of the Dodd firearms-control bill that languished in committee at the last session of Congress. It would prohibit the mail-order sale of firearms to individuals and impose other checks on the scandalous and deadly traffic in firearms in this country.

This bill will provide the real test of the administration's commitment to a serious attack on crime. This newspaper hopes the President brings all of his talents of persuasion to bear on passage of this key bill.

AMENDING THE SENIORITY RULE TO MAKE SERVICE BY CONGRESSMEN IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH MORE ATTRACTIVE

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

[19] "Continuous Lighting Reduces Accidents." The American City, September 1963.
[20] "Modern Lighting for $1 a Year." The American City, August 194, p. 121.
[21] "Lighting Cuts Accidents on Virginia Highways." The American City, March 1964.
[22] J. Parker Heck, "Traffic Accidents Claim 43,600 Lives in 1963." Op. cit.
[23] "Lighting Can Cut Crime." Op. cit.
[24] Edison Electric Institute. Street Lighting Manual, 1963, p. xiii.
[25] Ibid., p. 81.
[26] Letter from Edison Electric Institute to Economics Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, dated Mar. 19, 1965.
[27] "Ambitious Lighting Program." Las Vegas Sun, Jan. 3, 1965.
[28] "Mercuries Boost Light Levels Fivefold." The American City, January 1965, p. 117.
[29] Don Murray, op. cit.
[30] Guide to Nighttime Highway Safety. Street and Highway Safety Lighting Bureau.
[31] "Lighting Can Cut Crime." Op. cit.
[32] Edison Electric Institute, op. cit., p. xiii.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, both Congress and the executive branch would benefit from a slight change in the seniority rule which would make it more attractive for Members of Congress to serve temporarily in high-level posts in the administration.

I have recently submitted such a proposal for an amendment in the seniority system to the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. Because I believe many Members would be interested in this proposal, I ask that my statement to the Joint Committee be included at the conclusion of my remarks.

Congress ought to be an important source for the political executives who must be constantly sought for the administration. The service of Congressmen as administrators would help the President meet his need for men with a keen sense for policy. Their return to Congress would add the influence and experience of former heads of departments and agencies to the legislative process. Relations between the two branches could be improved and the United States, with its separation of powers system, could obtain some of the advantages of the broadening combination of executive and legislative service characteristic of parliamentary government.

As it is now, however, a Member of Congress who serves in the executive branch and is reelected to the same body starts again at the bottom in seniority, ranking ahead of only those Members first elected in the year in which he is reelected. This, plus the difficulty of winning back a seat after an absence of several years, strongly discourage executive branch service by Members of Congress.

Should we consider altering the seniority rules so that under certain conditions a returning Congressman would resume his seniority?

The text of my statement on this proposal follows:

A PROPOSAL TO MAKE SERVICE IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH MORE ATTRACTIVE TO U.S. LEGISLATORS

(Statement by Representative HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin, to the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, Mar. 3, 1966)

In the course of its review of congressional organization and procedure the joint committee will, I hope, give consideration to the opportunity which exists to enlarge the role of Congress in our governmental system by making the membership of the House and Senate more available as a source of recruitment for high-level positions in the executive branch.

This can be done quite simply by amending present seniority practices so that a legislator who leaves Congress to accept such a position in the executive branch would maintain his seniority if he should later be reelected to Congress.

I. Congress ought to be, but unfortunately is not, a prime source of recruitment for high-level positions in the executive branch.

(a) There exists among Members of Congress talents and abilities useful in policy-making positions in the various departments and agencies.

New national administrations have in recent years drawn increasingly on business, on the universities, on philanthropic foundations and on the ranks of the career civil service in their endless search for capable and knowledgeable people to serve as high-level officials of major departments and independent agencies. These are the so-called political executives—the lieutenants of the Chief Executive, charged both with implementing his policies within the bureaucracy and with arguing for and defending his program before the public.

Experience in Congress is a valuable background for the requirements of top-level positions in the executive branch. A study by Walter Kravitz of the Governmental and General Research Division of the Library of Congress, dated February 8, 1966, summed up the advantages of congressional service this way:

"After spending many years, and in some cases decades, on specialized committees and subcommittees, many Members of Congress have become acknowledged authorities in their fields. Indeed, it has been said of some chairmen and high-ranking members that they know more about the organization, administration and problems of the Federal agencies with which they deal than do those agencies' administrators, especially at the appointive level."

Important, too, in addition to the knowledge of particular Government programs, is the broad understanding of the process of formulating and carrying out national policy to be found among Members of Congress, and the comprehension of both the possibilities and the limitations of political action, growing out of long experience on the Washington scene.

(b) Many of the difficulties encountered in the recruitment of executives from outside the Government would not be encountered in an expanded effort to draw individuals from Congress.

The Library of Congress study noted six respects in which this seems to be the case:

1. "Reluctance on the part of individuals from business and industry to accept the financial sacrifice entailed by Government service. The pay is usually lower, the fringe benefits not so generous, and the future uncertain.

"For Members of Congress, salaries and benefits would be roughly comparable.

2. "Outsiders may be reluctant to divest themselves of holdings which might result in conflicts of interest.

"Members of Congress will find far fewer problems of this sort moving into an official position than will executives of business corporations.

3. "Among some businessmen and outsiders, service with the Government still tends to be held in low prestige.

"Members of Congress have no such view.

4. "Unfamiliarity with, and fear of, the redtape of Government bureaucracy, and an alleged loss of freedom and independence, still deter many outsiders from accepting posts with Federal departments and agencies.

"Members of Congress, on the other hand, are familiar with these procedures and know how to operate within them.

5. "One of the really critical qualifications for Federal service is often hardest to find among individuals in private affairs: That is, a sense for politics and an ability to deal effectively with Congress.

"This is the world, of course, in which Members of Congress have made their careers.

6. "Outsiders are often, finally, reluctant to move their families to an unfamiliar city and social environment.

"Members of Congress have established households in Washington."

(c) Only a few Members, however, have moved between the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

One of the great strengths of our Federal system—though seldom commented on explicitly—has been the free movement of individuals not only between a city council and the State legislature, or between a State legislature and Congress; but also between a mayor's office and the State senate, and between a governorship and Congress, in a continual blending of executive and legislative experience. Not many men will be able, as was the late James F. Byrnes, to serve with great distinction at the top level of all three branches of our National Government. But it is an ideal to be encouraged.

There are in Congress at the present time a number of men who have held major positions in the executive branch. Senators ROBERT KENNEDY and ABRAHAM RIBICOFF have been members of the President's Cabinet. Senator STUART SYMINGTON is a former Secretary of the Air Force. Senator THRUSTON MORTON is a former Assistant Secretary of State, as is Senator DONALD RUSSELL.

In the House, experience within the executive branch tends to have come at a more junior, lower level, often in staff positions and frequently at a relatively early stage in the Member's career. Representative KEN HECHLER is a former special assistant to President Truman. Representative JONATHAN BINGHAM served in the Department of State and later as deputy and acting administrator of the Technical Cooperation Administration. Representative CLARENCE LONG is a former staff member of the Council of Economic Advisers. Representative TOM MURRAY served during the early 1940's in the Office of the Solicitor of the Post Office.

This list is by no means complete. But it is representative. Particularly worth noting is that in many cases the executive branch service tends to have come during World War II. Barring another such untypical period Congress may, therefore, gradually tend to lose much of its presently accumulated first-hand experience in administrative service over the coming years.

Worth noting, too, is that so far as there is a discernible movement of individuals between Congress and the Executive, it occurs mainly as a flow away from the House, through the Executive and eventually into the Senate. The "purest" cases are those of Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, who began in the House, moved to the executive branch as a special assistant and director of food for peace in 1961–62, and then came to the Senate; and of Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, who served three terms in the House, then became Secretary of Agriculture, and then came to the Senate in 1949.

II. Here are two obstacles discouraging Representatives and Senators from making themselves available for temporary service in a national administration, but the principal one is the present arrangement for determining seniority within the committees and subcommittees of Congress.

(a) Since ours is not a parliamentary system, a Member intending to serve with the Executive is obliged to resign his seat, and to return to the House must run for election and win again.

This is in itself a significant restraint. The seat a man vacates when he goes to serve with an administration is soon filled by another, who quickly begins making his own record, and building his own ties with the district. And—unlike the British system, in which a member of Parliament may seek out a constituency safe for his party in which to stand for election—Members of Congress still generally reside in and represent individual districts.

It would not, however, be an insuperable obstacle, by itself. From time to time, in different parts of the country, there be Con-

gressmen willing to take the gamble, who would—after leaving the administration—try to secure again the endorsement and the nomination of their party, and who would, occasionally, be able to win back their seats. Occasionally, too, a Member who had at the time of his resignation represented one particular House district (perhaps of a larger city) would find an opportunity to move to a neighboring district where he had also been known, where he could run for election and win.

(b) The true deterrent is the present requirement that, upon returning to Congress, the Member starts again at the bottom of the seniority ladder in committees.

At the present time the two parties differ in the House in their practice for assigning to committees Members returning after an absence of one or more terms. The Republicans grant him some priority in claiming the committees on which he formerly sat; the Democrats do not. Both parties, however (and this is what is crucial) provide that—however senior the Member at the time he resigned from the Congress to enter the executive branch—he starts, upon reelection, behind all those Members newly elected during his absence and ahead only of those members of the committee elected the previous fall who do not have prior service.

This arrangement operates with particular force to discourage Members of Congress from resigning to serve in the executive branch, since it is precisely those more senior and better experienced Members—those most likely to be sought out by an administration as high-level officials—who have the most to lose by resigning.

III. This obstacle could be removed by providing that a Member who resigned to serve in the executive branch could, upon reelection, resume the places on his committees which he held when he left.

(a) A simple resolution of the party caucuses would be sufficient to introduce a basic change in the system for committee appointments.

The Library of Congress study points out:

"The seniority system is based on custom, not on rule. There are no formally adopted delineations of it. It remains in effect because the parties in both Houses of Congress voluntarily adhere to it. Technically the rules provide that committee appointments shall be made by each House (cf. Senate rule XXIV and House rule X). Actually, both chambers automatically accept the will of the parties. Members once assigned to committees retain their positions and their rankings without change unless their party's ratio on that particular committee is reduced, in which case the lowest ranking Members are dropped first. Assignment of new Members and transfers are decided on by the Committees on Committees.

"Again speaking technically, the powers of the committees on committees in both Houses and in both parties flow from authority delegated to them by the party caucuses. They are creatures of the caucuses and their decisions are subject to the approval of their parent political bodies. Since the final power lies with the caucuses, they may alter the present system as they choose or make exceptions to it. For example, at the beginning of the 89th Congress the House Democratic caucus reduced the seniority ranking of two Members.

"There is little question, therefore, that the caucuses have the authority, if they desire, to alter the present seniority system so as to provide that Members of Congress appointed to the highest level posts in the executive branch, and particularly posts requiring Senate confirmation, could, if later reelected to the same House, retain their seniority standings."

(B) None of the possible objections and complications really invalidates this essential proposal.

A number of specific questions do arise, both as to which appointments to positions in the executive branch should be covered under this special provision in the seniority system, and as to the particular adjustment of rankings within a committee or subcommittee.

Let me spell out the answers as I see them * * * with the aim, consistently, of keeping the adjustments in the seniority system as small and as uncomplicated as possible.

1. The right of return to committee posts should come into effect only for a Member who resigns while currently holding his seat. It should not be available to a lame duck who might be offered an appointment to an executive agency in the fall of the year following an election in which he either did not run or had run and been defeated.

2. The right ought to be limited in terms of the number of executive branch positions to which it would apply. One simple yet workable approach would be to limit it to those posts requiring confirmation by the Senate.

3. The provision ought to be open to any Member of Congress—specifically including even those most junior Members of the House and Senate.

4. It would be wise, however, to limit the right to a stated length of time. The value to Congress of a Member's temporary service in the executive branch will be greater, and the complications of his return fewer, if the period is limited to, say, 4 or 6 years.

