Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150004-9

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD at the proper place on the bill H.R. 5401.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall, No. 92 I was absent from the floor because of urgent business affecting my district. Had I been present I would have voted "aye." I have repeatedly stated