5. Guarded and circumscribed in this way, it would be possible then for the change in the present arrangements to provide that a Member returning to Congress after such service with the executive branch would be permitted to return to the place on the committees and subcommittees which he would have held if in fact he had never left the Congress at all.

One other option, of course, would be to provide that a Member returning after such service would take the place on his committees and subcommittees to which he would then be entitled by the number of terms he had served on those committees prior to his resignation to join the executive branch. This sort of complicated arrangement could, however—particularly when a rapid turnover of committee positions can be anticipated—effectively raise up the same obstacle to a Member's serving in the administration which we have been trying to remove. If Members' service in policymaking executive positions is really to be encouraged, I am inclined to think the former, simpler arrangement will need to be adopted.

6. We can assume that most Members who might resign under this new provision would later be reelected from the same district from which they were originally elected. I see no objection, however, to making this a privilege that resides with the individual House Member, rather than with the district from which he comes. This approach would also avoid complications that might arise as a result of a redistricting during the period the Member was serving with the executive branch.

IV. The resulting freer exchange of personnel between the two branches of Government should be of important benefit both to the Executive and to Congress.

As the Library of Congress study points out:

"The complexities of today's public policy issues and their almost overwhelming number have resulted in serious management and organizational problems for both the executive branch and Congress. The increase in the number of persons sufficiently expert and experienced to meet the multifarious interests of the Federal Government has not kept pace with the need. Consequently, expertise has become a relatively rare and valuable social resource."

Little more need to be said about the desirability, to the executive branch, of opening up the Congress as a source of recruitment for political executives.

There would be important advantages to Congress, too, from any new arrangement which actively encouraged Members to take temporary service with an administration and thereafter to resume their legislative careers. It would open up an additional channel of influence for its Members. And it would bring back into its Chambers, ultimately, the additional influence and knowledge earned by those who have served as high-level officials in the executive branch.

It would also, not least, contribute significantly to a better understanding and smoother relationship between the two branches of our Government.

The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress carries not only an official charge to review the organization of committees and the rearrangement of functions within the House and Senate but also, in a broad sense, an informal charge to consider the changes and adjustments needed to keep Congress in the future, as it has been in the past, the strongest and most viable parliament of any government in the world. Changes, and new approaches, will be required for Congress to retain its vital role. I hope the joint committee will study the proposal I have been discussing, and will perhaps commend it to the Houses of Congress as a feasible and desirable step for either or both of them to take.

WGST CELEBRATES 44TH YEAR

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, 44 years is a venerable age among radio stations. That is the anniversary which WGST—the Georgia Tech radio station—in Atlanta, Ga., celebrated on March 17, 1966.

The year 1922 was a boom year in the recently born field of radio. The old radio committee of the Department of Commerce began licensing radio stations for the primary purpose of providing weather information for farmers. Early that year the Atlanta Constitution applied for a license to operate such a station and on March 15, 1922, that license was granted. The station signed on the air 2 days later at 7 p.m., Friday, March 17, 1922.

The following year the Constitution presented the fledgling station to the Georgia School of Technology and the call letters WGST were initiated. Forty-four years later the station continues its tradition of service and has proven one of the most valuable endowments of Georgia Tech.

Today the station operates at 920 kilocycles with 5,000 watts. WGST is operated under the auspices of the radio committee of the board of regents university system of Georgia for and on behalf of the Georgia Institute of Technology. Chairman of the radio committee is Mr. John Langdale, of Valdosta, and general manager of WGST is Mr. John W. Collins.

WGST has been a pacesetter in the field of radio communications in Georgia, the South, and the Nation. In the first month of operation the station set a long distance record when a two-way communication was established with San Francisco. Letters reporting reception were received from as far away as Alaska. On the second day of broadcasting the station aired a live concert by the Emory University Glee Club.

Some notable instances of service in WGST's history:

When a tornado devastated Gainesville, Ga., on April 6, 1936, WGST dispatched three cars with engineers, nurses, announcers, and medical necessities to the scene. The first communication between the stricken community and the outside world was established by the WGST engineers.

In 1962 WGST founded the Georgia News Network which has for the first time in the history of Georgia linked radio stations in every area of the State into a massive news gathering and disseminating media. The member stations of the Georgia News Network feed news from their coverage area to the WGST newsroom where it is edited and compiled into a 15-minute newscast which is fed via telephone lines to the member stations each weekday morning. The Georgia News Network has been utilized for many important events. WGST is the originating station for "Southern Farm Facts," a 5-minute daily program aired over 51 stations in the Southeast. Thus the interest of the farmer is still served as was the original licensed objective of the station.

As WGST enters its 45th year plans are underway to grow with Atlanta, particularly in the area of local news coverage. Two additional mobile news units complete with the latest transistorized equipment are being placed into service, along with a Portamobile transmitter.

I join WGST's many friends in saluting its achievements.

THE NEED FOR A VICE PRESIDENTS' HOUSE

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, let me point out one over-riding, salient fact in all this discussion about a Vice Presidential residence.

There is no disagreement about the need for such a building.

It has been suggested, advocated, and declared a simple necessity for more than 35 years, although offers of fine homes were made to the Federal Government long before.

But since the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration, the office of the Vice President has been escalated into the status of "Assistant President," although we are reluctant to use this terminology. Every Vice President since Harry A. Wallace was delegated as a roving ambassador to the world at large, the duties of the Vice President have multiplied enormously.

This is common knowledge. And so is the realization that we are not giving the Vice President proper and adequate facilities and the tools to do the job all of us expect him to do. We get evidence of this every week, just by reading the daily press. There is a constant scramble to provide the Vice President with suitable quarters for conferences, ceremonial functions, and the social events demanded by international custom and courtesy. There cannot be argument that we are attempting to create good impressions on our visitors and abroad. And who will argue that we often fall short of putting our best foot forward at some of these occasions.

Again, I say that there is universal agreement that we need a Vice-Presidential residence and consent that it is a pressing problem.

With this universal admission and agreement, it just does not make commonsense to say: "Sure we need such an official residence—but not now—let us wait. Let us have another Commission to mull it over."

There never was a better time than now to get on with a job which needs to be done and delayed too long.

Any more study or investigation by any group would be sheer waste of the taxpayers' money. The proposal given to us today is well planned; it has foresight and financial prudence. Above all, it recognizes our obligations and responsibilities and it will meet them in the best way possible.

MICHIGAN CITY RED DEVILS WIN INDIANA STATE BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I call to the attention of my colleagues this year's Indiana State championship basketball team, the Michigan City Elston High School Red Devils, from my congressional district.

In the State of Indiana, the sport of basketball is rivaled only by what some observers have called the sport of politics. For four weekends in a row, the citizens of Indiana are the victims of an overpowering end-of-winter malady, commonly known as "Hoosier hysteria." The symptoms are argumentativeness, runny eyes, hoarse voices, a ringing in the ears, and nervous palpitations. These symptoms are the result of overcrowded and overheated gymnasiums, thunderous cheering, do-or-die pep talks, and a desire to win rarely surpassed in human competition.

The Indiana State basketball tournament, unlike tournaments in many other States, has no divisions or classes. Every high school team—large, small, public and private—competes on an equal footing until the strong have been sifted from the weak and the final champion has emerged from 4 weeks of the toughest State basketball competition in the Nation.

For the first time in the history of the school, the Michigan City Elston High School Red Devils captured the State championship and closed their finest season with a 26 and 3 record and a 20-game streak of victories.

In addition, James Cadwell, a Michigan City senior star, won the coveted Arthur L. Trester Award for Mental Attitude in tournament play. He was the 50th recipient of the annual award and the unanimous choice of the Indiana High School Athletic Association's board of control.

The other members of the 10-man championship squad are Mike Adams, Stan Farmer, Sam Garrett, Larry Gipson, Harold Kennedy, Dennis Krueger, Rob McFarland, Terry Morse, and O'Neil Simmons.

Their fine coach is Doug Adams and the assistant coach is Al Whitlow.

Warren Jones is the high school principal and Elmer Millbranth is the athletic director.

The team manager is Bob Hampton.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add my congratulations to this year's Indiana State champion basketball team, the Red Devils of Michigan City.

THE 117th ANNUAL BANQUET OF THE ST. PATRICK SOCIETY OF BROOKLYN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday, March 17, I had the privilege of again attending the annual dinner of the St. Patrick Society of Brooklyn.

The following is the program on that occasion as well as the remarks of Rev. Daniel A. Gilroy, of Our Lady of Refuge Church in Brooklyn, entitled "The Day We Celebrate":

TOASTS OF THE 117TH ANNUAL BANQUET OF THE ST. PATRICK SOCIETY OF BROOKLYN

"The Star-Spangled Banner."

Invocation: Rev. Thomas J. Swarbrick, pastor, St. Joseph's Church, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Toast to the President of the United States.

Speakers: Eugene F. O'Connor, chairman, dinner committee; Walter E. Cooke, president of the society, toastmaster.

"The Day We Celebrate," Rev. Daniel A. Gilroy, Our Lady of Refuge Church, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Benediction.

THE DAY WE CELEBRATE

(By Rev. Daniel A. Gilroy)

Throughout the United States in these past few days toastmasters have called on speakers to address the audience on the day we celebrate. For no matter how far removed

one may be from the Emerald Isle, St. Patrick's Day brings out the cultural ties that span ocean waters and years. St. Patrick's Day is a day of thanksgiving to a missioner who brought a people from the darkness of paganism into the light of a spreading Judeo-Christian civilization.

In the early part of the fifth century after some Roman legions were withdrawn from their outposts in Britain, maurauding sailors from Ireland invaded the unprotected coastal villages. In one such Roman colony hostages were taken back to Ireland and sold as slaves. Patrick, a teenage son of a Roman tax official, was a victim of this kind of raid, brought to Ireland and sold into slavery as a tender of herds. The long days and short nights of this lonely boy were spent in prayer and dreams and, captivated by the people of Ireland, he had visions of being a help to them.

Escaping after a few years, he traveled to the continent bent on an education, his memory ever on the people of Ireland. After he became a priest and bishop he led a band of missionaries to Erin's shore. Twenty years had passed and his love for these people had increased. Though pagan, the Irish were not primitive. They had a well developed language, a high degree of culture and complex social and legal systems.

The legend of the shamrock, the traditional symbol of St. Patrick's Day, had its roots in an incident which took place shortly after Patrick had arrived in Ireland. On the eve of Easter, which coincided with the pagan feats of Beltaine when all hearth fires were quenched, the Christian missioner pierced the dark and gloom with the new Easter fire. Summoned by King Laoghaire for breaking the law, he presented his credentials in a conflict with the Druid priests and in explaining the Christian doctrine attempted to show the reasonableness of the belief in the Blessed Trinity by plucking from the earth the three-leaf shamrock. The work thus begun with this example spread over Ireland.

In the year 461 on the 17th of March he rendered his soul to God and immediately he was assigned a place with full honors in the Irish heroic cycle. The bards who sang of heroes of times gone by found their greatest subject in the slave boy who came back to conquer for Christ.

There is a racial affinity generated by heritage and culture so that the native-born Irishman will "welcome home" one who is Irish by descent and will look upon anyone anywhere with the tiniest drop of Irish blood as one of their exiles.

The Irish are conscious of tradition and history possibly more than any other race and because of it they are never able to forget their debt to St. Patrick. The sentimental Irish nature has created a historic fixation in the offspring of their exiles who will speak with pride of the county where their forebears originated or recount deeds of the great Irish patriots.

The road that passes every door in Ireland leads to the farthest corner or nook of the globe, and once it has been traveled there is a yearning to retrace the steps of its path, a yearning which if not fulfilled in person is passed on in the blood of offspring. Because of that blood we can proudly say tonight, "Thank God for St. Patrick and the faith he gave to us."

PUERTO RICO EMANCIPATION DAY, MARCH 22, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today on the lovely island of Puerto Rico, the people of the Commonwealth will be observing Emancipation Day. This observance commemorates the day upon which slavery was abolished in Puerto Rico. It commemorates the day upon which the people of this enchanting island tasted their first fruits of victory in a long and ardent struggle for complete freedom.

It is well for all Americans to join with our fellow citizens who have come from the great Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in congratulating all Puerto Ricans upon the observance of this historic event.

It is well for us to remember that ever since the discovery by Columbus of the island in 1493 its people and its physical location have been of great importance to the economic growth and to the political security of this Nation. As a territory it played an important role in our development. As a Commonwealth it has become even more important to us.

I am proud, Mr. Chairman, of the part I was privileged to play back in 1952 in helping Puerto Rico achieve its unique status as a Commonwealth.

I recall with sincere pride the courtesy of our late and beloved Speaker Sam Rayburn in permitting me to chair the proceedings on May 28, 1952, which gave Puerto Rico its self-autonomy while at the same time permitting it to enjoy the position of an associated State in our federal system. On the heels of that important act of Congress, Puerto Rico has begun a whole series of dramatic economic, social, and political developments.

In spite of being one of the most densely populated areas of the world, it has the highest standard of living among all the countries loosely described as Latin America.

We as Americans share in the pride of the people of Puerto Rico and their leaders for the manner in which they have expanded and improved their transportation, electric power, and communications systems. We are proud, too, of the manner in which their public and private housing programs are progressing so rapidly. We marvel, too, at the manner in which Puerto Rico has accomplished so much in providing expanded school opportunities for the young people and for the grownups heretofore denied education. We rejoice that the Commonwealth has developed such far-reaching social welfare benefits to the sick and the needy.

Mr. Speaker, there is indeed a benign, bloodless revolution now at work in Puerto Rico which is bringing untold blessings to the people who today celebrate their Emancipation Day. I feel particularly close to them because of my intimate friendship with so many of them who today make their homes in my congressional district. I know firsthand the splendid contribution which so many of them are making to my district, my city, my State, and to the Nation. They are devoted citizens and conscientious workers. They bring to us a warmth of friendship, a love of beauty, and a richness of culture for which we are most grateful.

I extend to all who pride themselves in their Puerto Rican heritage my warmest best wishes for continued success and happiness.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HAGAN of Georgia (at the request of Mr. FOUNTAIN), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. CARTER), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY of New York (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana), for 30 minutes, today, on two different subjects; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PHILBIN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TENZER.

Mr. RONCALIO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CARTER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCEWEN.

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. REINECKE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CALLAN.

Mr. MACHEN.

Mr. WOLFF in two instances.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. ANNUNZIO.

Mr. BANDSTRA.

Mr. HUNGATE.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1488. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the 6-month waiting period, of approximately 126,300 long calcined tons of refractory grade bauxite from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2642. An act to authorize the release of platinum from the national stockpile, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 10553. An act to preserve the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of

1954, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 for congressional employees receiving certain congressional staff fellowships.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 969. An act to authorize redetermination under the Civil Service Retirement Act of annuities of certain reemployed annuitants;

H.R. 7526. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Antonio;

H.R. 10553. An act to preserve the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 for congressional employees receiving certain congressional staff fellowships; and

H.R. 10722. An act to authorize the payment of an allowance of not to exceed $10 per day to employees assigned to duty at the Nevada Test Site of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes, p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 23, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2221. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims and judgments rendered against the United States, as provided by various laws (H. Doc. No. 414); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2222. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1966, for the legislative branch (H. Doc. No. 415); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2223. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed amendment to the budget for fiscal year 1967, for the Federal Aviation Agency (H. Doc. No. 416); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2224. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480, agreements signed during February 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2225. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the fourth annual report of the Office of Civil Defense covering civil defense functions assigned to the Secretary by Executive Order 10952 of July 20, 1961, pursuant to the provisions of the Executive order and section 406 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2226. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report that no military construction contracts had been awarded on other than a competitive basis during the period July 1, 1965, through December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89–188; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2227. A letter from the national secretary-treasurer, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, transmitting the 84th Annual National Encampment proceedings of the national organization, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 83–605; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2228. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 10476. A bill to retrocede to the State of Kansas concurrent jurisdiction over Haskell Institute; without amendment (Rept. No. 1343). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 13848. A bill authorizing the sale of standard silver dollars held by the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 13849. A bill to provide for a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 13850. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to broaden the veterans' educational assistance program under that title to provide for assistance in on-the-job training programs, on-the-farm training programs, and certain flight training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.R. 13851. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 13852. A bill to authorize the construction of the Klamath River project in the State of California for flood control and related purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 13853. A bill to establish a consolidated Federal corrections system and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13854. A bill to establish a Commission on Revision of the Federal Criminal Laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 13855. A bill to establish a Commission on Revision of the Federal Criminal Laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 13856. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 13857. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FARNSLEY:

H.R. 13858. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 13859. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 13860. A bill authorizing the sale of standard silver dollars held by the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

My Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 13861. A bill to make the overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense eligible for assistance under titles II and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 13862. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 13863. A bill to simplify the requirements of section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to assignments executed to secure loans from federally insured banks; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HANSEN of Iowa:

H.R. 13864. A bill authorizing the sale of standard silver dollars held by the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 13865. A bill to provide for the temporary suspension of duty on certain granulated and ground cork and on certain natural and composition cork cut or modeled into rods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 13866. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize a civilian health benefits program for retired members of the uniformed services and their dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13867. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to increase health benefits for dependents of members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13868. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13869. A bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to maintain parity between military and civilian pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13870. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 13871. A bill to provide for a program to advance the humane care, comfort, and welfare of laboratory animals used in scientific study; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13872. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish the position of Chief Veterinary Officer of the Service and provide for the rank of Assistant Surgeon General for said position; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H.R. 13873. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children and to insure that children participating in domestic nonprofit school lunch programs will be assured of adequate supplies of nutritious dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 13874. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MACKAY:

H.R. 13875. A bill to amend section 255 of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to eliminate epilepsy as an affliction prohibiting employment of aliens on board vessels arriving in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.R. 13876. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to make changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 13877. A bill to correct certain inequities and relieve certain liabilities arising out of overpayments of compensation to Government employees as a result of administrative error in the application of certain provisions of the Classification Act of 1949, the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964, and other provisions of law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 13878. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 13879. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in every State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 13880. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 7-percent increase in all annuities and pensions payable thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 13881. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 13882. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to make changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 13883. A bill to assist the State of Florida and certain property owners in resolving problems of landownership and use of the Naval Live Oak Reservation property at Gulf Breeze, Fla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 13884. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for the purposes of strengthening and facilitating mutual cooperation and assistance, including training of personnel, in the administration and enforcement of that act and of State and local laws relating to food, drugs, devices, or cosmetics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13885. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to improve the safety and reliability of drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13886. A bill to protect children and others from accidental death or injury by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to aspirin intended for children, safety closures on drug containers, and cautionary labeling of containers of articles subject to the act where necessary to that end, and by amending the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act to ban hazardous toys and articles intended for children, and other articles so hazardous as to be dangerous in the household regardless of labeling, and to apply to unpackaged articles intended for household use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TODD:

H.R. 13887. A bill authorizing the sale of standard silver dollars held by the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 13888. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 13889. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to provide for the use of counterpart funds for international agricultural conferences; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 13890. A bill to amend titles III and XI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to strengthen instruction in school health and physical education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 13891. A bill to authorize the conclusion of an agreement for the joint construction by the United States and Mexico of an international flood control project for the Tijuana River in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of February 3, 1944, with Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 13892. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 13893. A bill to permit all patients currently using the drug Krebiozen to purchase same in Illinois for use in any State until a clinical test on cancer patients is completed; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 13894. A bill to facilitate the management, use, and public benefits from the Appalachian Trail, a scenic trail designed primarily for foot travel through natural or primitive areas, and extending generally from Maine to Georgia; to facilitate and promote Federal, State, local, and private cooperation and assistance for the promotion of the trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LAIRD (by request):

H.R. 13895. A bill to provide that where the entitlement of a veteran, widow, or child to a pension from the Veterans' Administration is based upon the veteran's having served in World War I, the beneficiary shall if otherwise eligible have the right to elect payment of pension under either the provisions of title 38 as in effect on June 30, 1960, or as amended by the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959, whichever provides the greater benefit; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 13896. A bill to set a definite limit on the number of employees supervised by a foreman of mails; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 13897. A bill to establish and maintain orderly marketing conditions for processing pears in the interest of producers and consumers, and an orderly flow of the supply thereof to market throughout its normal marketing season to avoid unreasonable fluctuations in supplies and prices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 13898. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to old-age, survivors, disability, and hospital insurance protection for certain Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 13899. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to old-age, survivors, disability, and hospital insurance protection for certain Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 13900. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to old-age, survivors, disability, and hospital insurance protection for certain Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 13901. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to old-age, survivors, disability, and hospital insurance protection for certain Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 13902. A bill to provide a method of regulating and fixing wage rates for ungraded employees in the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 13903. A bill to protect consumers, homebuilders, building material suppliers, lumber manufacturers, and others against false grade marking of lumber, to promote interstate commerce in lumber, to strengthen the standards program of the lumber industry and to promote the general welfare; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 13904. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 13905. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.J. Res. 967. Joint resolution to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.J. Res. 968. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.J. Res. 969. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning with the fourth Sunday of February of each year as National Father and Son Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.J. Res. 970. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.J. Res. 971. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning on April 17, 1966, as National Coin Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.J. Res. 972. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the 7-day period beginning the second week of September this year and each year thereafter as "National Family Health Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.J. Res 973. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.J. Res. 974. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 787. Resolution to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 94; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. Res. 788. Resolution relative to the anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. Res. 789. Resolution relative to the anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Res. 790. Resolution relative to the anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

H. Res. 791. Resolution relative to the anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Res. 792. Resolution relative to the anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Res. 793. Resolution relative to the anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

427. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia, relative to a special milk program for children, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 13906. A bill for the relief of Giusto and Maria Saltarelli Nicastro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 13907. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gladys Margaret Catherine Laming; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 13908. A bill for the relief of Varunny A. Malickel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 13909. A bill for the relief of Edward G. Beagle, Jr., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13910. A bill for the relief of Charles J. Arnold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 13911. A bill to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the University of Chicago; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 13912. A bill for the relief of Fiorina Gallo Braillon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13913. A bill for the relief of Cynthia Brandford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

352. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the president, Foggy Bottom Association, Washington, D.C., relative to the proposed use of jet aircraft at National Airport, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Future Homemakers: Tomorrow's Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD M. FRASER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to a youth organization that probably receives far less recognition than it deserves.

This organization is the Future Homemakers of America. March 27 through April 2 has been designated National FHA Week. Throughout the week, more than 600,000 FHA members in 11,000 chapters will observe the event. There are chapters in secondary schools throughout the United States, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and in American Army post schools throughout the world.

The members of FHA are the teenagers of whom the Nation should be proud. They are home economic students in junior and senior high schools. They are the good homemakers and good citizens of tomorrow.

In Minnesota, Future Homemakers claims more than 18,000 members in 420 chapters. In my district, Minneapolis, and its suburbs there are seven chapters in six high schools. Edison, North, Patrick Henry—two—Minnehaha Academy, Roosevelt and Brooklyn Center.

Minnesota's State FHA president is Jane Marcotte of Marshall. The State adviser is Lila M. Mallough of the Minnesota Department of Education.

My congratulations, Mr. Speaker, to this fine organization and its leaders.

Restore Budget Cuts in Special Milk Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, the deletion of $82 million in the special milk program, as proposed in the President's budget, would effect a drastic curtailment of this program. Many areas of the Nation have expressed concern over this segment of the proposed 1966–67 budget. This cut would, in effect, emasculate a program designed to promote sound nutritional benefit to school children throughout the Nation.

In my own State of New York for example, the far-reaching impact of such an unwise cut would affect 4,020 schools participating in the special milk program. New York State's allocation would be reduced by an estimated $8.6 million.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to provide for a permanent special milk program and to insure that school children receive top priority in distribution of dairy products acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Farmers' Hides Are Taken Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR CALLAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, the livestock industry in Nebraska, and the Nation, will suffer heavy losses if the recently imposed export quotas on hides are not immediately removed by the U.S. Department of Commerce.

The export quotas on hides, declares the Department of Commerce, are to "maintain existing domestic supplies."

This means that the tanners can now buy their hides at a lower price—at the expense of the farmer. Our livestock industry would prefer to sell domestically, provided the domestic markets would pay competitive world prices.

The domestic market has already dropped 5 cents per pound for hides. This amounts to about $4 per hide. The live cattle prices dropped immediately as the result of the lower domestic hide prices. These losses are always passed back to the original producer.

In Nebraska, the export quota order will mean a loss of more than $17 million to our producers this year.

The American livestock industry and the U.S. Department of Agriculture have been overseas promoting the sales of beef and beef byproducts—and getting results.

Last year, exports of cattle hides rose to 13.3 million—and brought us almost one-quarter billion dollars. The livestock industry not only helped itself, but helped the Nation with the foreign exchange problem of gold outflow and balance of payments.

Will we be paying less for shoes, Mr. Speaker, because hides are being bought for less money by tanners? About 25 pairs of shoes are made from a hide. This means there is about 70 cents of green hide in each pair of shoes. If the price of hides drops one-fourth, this means the price of leather in a pair of shoes will go down only 20 cents. It is difficult to believe that this savings will be passed on to the purchaser of a pair of shoes.

Mr. Speaker, if it takes legislative action to negate this export quota order on hides, let us act immediately.

Questionnaire in Missouri's Ninth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that we of the 89th Congress can be justifiably proud of our record achievements during the 1st session, but many weighty decisions must still be made on domestic and foreign issues before this session ends.

In an effort to sound the sentiment and gain the advice of my constituents on a number of our more controversial measures and the more pressing issues facing us at this time, I issued a questionnaire at random throughout the Ninth District. I think the results will be of great interest to my colleagues and request permission to reprint the results following:

1. Do you approve of our Government's policy in Vietnam? Yes (1,507), no (900), undecided (135).

a. Would you favor withdrawal of troops from Vietnam, leaving the area to Vietcong? Yes (424), no (1,938), undecided (175).

b. Would you favor extending the war with widespread bombings and additional troop commitments? Yes (1,577), no (693), undecided (275).

2. Should Red China be admitted to the United Nations? Yes (671), no (1,712), undecided (153).

3. Is the poverty program effective in your area? Yes (395), no (1,195), undecided (948).

4. Do you favor expanding coverage of fair labor standards and minimum wage laws to farm workers, restaurant, motel, and filling station employees? Yes (1,759), no (657), undecided (126).

5. Would you favor an increase in congressional terms from 2 to 4 years? Yes (1,389), no (1,189), undecided (66).

The 93d Anniversary of Abolition of Slavery in Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today, March 22, marks a shining moment in Puerto Rico's history—the 93d anniversary of the emancipation of slaves in Puerto Rico.

Slavery was first introduced to Puerto Rico in 1502 when Juan Sanchez obtained permission to bring five caravels of Negro slaves into Puerto Rico free of duty. In 1513 the general introduction of slaves was authorized upon the payment of a tax of 2 ducats per head, and by 1531 over 1,500 Negro slaves had been imported. By the end of the 16th century, Negroes had largely replaced Indians in the fields and sugar mills, and slave traffic continued to expand during the 17th and 18th centuries. It has been estimated that by 1830 the Negro slaves in Puerto Rico numbered about 34,000.

The relation between masters and slaves in Puerto Rico in the 19th century probably did not differ materially from such relations elsewhere. The most barbarous customs of earlier days, such as branding, had been abandoned, but racial strife continued, as evidenced by the severity of the slaveowners and the resulting sullen resentment of the slaves.

Elsewhere in the world, significant gains were made in man's age-old struggle for freedom. Slavery was abolished in Santo Domingo in 1801; in the British dominions in 1838; in France in 1849; in Holland in 1863; and in the United States in 1865. Such events could hardly fail to have an effect upon the movement in Puerto Rico.

One difference between developments in the United States and in Puerto Rico is worthy of note. The 13 North American colonies declared their independence in 1776 and subsequently won acknowledgment of that independence, but almost a century was to elapse before our Nation saw fit to apply the doctrine of freedom to the Negro slaves. In Puerto Rico, however, the movement toward self-government proceeded hand in hand with the movement toward emancipation.

The great liberal leaders who were in the forefront of this emancipation movement have bequeathed to Puerto Rico a noble heritage. Among these courageous leaders were De Castro, Acosta, Betances, Belvis, and De Vizcarrondo.

Román Baldorioty de Castro was born in Guaynabo and educated in Madrid and Paris. He was elected deputy to the Spanish Cortez in 1870 and concentrated his efforts on the emancipation of the slaves.

José Julián Acosta, primarily an educator, was also a leading patriot and abolitionist. Elected a deputy to the Cortez in 1871, he pleaded for the freedom of the slaves.

Ramón Emeterio Betances, who was born in Cabo Rojo in 1829, graduated with a medical degree in Paris and returned to practice his profession in Mayaguez. He collected money from his friends, bought slave children, had them educated, and set them free.

Segrundo Ruiz Belvis freed all his slaves upon his return from the University of Madrid, where he had received degrees in philosophy and law.

Julio L. de Vizcarrondo, who was born in San Juan in 1830, was forced to leave Puerto Rico at the age of 20 because of his activities in behalf of the slaves. Journeying to Spain in 1864, he founded the Sociedad Abolicionista Espanola and proceeded to attack slavery vigorously in the Spanish press.

In 1873, when Amadeo, a younger son of the King of Italy, abdicated the Spanish throne, a republican government was inaugurated and the cause of human rights triumphed. On March 22, 1873, the National Assembly of the Republic of Spain unanimously voted for the abolition of slavery in Puerto Rico, and made provisions for funds with which to compensate the slaveowners. Bonds were issued, owners were compensated at an average rate of 200 pesos per slave, and slavery in Puerto Rico was abolished.

The hope for human rights and the dignity of mankind was finally realized, and to this day, the island of Puerto Rico remains an undimmed beacon in the record of man's fight for freedom.

Voter Registration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I feel that one of the most important developments toward perfecting the democratic process in the United States in recent years was the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and subsequent efforts in the direction of universal registration to vote.

My own State of California has always been a leader in attempts to bring as

many persons to the polls to vote as possible. I am currently sponsoring a registration drive in my own district and I am sending the following message to each household in the district:

DEAR FRIEND: As your Congressman, it is my duty to urge you to take part in determining the future of America. Register to vote if you are not now registered. Congress has expressed its intent that every citizen should vote. Remember, you are responsible for the quality of your elected officials. Deadline to register to vote in the June 7 primary is April 14.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.,
Member of Congress.

YOU MUST REGISTER BY APRIL 14

If you: 1. Have not registered in California before; 2. Have moved, changed your name legally, or wish to change your political party affiliation; 3. Failed to vote in the November 1964 general election.

Registration headquarters: 4304 Brooklyn Avenue, East Los Angeles, phone: 263-9383; 4408 Melrose Avenue, Los Angeles, phone: 666-5442.

Drive chairman: Well-known East Los Angeles civic leader Richard M. Calderon.

You can register at all fire stations, city halls, many markets, registrar of voters office (808 North Spring Street, Los Angeles) or call headquarters for information.

Deprive American Students To Help the Reds on Castro's Campus?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the following editorial was presented over WTAE, channel 4, in Pittsburgh, by Franklin C. Snyder, vice president and general manager, Pittsburgh Broadcast Division—the Hearst Corp.:

Criticizing any money spent by or for the United Nations is a sure way to get yourself dismissed as a square, a moss-backed isolationist, or a far-out rightwinger.

We're none of these things, but we still think the proposed gift by the United Nations development program to Castro's University of Havana is pretty silly.

This U.N. agency has Castro's college of communism and kookery down for $3,100,000. Since the United States furnishes 40 percent of this program's funds, more than $1 million in American taxpayers' money would go to the University of Havana, a fountainhead of international communism 90 miles from our shores.

And it is an ironic fact that while we send $1,200,000 to the University of Havana, the Federal Government is practicing some education economies at home—like proposing to cut funds available for American student loans and to reduce Federal aid to land-grant colleges, such as Penn State.

A similar editorial was broadcast over WRYT radio by F. Geer Parkinson, vice president and station manager.

Listeners are understandably provoked at this disclosure, which so far has had little public notice. The whole sordid story needs to be given public circulation, for it reflects an attitude on the part of the United Nations that will continue to prevail until its major underwriter, Uncle Sam, is no longer willing to permit his money to be appropriated to the cause of those who seek to destroy him.

As pointed out in the editorial of the air, it is ironic that more than a million dollars taken from the taxpayers of this Nation should be marked for shipment to Castro's university at the very time the administration proposes to cut funds for American student loans and for land grant colleges. The pending contribution for the education of Communist students in Cuba is also in step with the administration's request to reduce appropriations for the children's lunch program in our own schools.

Adding to the insult of serving Castro's bearded scholars to the neglect of our own students is the threat to increase taxes for the purpose of carrying on in Asia the battle against the very tactics and doctrine that Communist Cuba is attempting to impose upon the entire Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, American dollars have been donated to many strange and suspicious programs in recent years, yet in the light of current conditions it is doubtful if any has been more absurd than this plot to aid Cuba's detested dictator. I trust that the White House will make it clear that the United States will not stand for such nonsense under any circumstances.

Protect Against Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I deplore the ill-advised price advances in the economy, now current, or in the making, that may militate against price and economic stability, pushing the economy toward very dangerous runaway inflation, and making the imposition of price controls in the not too distant future a distinct possibility.

We greatly prize our free enterprise system. It has been responsible for our unmatched national, economic progress, prosperity and high standards of wages and living.

However, at a time when we are engaged in a desperate conflict with world communism, and when there is a special need and urgency for us all to work together for the national security and national interests, it would be a great mistake to do anything that would result in abnormal price escalation and imbalance in our economy. These consequences we must energetically strive to avoid and we should be very careful how we act and what we do in respect to anti-inflationary measures.

I hope and urge that business, labor, and Government will clearly recognize the dangers implicit in unrestrained, inflationary pressures and be willing to follow the guidelines that have been laid down by the President to prevent disruptive and dangerous price increases in goods, products, commodities, and services.

I do not believe that Congress will or should impose price controls, or other stringent controls over the economy at this time, or until this action becomes absolutely necessary and urgent.

But it should be recognized by all of us that we must hold the line against inflation one way or another, and if various segments of the economy do not cooperate to that end, then in the interests of the Nation, the national leadership will have no recourse than to act drastically to protect the stability of the economy.

To my mind, failure on the part of business, labor, and Government to adhere closely and voluntarily to reasonable guidelines to forestall inflation will inevitably result in compulsory controls and this, if it becomes necessary, could take the form of general price and material controls over every facet and feature of the American economy, and this would be most unfortunate, if there is any way we can avoid such drastic controls.

I hope that the leadership of the Nation, both private and public, will realize the fact that, in the economic sense, we are in effect at present literally perched on the top of a seething, financial and inflationary volcano. We shall either dampen its fiery upsurge, or we will in time see it catapult and explode this economy onto the dangerous stormy seas of runaway inflation.

Let us take note of our predicament and the dangers before us, and act before we are engulfed by perilous economic forces that are threatening to run riot and could bring us serious injury and disruption.

Washington Report of Hon. Lester L. Wolff to Third Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER L. WOLFF
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my most recent Washington report to residents of the Third Congressional District of New York:

DEAR FRIEND: As your representative in Congress, I feel that it is vital to keep you advised of important bills and projects which can affect you and your family. For your convenience, I have taken the liberty of condensing the information on six subjects. If you prefer a more detailed report on any, I would be happy to comply with your request.

APOLLO MOON PROJECT

On February 16 of this year, after little more than 1 year's effort on the Space Committee, I was pleased to announce the largest single contract ever awarded by NASA to produce the lunar excursion module (LEM), $1 billion contract, awarded to our own Long Island Grumman Aircraft of Bethpage.

What LEM means to Long Island

This means more business, more work for residents of the Third Congressional District. Another ancillary benefit accomplished by the LEM contract, is that more and more of the Nation's space effort's highly technical aspects will be concentrated in our area. This is another step toward making Long Island the eastern space center of the United States. We look forward to the building of a space center of related industries and also a greater diversification of present defense industries.

I am working together with others who feel strongly that we must create a solid economic foundation for the business stability of Nassau. Too many years have gone by with little or no attention to this problem. In the past year it has been shown that aggressiveness and coordinated planning can alleviate a major portion of the economic dislocation we have suffered in the past.

NEW GI BILL

This past November I visited Vietnam (at my own expense) for the third time in 16 months. I toured the combat areas and visited the hospitals and various troop encampments with my distinguished colleague, Representative OLIN TEAGUE, of Texas, chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. During our many conversations with the young men we met, and after reviewing some of their concerns for the future, Representative TEAGUE and I felt that a new GI bill was needed. Upon returning to Washington, we prepared the legislation. I am pleased to be able to report that as coauthor of this bill, I was called to the White House to witness President Johnson signing into law this measure that will aid thousands of our young men who have served both in combat and in times of peace. They will now receive the benefits they so richly deserve. We have available an analysis of these benefits for anyone desiring them.

CONSERVATION

Many years ago I brought my family to Nassau County because we wanted to live in a "countrified" environment. Today, we are faced with the problem of halting the onrush of bulldozers and dredges which are quickly changing the face of the entire area. Air and water pollution have also become increasing menaces. Because of deep concern about these problems, I introduced in the past session of Congress legislation, H.R. 11557, calling for a comprehensive study of the Long Island Sound shores so that we may stop indiscriminate destruction of our homes and set up a master plan to preserve as much of the natural beauty as possible while encouraging progress.

We have made progress

Conferences have been held with Congressman WAYNE ASPINALL, chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to arrange for hearings on this subject. These hearings are now being scheduled and when the dates are announced, those who are interested are invited to attend or submit statements.

I have also requested on-site inspection visits to our shoreline areas by qualified people. Chairman ASPINALL has also requested reports from the Departments of Interior, Defense, and the Bureau of the Budget. I will be glad to send copies of the bill to any interested individual or organization. The backbone of this conservation effort to save the urban character of our land in Nassau will be strengthened by your support and active participation.

PET PROTECTION BILL

There has been much interest of recent date over the protection of our pets. In 1965 I introduced legislation, H.R. 9875, making it a Federal offense to transport, sell, and handle dogs and cats inhumanely. Hearings were held in Washington the week of March 7 on my bill and an approved version should be reported out shortly.

CIVILIAN AIR ACADEMY

This Nation today faces a shortage of 1,800 commercial pilots. With the ever increasing need and the advent of highly sophisticated supersonic and V/STOL aircraft, the number of pilots now being trained by the Air Force and commercial airlines falls very short of our country's needs. I have, therefore, initiated plans calling for the establishment of a Civilian Air Academy similar to the Kings Point Merchant Marine Academy, which would be a 4-year Federal college devoted to the training of civilians to maintain American air supremacy.

AN INDUSTRIAL AND BUSINESS CONTRACT PROCUREMENT WORKSHOP

In an effort to broaden the base of industrial recovery on Long Island, I have initiated a procurement contract workshop which will meet for the purpose of advising industry in our area of the proper procedures for obtaining a larger share of available government contracts. Ever mindful that industry must not be dependent upon Government as their sole source of business, I believe it important that I do, however, exert every effort to help the local industry get their just share of available Government contracts. There will be about 21 Federal procurement agencies, many brought here from Washington to this workshop. They will explain the "hows" and "whys" of Government contract competition. I invite all who are in business on Long Island to join at this session to help business help itself. Please call my office for further details.

Coming to Washington?

Need any information?

If my office can be of service to, or if you have any suggestions how I can better serve you, please contact me.

Washington office: Longworth Building, room 1629, Washington, D.C., phone 225–5956.

Regional office: 156A Main Street, Port Washington, phone 767–4343.

Regional office: 333 North Broadway, Jericho, phone 681–4120.

Area office: Glen Cove Post Office, Glen Cove, phone 676–9300.

Sincerely,

LESTER L. WOLFF,
Your Congressman.

Budget Bureau Limitations Threaten Cutback in SCS Watershed Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERT BANDSTRA
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House action taken by the Bureau of the Budget which, unless reversed, will be extremely harmful to future operations of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service watershed program.

The Budget Bureau, I have learned, has imposed upon SCS severe limitations for fiscal year 1967 sharply curtailing the number of approvals which can be made for both planning and construction of watershed projects.

In addition, and despite the lack of any authorization from the Congress, the Budget Bureau also has placed a limitation on the number of watershed planning approvals for fiscal year 1966.

If the Budget Bureau's limitations remain in effect, the results will be as follows:

For the remainder of fiscal year 1966, SCS will be able to approve planning for only eight additional watersheds.

For all of fiscal year 1967 SCS will be restricted to providing planning for 50 watersheds and approving the actual construction of only 35 projects.

In comparison with the past operation of the watershed program, these limitations are extremely severe. For example, from fiscal year 1963 through 1965, SCS has made an annual average of 114 planning approvals and 62 construction approvals.

Thus, if the Budget Bureau's limitations for fiscal year 1967 are not removed, the scope of the present watershed program will be virtually cut in half.

The most immediate problem, however, is the Budget Bureau's limitation on watershed planning for the current fiscal year. This limitation, covering the entire fiscal year 1966, restricts SCS to providing planning for 100 watersheds.

Thus far in fiscal year 1966, SCS has given approval to planning for 92 projects. If similar assistance can be provided for only another eight watersheds before June 30, SCS will be faced with a heavy backlog of planning requests.

At present, SCS has pending 47 such requests. Included is one from my home State of Iowa, asking planning assistance for the Carter Creek watershed in Davis and Appanoose Counties. Almost certainly, more planning requests will reach SCS before the current fiscal year ends.

In my view, these planning limitations for fiscal year 1966 are unfair, both to SCS and to the local people who are awaiting approval of watershed planning requests, and I feel very strongly that the Budget Bureau should remove them.

The limitations on SCS, both for the current and the coming fiscal year, were imposed only about 2 months ago. They appear in the Federal budget for fiscal year 1967, sent to the Congress on January 24, as estimates.

These estimates, however, are in fact hard and fast limitations, and SCS is working with the knowledge that the estimates cannot be exceeded. But even though the Budget Bureau has imposed the limitations, it has, to the best of my knowledge, offered no explanation for them to SCS.

If the planning limitations for fiscal year 1966 remain in effect, it will be grossly unfair to the people on the local level who have spent a great deal of time and effort reaching agreement on the watershed planning requests now pending with SCS.

Preparation for a SCS watershed project requires an enormous amount of local cooperation, perhaps more than in any other Federal program. It requires coordination between farmers in the watershed, State and local conservation officials, and personnel in the State SCS headquarters.

Thus, by the time a watershed planning request reaches SCS in Washington, it represents perhaps a year or more, and sometimes several years, of preliminary planning and cooperation among State and local officials.

If SCS cannot approve more than eight additional planning requests during the remainder of this fiscal year, the probable result is that many of the proposed watershed projects will never reach the planning stage.

The danger of this is all the more acute, of course, if the even more restrictive Budget Bureau limitations for fiscal year 1967 are kept in force.

If this should happen, and if many of these watersheds never reach the planning stage, then much of the efforts toward cooperation and preliminary planning on the local level will have been spent in vain.

In fairness to those who have invested so much time and effort in these proposed watershed projects, the Budget Bureau should lift its planning limitations for the current fiscal year.

This will allow SCS to approve a reasonable number of planning requests before June 30, unhampered by an arbitrary and unrealistic limitation. If a local watershed merits planning approval, SCS should be allowed to provide that approval.

In addition, I think it is essential that the severe Budget Bureau limitations on planning and construction for fiscal year 1967 should be removed.

If the Budget Bureau itself does not do so, then I believe the Congress should spell out, in language accompanying the SCS appropriations for next fiscal year, that these limitations shall not remain in effect.

Unless they are removed, serious damage will be done to a time-proven program which has provided valuable benefits to rural America.

Since 1954, when Congress enacted the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, rural residents have been able to utilize SCS assistance for construction of watersheds in many areas across the Nation.

These watersheds have provided much-needed measures for soil and water conservation, as well as for flood control. Moreover, SCS now provides assistance for recreational development at watershed projects, and this can be a big help in promoting economic growth in some rural areas.

The Congress now has before it proposed legislation to establish new programs for both conservation and rural redevelopment. Continued efforts in these areas are, of course, much to be desired.

In my view, however, it makes no sense at all to propose new programs for conservation and rural redevelopment and, at the same time, sharply curtail the highly effective and widely supported SCS watershed program.

Personally, I do not believe that it is the intent of the Congress that the watershed program should suffer a severe cutback, and I am therefore hopeful that the Budget Bureau limitations on SCS will be lifted.

The National Water Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED REINECKE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Water Commission Act."

THE NATIONAL WATER COMMISSION

SEC. 2. (a) There is established the National Water Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of seven members, who shall be appointed by the President. Members shall serve at the pleasure of the President. No member of the Commission shall, during his period of service on the Commission, hold any other position as an officer or employee of the United States, except as a retired officer or retired civilian employee of the United States.

(c) The President shall designate a Chairman of the Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Chairman") from among its members.

(d) Members of the Commission may each be compensated at the rate of $100 for each day such member is engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission. Each member shall be reimbursed for travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(e) The Commission shall have an Executive Director, who shall be appointed by the Chairman with the approval of the President and shall be compensated at the rate provided by law for Level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule. The Executive Director shall have such duties and responsibilities as the Chairman may assign.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall (1) review present and anticipated national water resource problems, making such projections of water requirements as may be necessary and identifying alternative ways of meeting these requirements—giving consideration, among other things, to conservation and more efficient use of existing supplies, increased usability by reduction of pollution, innovations to encourage the highest economic use of water, interbasin transfers, and technological advances such as desalting and waste water purification and reuse; (2) consider economic and social consequences of water resource development, including, for example, the impact of water resource development on regional economic growth, on institutional arrangements, and on aesthetic values affecting the quality of life of the American people; and (3) advise on such specific water resource matters as may be referred to it by the President and the Water Resources Council.

(b) The Commission shall consult with the Water Resources Council regarding its studies and shall furnish its proposed reports and recommendations to the Council for review and comment. The Commission shall submit to the President such interim and final reports as it deems appropriate, and the Council shall submit to the President its views on the Commission's reports. The President shall transmit the Commission's final report to the Congress together with such comments and recommendations for legislation as he deems appropriate.

(c) The Commission shall terminate not later than five years from the effective date of this Act.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission may (1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as it may deem advisable; (2) acquire, furnish, and equip such office space as is necessary; (3) use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States; (4) employ and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949; as amended: *Provided,* That not to exceed five persons may be employed and their compensation fixed at salaries not in excess of GS–18, without regard to such laws; (5) procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals; (6) purchase, hire, operate, and maintain passenger motor vehicles; (7) enter into contracts or agreements for studies and surveys with public and private organizations and transfer funds to Federal agencies and river basin commissions created pursuant to title II of the Water Resources Planning Act to carry out such aspects of the Commission's functions as the Commission determines can best be carried out in that manner; and (8) incur such necessary expenses and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform its functions under this title.

(b) Any member of the Commission is authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by a majority of the Council that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE CHAIRMAN

SEC. 5. (a Subject to general policies adopted by the Commission, the Chairman shall be the chief executive of the Commission and shall exercise its executive and administrative powers as set forth in section 4(a)(2) through section 4(a)(8).

(b) The Chiarman may make such provision as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the preformance of any of his executive and administrative functions by the Executive Director or other personnel of the Commission.

OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission shall, to the extent practicable, utilize the services of the Federal water resource agencies.

(b) Upon request of the Commission, the head of any Federal department or agency or river basin commission created pursuant to title II of the Water Resources Planning Act is authorized (1) to furnish to the Commission, to the extent permitted by law and within the limits of available funds, including funds transferred for that purpose pursuant to section 4(a)(7) of this Act, such information as may be necessary for carrying out its functions and as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency, and (2) to detail to temporary duty with this Commission on a reimbursable basis

such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as it may need or believe to be useful for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status.

(c) Financial and administrative services (including those related to budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement) shall be provided the Commission by the General Services Administration, for which payment shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Chairman of the Commission and the Administrator of General Services: *Provided*, That the regulations of the General Services Administration for the collection of indebtedness of personnel resulting from erroneous payments (5 U.S.C. 46e) shall apply to the collection of erroneous payments made to or on behalf of a Commission employee, and regulations of said Administrator for the administrative control of funds (31 U.S.C. 665(g)) shall apply to appropriations of the Commission: and *Provided further*, That the Commission shall not be required to prescribe such regulations.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are required to carry out the purposes of this Act.

School Milk and School Lunch Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TENO RONCALIO
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, as Congress pursues a cautious and deliberate course through a stream of complex and serious national and international issues, it is imperative that those matters of a less crucial nature not be overlooked.

One of the seemingly less crucial problems that could be an unfortunate victim of our well-intentioned preoccupation with questions of paramount importance is the appropriation for the school milk and school lunch programs.

The Nation realizes that a certain degree of fiscal restraint will be necessary to insure our Government's capacity to meet our serious challenges, particularly our commitment in Vietnam.

The question is not whether increased economy measures are needed, but rather, where these economy measures can be safely directed.

I submit that the school milk and school lunch programs, proven and valuable Government services that they are, should not be summarily sacrificed.

We should instead direct our paring knives to appropriations for less proven and less valuable services that can better absorb cuts without serious impairment of such widespread impact.

If the Vietnam conflict is to require sacrifice on the part of certain Government programs, there are alternatives open to us. We may choose to begin by temporarily restoring the excise taxes on luxury items untouched by the recent tax adjustment measure.

Another alternative would be a move to effect reasonable reductions in certain antipoverty programs. Commonsense dictates that when economy measures are required, they should begin with those programs that have not as yet won broad acceptance nor demonstrated positive effectiveness.

In order to place into perspective the terrible impact of the proposed reductions, I would like to introduce some facts on the situation in my State.

In Wyoming, with a population of approximately 340,000, some 32,000 children in 273 participating schools were served lunches during fiscal 1965. During that year, 5.2 million lunches were served. Only 3 percent of the lunches were served free to needy children. For the remaining children, the cost of the lunch was 27 cents a meal, with the Government absorbing 10 to 11 cents a lunch. Wyoming received $222,000 in Federal assistance for the lunch program.

Under terms of the proposed cut, the Government would now pay 1 cent less per lunch, which would mean Wyoming would receive $40,000 to $50,000 less, based on 1966 participation. This would result in Government assistance of $170,000 to $180,000—instead of the $222,000 last year.

During fiscal 1965, milk was served in 314 schools with 3.6 million half pints of milk served to Wyoming schoolchildren. This was over and above the 5 million included in the lunch program.

In the proposed budget, funds for this program are cut from $103 million to $21 million, and milk is to be served only in schools with no lunch program. This reduction of four-fifths means that Wyoming could expect her share to be $25,800—instead of the $129,000 received in fiscal 1965.

These children have paid 3 to 4 cents a half pint with the Government providing the other 3 cents. The immediate consequence would be a doubling of the cost of milk to the student.

This summary indicates to what a great extent this reduction would work a hardship on Wyoming students. I know it cannot be any less severe in our sister States, and with the total effect calculated, this proposed reduction can only be viewed as a serious threat to one of the most beneficial of Government programs.

The cost of these programs is actually modest when we view them as an investment in the health of our Nation's youth. The merits of establishing good dietary habits for our youth is obvious. Health is an essential factor in learning.

To restrict the chief impact to needy students is to place them in a separate and distinct category—an outlook so contrary to our American equality concept of a public school.

The school milk and lunch programs have done more than any other Federal program to improve the diet and health of American students. Now we are asked to assume the impossible task of limiting it to the needy, when we know that any ruling established will still hurt deserving children. This program must continue to be open to all students.

Because the merit is so apparent, perhaps it is best to emphasize the harmful consequence of a reduction. The increased cost would certainly cause some students to withdraw from the programs entirely, often to a totally unsatisfactory situation.

The dairy industry, already troubled by farmers leaving because of low income, would be further damaged, since these programs create and develop markets for dairy products.

The milk program supplements the dairy price support program because markets are provided for Government-purchased milk. Otherwise, the Commodity Credit Corporation would have to buy and store dairy surpluses—at a direct cost of about $100 million—or almost the cost of the milk program in 1965.

Surely the scant savings ultimately realized by this ill-advised budget cut do not justify such a move. To continue the present program, as the public most surely will demand, will merely shift the burden to State governments already beset by increasing pressures upon their resources.

There is only one practical course open to us—total restoration of the necessary appropriations, for to handicap these programs in the false name of economy would be a grave disservice to the Nation.

Soviets Continue Persecution of Jews and Denial of Religious Freedom to Celebrate Passover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER L. WOLFF
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, Passover is almost upon us once more. Millions of Jews the world over will again commemorate the liberation of their forefathers from Egyptian bondage. Unleavened bread, or matzoh, will be baked and eaten as it was in the wilderness in the time of Moses.

How glorious it is to be alive, free, and a citizen of America. For Jews and other citizens of the Republic, the cup of foreign suffering has been averted. We can sit down to our tables and participate in our respective religious celebrations in contentment and tranquillity. The blessings of liberty are ours, and we too often take them for granted.

We may worship God according to the dictates of our consciences, secure in the knowledge that they will not be questioned. We fear no knock on our door at night; no nocturnal trip to prison to be held incommunicado; no fear of a trial that is a mockery of justice, and whose verdict is preordained; no fear of concentration camp, or bleak, unrelieved imprisonment.

But for the oppressed of this world, the cup of affliction is forcefully held to their

lips, and they are forced to drink ever so deeply. Jews of the Soviet Union cannot truly celebrate Passover. They cannot bake the matzoh they need to properly commemorate their history and celebrate their culture. They are forbidden to adequately teach the fruits of 6,000 years of civilization to their sons and daughters. If they attempt these activities on a full scale, they do so at their own peril. All liberty-possessing people cannot let this pass unquestioned, unrelieved, unopposed.

The Soviet Union is writing yet another page in the book of suffering of the people of Israel. Upon Babylonian captivity, Egyptian enslavement, Spanish expulsion and inquisition, crusades, and Dark Ages savagery, Eastern pogroms, Dreyfus injustice and excruciatingly horrible torments of Nazi genocide, they are cementing another gruesome stone. If Soviet policy does not change, their name shall forever be appended to this particular page of history; befouled with suppression and the crushing of the human spirit by dictatorship.

For it is ever true of dictatorship that it cannot abide full, free expression of religion. Open worship as an expression of individuality blinds the eyes of those who thrive in the darkness of totalitarianism, casting light they continually attempt to extinguish. Yet there are those, who, at risk of all the horrors of a police state, keep the flame of religious freedom alive and alight. We must let them know they are not alone. We must let them see the glow emanating from America.

For here the Jew, along with all other refugees from the oppressors of the world, lives in sunlight. Here we have intertwined the Judeo-Christian ethic with the sublime outpourings of Jefferson. It would ill behoove America to stand silent while Jews of the Soviet Union are deprived of their birthright as human beings.

For their cup of agony of the spirit does run over. They are a living reminder to us that so long as a single human being is denied the right to worship exactly as he pleases, the rest of us live and practice our faiths in perpetual jeopardy. What is even partially denied to one is potentially a complete denial to all.

Let us again remind the Soviets of this monstrous injustice. Let us tell them once again that we regard their actions toward Russia's Jews as a denial of the fruits of 6,000 years of civilization. It must not lie fallow and unused. The enforced silence of these people is as eloquent as any wail of torment. There are nonphysical tortures that crush the human spirit as surely as a gas chamber snuffs out a life.

Let the Soviets remember that free men and those who yearn to be free have survived many burners—both of books and of people. Attilas, Hitlers, and Stalins come and go like quicksilver ephemerally flitting across the sands of time. Their mark is that of a hole left behind by a finger stuck into the water of a pond. Their trail is that of the beast. Their monuments are ruins. When mankind does remember them, it is only with disgust, not reverence.

The suffering of one who yearns to be free is the suffering of all. It is apropos that we say this as the Passover approaches, commemorating the escape of an entire people from bondage at any cost. For men have shown again and again that they will pay any price for liberty. The battle for that liberty is no less today than the struggle was then. We have not forgotten. We shall not forget. One day the Jews of the Soviet Union shall have the freedom God wills for them.

At this time I again call upon the Government of the Soviet Union to grant complete religious freedom to its citizens. Freedom on this Passover to bake matzohs, to observe the Passover properly, to educate rabbis and their children. Let this Passover and subsequent ones be completely free.

For as long as one soul writhes in the mental or physical agony of totalitarian suppression of his body or spirit; as long as one human being is deprived of freedom and yearns for it; liberty will fight furiously, endlessly, for life and full expression.

Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 16, 1966, the very distinguished chairman of the House Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] was the guest speaker at the Bowie-Queen Anne District Democratic Club at the Somerset Elementary School, Stonehaven Lane, Bowie.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the honor of speaking to the Bowie-Queen Anne District Democratic Club on many occasions and it is one of the most stimulating groups in the district which I have the honor to represent. There is no better friend of the Federal employee than the gentleman from New Jersey. He is very well known in Prince Georges County where I live. I hope that his visit to my congressional district will be repeated again and again. On behalf of the more than 70,000 Federal employees in the 5th Congressional District of Maryland, I would like to express my thanks to the gentleman from New Jersey for his untiring efforts in behalf of the Federal employee.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I insert Chairman DANIELS' speech given to the Bowie-Queen Anne District Democratic Club:

ADDRESS BY CHAIRMAN DOMINICK V. DANIELS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT, INSURANCE, AND HEALTH BENEFITS, HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE BOWIE-QUEEN ANNE DISTRICT DEMOCRATIC CLUB, BOWIE, MD., MARCH 16, 1966

Mr. Chairman, friends, I am most grateful for your kind invitation to be here tonight and to have this opportunity to meet and talk with you. Your chairman thought you might be particularly interested in hearing about some of the proposals pending before this Congress which affect Federal employees.

Every piece of legislation before the Congress is, of course, going to affect the Federal employee. He is, after all, first a citizen and only then a Government worker. He may be a parent, a veteran, a young man beginning his career in Government service, or a woman near retirement age. The Federal worker is interested in—and will be affected by—everything this Congress does with regard to education, poverty, crime, air pollution, taxes, space exploration, transportation, aid programs, and, of course, our commitments in Vietnam.

I wish we could discuss all these issues. I would like to hear from you about the decisions that must be made. But I am afraid we would be here far into next week—or the week after that.

During his time in the House, a Congressman does, however, become something of a specialist in one or two fields. Guided by the particular interests of his constituents, a Representative soon finds he is spending a great deal of his time on one or two special problems.

One of my own interests is that legislation which most directly affects Government workers—their pay raises, health, retirement, and insurance plans—those matters which come under the jurisdiction of our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and, particularly, under the jurisdiction of my own Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits.

I want to quickly add that I do not claim to have all the answers on the various health, retirement, insurance, and pay plans that are before this Congress. But I have been working on these programs for several years now, and believe I can be of some help to you in explaining just what proposals are before the Congress this year which will most directly affect Federal employees.

The key item is, of course, the President's new pay and fringe benefit package. In his message to the Congress on March 7, the President asked for enactment of legislation which will provide an average pay increase for Federal civilian employees amounting to 3.2 percent. About 2.85 percent of this would be in a direct salary increase, and the rest would be in certain fringe benefits.

These benefits include proposals to allow those who reach 55 with 30 years' service to retire without any reduction in annuity. It is proposed that retirement, disability, and survivor benefits payable to Federal employees be equal to the benefits payable to other citizens under the social security system. The administration suggests that the Government provide for the transfer to the social security system of service credit to employees who die, become disabled, or leave Federal employment before becoming eligible for Federal retirement systems benefits. A phased 2-year increase in the Government contribution to the health benefits program is suggested. There is also a proposal for a one-half percent increase in the contribution of both the Federal agencies and employees to the retirement fund. The administration proposes that these changes be effective January 1, 1967.

The President also recommended the enactment into law of a clear statement of retirement policy and adjustments between the civil service and the Foreign Service retirement systems. Other important recommended adjustments in our retirement system include the extension of medicare to Federal civilian employees, the continuation of benefits until age 22 for surviving children, still in school, of deceased employees. A guaranteed minimum to widows of employees who die after retirement for

disability is recommended, as are continuing benefits for a surviving widow if she remarries after age 60. The administration recommends that these latter adjustments in our retirement program be deferred for at least another year—to January 1, 1968.

The package is an attractive one. As the President has said, America expects much of its public servants, and we make vigorous demands on their time and energy. We exact high standards of work and conduct and are fortunate indeed in having a civil service corps of honest, intelligent, efficient, and dedicated men and women. I could not agree more, and I am firm in my belief that the public interest is best served when these men and women are compensated equitably and competitively for equality performance.

I am sorry, however, that the proposals do not go further. My own proposal to extend life insurance benefits introduced in the Congress last session—is not mentioned. The pay raise is not as generous as I think it should be, for it will not close the gap between compensation for Government employees and those in private enterprise. The smallest increase—approximately 1 percent—will go to the lowest grades, and the very modest higher increases—up to 4½ percent—will go to a few upper grades. The recommended effective date for the pay raise is January 1, 1967.

Frankly, I had hoped we could do better, both with pay and with retirement, insurance, and health benefits. On January 25 of this year I introduced legislation to provide a 7-percent pay raise for Federal employees. I introduced a bill to liberalize the Federal employees group life insurance act on January 10, and hearings were held on the legislation this February. This bill would broaden life insurance coverage for Federal employees, raise the limitation on the amount of life insurance allowable, increase the Government's contribution to one-third of the cost of the premium charges, and would give additional protection to retirees.

Last year I suggested an amendment to the Health Benefits Act of 1959 which would increase the Government contribution for those enrolled in Government health benefits plans. This proposal is more generous than that of the administration.

I will spare you the technicalities of these various measures, but want to emphasize that their intent is to carry out a deep and binding commitment to our Federal employees, embodied in the Federal Pay Act of 1962, that their salaries and other benefits should be comparable to those salaries and benefits earned by employees in private industry for similar types and levels of work.

In signing that Reform Act the President emphasized the need for excellence throughout our society. In his words: "Challenges cannot be met in this modern world by mediocrity * * *. We must search for brilliance, welcome genius, strive for excellence." To hold men and women with such qualities in the Federal establishment we must offer them compensation equal to that offered elsewhere.

Last year the House retreated from the position it had taken in passing a reasonably decent pay raise bill for Federal employees and accepted the watered-down version handed to us by the Senate. As the late Sam Rayburn once remarked, "Legislation is the art of the practical." We were practical and accepted the possible.

The situation in Vietnam has put us in a similar position this year. If the administration proposal falls short of reaching the state of true equality for Government workers which we seek—as I believe they do—it is because our country has many other problems to solve and other worthy goals to strive for. Earlier I mentioned some of these—schools, clean air, clean water, roads and dams, space exploration, foreign aid. Our most immediate—and most grave—problem lies in our commitment in Vietnam.

To protect this country's interests, as we must do in Vietnam, to secure our children's futures as we hope to do through our poverty and crime and other programs, we are going to have to commit a large proportion of our available resources. And while we are a vigorous nation and these resources are indeed vast, our civil servants are being asked to wait for some of the benefits to which they are entitled.

Let me state at this time that I shall vigorously oppose any attempt to make Federal employees the only group to be denied needed pay increases while other groups in our society are not so restricted. The net result of such a policy would not just be a delay for the implementation of the comparability principle, it would be more in the nature of a complete rout.

I am not about to let the comparability gap grow any wider.

The major administration proposals—the suggested pay raise, the 55–30 retirement plan, liberalized disability and survivor benefits, a modest increase in the Government's contribution to the health benefits program—will most likely pass the Congress this year. I am hopeful that my bill to widen life insurance benefits will also pass, despite the opposition of the administration. I am afraid that other proposals must await future developments.

Whatever the successes—or the compromises—reached by this Congress in the areas of pay, retirement, health, and insurance benefits, we are committed to a rational and equitable system of compensation for the Federal worker. I will continue to work toward the full realization of that goal.

The Proposed Atlantic Expressway—Unanimous Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT TENZER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a proposed project which has been put forward by the New York State Department of Public Works for the construction of an expressway through the South Shore of Long Island over Sunrise Highway. The voice of the people is loud and clear in unanimous opposition to the proposed route. Because some have erroneously referred to the proposed Atlantic expressway as a Federal highway, many of my constituents wrote to me voicing their opposition to the project. The project is in the early stages of planning and, therefore, the State of New York has not yet applied for Federal funds—and probably will not do so for a number of years. However, because of the unanimous opposition to the proposed project, the State of New York should study various alternative routes before large sums of money are expended for the further development of a plan which has no local support.

Residents on the South Shore, local businessmen, churches, local civic organizations, elected officials, daily newspapers and community newspapers on Long Island have spoken out with determined opposition to this proposal. Based upon letters from officials and meetings with constituents, I wrote the following letter to Governor Rockefeller on February 24, 1966:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1966.

Hon. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
Governor,
Albany, N.Y.

DEAR GOVERNOR: I acknowledge receipt and thank you for your reply of February 15, 1966 to my telegram concerning the proposed Atlantic expressway.

I am writing again because the voice of the people on the South Shore of Long Island is coming through to Washington loud and clear, and the sounds are unanimously opposed to the proposed route. The voices are those of owners of private dwellings; businessmen whose establishments are located along Sunrise Highway; mayors of the villages along the proposed route; civic associations; boards of trade, chambers of commerce and other organizations; and lastly, but by no means the least, the voice of the presiding supervisor of the town of Hempstead. Of the many communications which I have received from the residents and businessmen of the South Shore not a single one speaks in favor of the proposed Atlantic expressway route.

It is important that I inform you that there is considerable confusion in the minds of the public about the manner in which a highway is developed from the planning stage to completion. The reason for this is primarily because it is being referred to as a Federal highway and secondarily because there is a lack of coordination between local, State and Federal elected officials on matters of common concern. In my telegram to Mayor Robert Sweeney, of Freeport, dated February 7, 1966, the text of which was included in my telegram to you, I pointed out that New York State is engaged in planning the highway, and has not filed an application for Federal funds. I also pointed out that under ordinary circumstances the State would not do so until after public hearings on the proposal have been held. Therefore, I am not presently in a position to ask that Federal funds be withheld from the project as I am being requested to do by most of my correspondents, who firmly believe that the proposed route is not in the public interest.

In your letter you suggest that it is premature to hold a public hearing and state that you have suggested to Superintendent McMorran that when the plans for the proposed route have been firmed up to a reasonable degree he might plan to hold an informational meeting. Most respectfully sir, I do not believe that this is a satisfactory answer for the people on the South Shore of Long Island.

A public hearing on the proposed Nassau expressway was held January 21, 1966, after detailed plans were completed and after a public announcement that work was to commence. This was considered by those who attended the hearings as too late on a project planned over a period of more than 15 years. Forty-one witnesses testified at the hearings, including the Congressman, State legislators, the presiding supervisor of the town of Hempstead, and village mayors. All unanimously opposed that aspect of the Nassau expressway plans which called for an overhead rather than a depressed road in certain sections of Inwood and Lawrence.

As an illustration of the feelings in the community the following telegram was received by me on February 21, 1966:

"Congressman HERBERT TENZER,
"*Congressional Building,*
"*Lynbrook, N.Y.:*

"Proposed Atlantic expressway through South Shore will be irreparably disastrous to village of Lynbrook. Request your intervention to oppose this as presently proposed and urge a complete disclosure of plans before any other steps are taken to move the project further ahead.

"GEORGE H. MANGRAVITE,
"Mayor."

Your constituents and mine are not sufficiently aware that the Atlantic expressway is a State project, requiring State approval, and that before it receives such approval, public hearings will be held.

Because of the experience on the Nassau expressways and the widespread misunderstanding of the procedure, I respectfully suggest that you issue instructions for the calling of a preliminary public hearing, before large sums of money are expended on a project which has such unanimous opposition.

On the date of February 23, 1966, I received the following communication from the Federal Highway Administator, the details of which are self-explanatory.

"DEAR MR. TENZER: This is in reply to your letter of February 11 requesting a report on the status of the Atlantic expressway.

"The State has had consulting firms prepare engineering, traffic and revenue, and feasibility reports on the proposed Long Island-New England Bridge and connecting highways, including the Atlantic expressway. Any action to be taken on this project would be the responsibility of State authorities. We have received no proposals from the State for Federal participation. Under the circumstances we suggest that you write the New York Department of Public Works for information on any development plans and status of the overall project.

"Sincerely yours,
"REX M. WHITTON,
"Federal Highway Administrator."

Governor, at your meeting with the New York State congressional delegation held recently in Washington, you made a strong appeal that on matters of common interest we develop concerted action on a bipartisan basis. I agree with you most heartily in this approach. I am writing to the presiding supervisor of the town of Hempstead and the mayors of those villages along the proposed route which are located in the Fifth Congressional District, inviting them to join with me in developing a bipartisan approach to protect the interests of residents and businessmen whose property and investments will be affected by the proposed Atlantic expressway.

Finally, Governor, I would most respectfully urge that you ask for feasibility studies on alternative routes, including the possibility of using the route of the Southern State Parkway, and the possibility of building the expressway over the Long Island Railroad tracks. Both of these suggestions involve publicly owned property with enough width for a 10-lane expressway. Important however is the fact that neither one involves a disruption of residence and business property to the extent involved in the present proposed route.

Your early attention to this communication is most respectfully requested.

Sincerely yours,
HERBERT TENZER,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the local press expresses the voice of the people from villages along the South Shore of Long Island which includes the full length of the Fifth Congressional District of New York.

Elected officials and civic organizations as well as groups representing all the major political parties have expressed their opposition to the proposed expressway to me and they must be persuaded to express their opposition to Albany.

In my letter to Governor Rockefeller and in my letters to every Mayor on the South Shore of Long Island, I have endeavored to set the record straight. The proposed Atlantic Expressway is a State project in its early planning stages. While Federal funds have not been requested, I have expressed myself in opposition to the granting of such funds to the appropriate agencies. The voices of the people should be directed to Albany before it is too late.

The daily and community newspapers on the South Shore have rendered a unique public service by helping me to bring to public attention that we are dealing with a State project at this point. Their attention to the subject matter has brought about an unparalleled unity among elected officials of every political persuasion and I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point some of the editorial comment on this dismaying project:

[From Newsday, Mar. 1, 1966]

THE ROAD TO ROCKY POINT

The proposed Atlantic Expressway along Sunrise Highway, intended as a high-speed connection between New York City and the proposed Long Island-New England Bridge, has been running into opposition recently from the mayors of five South Shore communities through which it would pass. As projected, the road would be a 10-lane highway 84 miles long that, in Nassau, would require substantial changes inside the downtown business area it traverses.

Representative HERBERT TENZER, Democrat, of Lawrence, has now suggested that double-decking the Southern State Parkway might be an alternate and less disruptive solution. Edward McGowan, chairman of the Long Island-New England Bridge Study Commission, which proposed the Atlantic expressway, has described the Tenzer alternate as illegal—saying that the bonds for the section of Southern State, on which motorists must pay tolls, forbid its conversion to any other use. TENZER, however, has made a highly sensible suggestion. He wants the commission to hold hearings on the conversion of Southern State. If it represents a more acceptable route, with less disruption, then he feels the possible answer may be to retire the existing parkway bonds and to make use of that route.

We would take TENZER's suggestion a step further. Why not check all possible routes—including, by the way, the overcongested Long Island Expressway? Something, very soon, has to be done to improve rush-hour travel between New York and Long Island. If a route can be found that achieves a smoother flow of traffic in and out of the city, requires minimum disruption and at the same time provides fast access to the Rocky Point Bridge, that's the route to choose for development. Until further feasibility studies have been undertaken by the Department of Public Works, with the concurrence of the bridge study commission, no conclusions can be reached.

Mr. Speaker, the Long Island Press, March 11, 1966, in an editorial relating to the Long Island Sound bridge project, had this comment relating to the Atlantic expressway:

What's more, the proposed $350 million Atlantic expressway, suggested as part of the commission's original package, has stirred up a storm of protest from one end of the island to the other. This 10-lane swath through some of Long Island's most prosperous shopping communities is an unwelcome prospect. And even more dismaying are some of the alternatives being blithely put forward—like elevating the Southern State Parkway or the Long Island Expressway.

The thought of such metal and concrete monsters is a nightmare to Long Islanders who know what elevated structures can do to communities. Many areas of Queens have been saddled with such structures—the "Els" in Richmond Hill, Jamaica, Long Island City, Ridgewood, Corona, Elmhurst, Jackson Heights, Woodside and Sunnyside, not to mention the Bronx and Brooklyn. The people of these communities wish they could be rid of these depressing, noisy monstrosities. It is hard to believe somebody would think of bringing them, in this day and age, to the heart of residential Long Island.

The Long Island Kernal (Freeport), on February 17, 1966, said this:

CONSIDER AN ALTERNATE PLAN

Instead of disrupting long-established business districts and municipal facilities and at the same time incurring fabulous condemnation expenditures—why not utilize already existing highway routes which will disrupt practically nothing? And which would incur practically no additional property condemnation.

How? Widen these existing routes where necessary and double-deck them. (This has been proposed for Sunrise Highway.)

The route for the proposed alternate super-expressway would start at the Verrazano Bridge, utilize the Belt Parkway south and east to Marine Parkway, then southeast to Beach Channel Drive. Thence east on Rockaway Freeway to Sheridan Boulevard to Burnside Avenue and Rockaway Turnpike. From Rockaway Turnpike to northeast on Peninsula Boulevard to Southern State Parkway thence east to Sagtikos Parkway. North on Sagtikos Parkway to Long Island Expressway—and from there you have it right through, past Riverhead and along the North Fork to the East Marion bridgehead.

Southern State Parkway to Sagtikos Parkway is no longer a pleasure driving route, but a vital traffic artery. Therefore double-decking it as part of the Long Island superhighway would not only facilitate traffic flow, but would solve the question of a route to the (proposed double-decked) Long Island expressway and eastern Long Island.

The route proposed here would add no more than 3.1 miles in distance from the Verrazano Bridge to the East Marion bridgehead as compared to the proposed property-destroying, tax-destroying Sunrise Highway route.

The Bellmore Life of January 26, 1966, had this to say:

EXPRESSWAY THROUGH BELLMORE

Engineers and planners have come up with a grandiose project for a bridge from eastern Suffolk to Connecticut and an even more grandiose sounding Atlantic Expressway through the length of Long Island. Further studies are being undertaken and perhaps they will lead to the decision to build the bridge. Perhaps from an overall point of view and in the name of progress the bridge should be built. It is too early to tell.

But, from a local standpoint, considering the interests of Bellmore, we doubt that the

radical widening of Sunrise Highway would be a good thing. The net result would be more gas fumes and less business. It would destroy many small businesses in which men and women have sunk much of their lives and hopes.

The proposed expressway would cut our community in half, leaving crossings only at Newbridge Road and Bellmore Avenue, but closing off Bedford Avenue and Centre Avenue. During construction it would disrupt the lives of the citizens for many months.

However much a bridge to Connecticut may be needed, this seems a very expensive way to lead up to it. We hope some other solution can be found. The fact that a commission has recommended using Sunrise Highway does not necessarily mean that other solutions may not be preferable.

Mr. Speaker, at long last after many letters and speaking engagements on the subject, editorials are now directing readers to elected State officials as well as their Congressman. Now the voices may finally be heard in Albany. The editorials follow:

[From the Leader (Freeport, N.Y.), Mar. 3, 1966]

CHINESE WALL IN FREEPORT?

Of all the idiotic ideas that have come forth in recent years, the proposal to convert Sunrise Highway into a 10-lane superexpressway is the worst.

According to the plan offered by the Long Island-New England Bridge Study Committee, the elevated structure would be about the height of the LIRR elevation. It would extent from the Queens-Nassau line to Patchogue where it would turn north to connect at Rocky Point with a proposed bridge to New England. It would run through the heart of Valley Stream, Lynbrook, Rockville Centre, Baldwin, Freeport, Merrick, Bellmore, Wantagh, Seaford, Massapequa, Massapequa Park, Amityville and on through Suffolk. The South Shore would become part of a corridor stretching from Washington, D.C., to Boston.

Are they kidding? This could only mean that our wonderful residential communities would become suitable only for the high rise apartments and factories that would necessarily spring up along the route.

Who would lose on the deal? Everybody else, especially the businessmen along Sunrise Highway and bordering streets and the homeowners who moved here to escape the big city. Faced with providing services, schools, fire protection, etc., for the huge apartment houses, the taxpayer will even lose his proverbial barrel—he'll be over it instead of in it.

The proponents of the superhighway claim that it will create more jobs on Long Island. True—but it will also bring hundreds of thousands of new jobseekers to live in the multistoried apartment houses. It will provide easy access to additional jobhunters from New York City. The competition for jobs will be fierce. The benefit from the increased jobs will be wiped out and we will be worse off than before.

WHAT CAN YOU DO

Fast action is called for if we are to prevent this attempted rape of Long Island. There are State and Federal funds required for the proposal and an "authority" must be created to administer the project. You can stop it—write your assemblyman, State senator and congressman today if you value your investment in your home or business. (Send copies to this newspaper, too, so we can keep up with the thinking of our readers.)

None of us moved to Nassau County during the past 20 years just for the sake of moving. We were seeking something better for ourselves and our children—and our grandchildren. Must we lose it all to become part of a high-speed route from Washington to Boston?

This newspaper will devote all the energy and all the power of a free press toward putting down this onslaught against our suburban way of life. We can't do it alone, however. The forces behind the highway proposal are extremely influential. Your help is absolutely essential if the plan is to be defeated. Get those letters moving—and fast.

[From the Long Island Graphic (Freeport, N.Y.), Mar. 3, 1966]

PROPOSED HIGHWAY MENACES OUR WONDERFUL COMMUNITIES

There has been considerable controversy regarding the proposed superhighway slated for Sunrise Highway all the way from Valley Stream to Patchogue.

The 14-lane elevated structure is a plan offered by the Long Island-New England Bridge Study Committee extending from the Queens-Nassau line to Patchogue where it would turn north to connect at Rocky Point with a proposed bridge to New England.

Running through the heart of Baldwin, Freeport, Merrick, and other adjacent communities, the highway would bring about the erection of high rise apartments and factories and mean the end of our wonderful residential communities.

At the same time, the businessmen along Sunrise Highway and bordering avenues would be adversely affected, and homeowners would be faced with providing schools, and additional services for the huge apartment houses.

While the committee claims more jobs would be created on Long Island, they're forgetting it will also bring hundreds of thousands of new jobseekers to live in multistoried apartment houses.

Since State and Federal funds are required for the planned superhighway, an authority must be created to administer the program. Only you, the voter, can stop it. Write to your State senator, assemblyman, or Congressman today. The Freeport Chamber of Commerce should sponsor the protest and now.

If you live or do business in the Fifth Congressional District, your Congressman is HERBERT TENZER; your assemblyman is John Thorpe, Jr., and State senator Norman F. Lent.

Representatives of the chambers of commerce will meet on Tuesday night, March 29 at 8 p.m. at the Sea Crest Restaurant, Sunrise Highway, Massapequa, along with editors and publishers of weekly newspapers in affected areas.

The protest is on. While the local newspapers, such as the Massapequa Post and others, can't fight this attempted rape of Long Island alone, your help is needed. Get those letters moving to your legislators now.

[From the Mailleader (Valley Stream, N.Y.), Mar. 3, 1966]

SKYWAY

With the growing tremor of the impending Atlantic expressway becoming more and more ominous, the sounds of an aroused populace are being heard in Washington and Albany. It is apparent that most Long Islanders affected by this arterial extravaganza are unaware of many aspects associated with its placement and ultimate construction.

We discussed last week the alternatives that accompany the present plan and during the past 7 days, the officials of our communities have communicated with Congressman TENZER and in turn with Governor Rockefeller. The answers have been most revealing and could be indicative of things to come. The project is first of all a State one—part of the tri-State transportation committee, and does not come under the Federal Highway department nor in turn, in its present scope, under Federal participation. The skyway is a project strictly State instituted and the accompanying engineering, traffic and revenue, and feasibility reports on both it and the proposed Long Island-New England Bridge have caused the resulting hue and cry. Every town or village in the path of the skyway is encouraging its citizens to make their views known to the town supervisor, county executive, and eventually to the Governor in Albany.

Much has been said about the resulting havoc which would affect property owners and business owners alike. A very important result which has been seemingly played down throughout this clamor is the burden placed on those who are not necessarily in the path of the proposed route. This means you, Mr. Citizen. Yes, you who live even miles away from Sunrise Highway but who nonetheless have to share this ever-increasing burden. Who will eventually have to shoulder the losses from the businesses forced to shut down or move away? Who will have to come up with the difference to keep your community and country treasuries in the "black"? You, the homeowner. The loss in taxes will have to be replaced in some way and where will they turn? To you, the homeowner. Rockeville Center, alone predicts that besides the losses to property which amounts into the $3 millions, the village would lose over $800,000 taxwise.

So let us think, while the time is right, of the proper course of action to set. The wheels are already in motion. What are you doing to make your voice heard?

[From the Baldwin (N.Y.) Citizen, Mar. 17, 1966]

WE ADD OUR VOICE

Proposals to put a 10-lane expressway above or alongside Sunrise Highway have been greeted with unanimous dismay by residents, business interests, and government officials all down the south shore.

Here in Baldwin, the effect would be disastrous. Not only would such a high-speed monstrosity destroy our business district; it would split our long, narrow community right in half.

The town board, chambers of commerce, and Congressman TENZER are among those whose voices have been raised in protest. We add our own.

Mr. Speaker, a resolution was adopted by the Town Board of the Town of Hempstead, N.Y., on March 1, 1966, stating that the town board "stands firmly opposed to the proposed route."

I am making this record in opposition to the proposed Atlantic expressway so that all Federal agencies having jurisdiction will be informed of the opposition and in turn advise the State of New York that Washington will not support a project which does not have the support of the people.

In conclusion I want to inform my colleagues that I am urging that Federal funds be withheld from this project so long as there is widespread opposition at the local level which indicates that the project is not in the public interest.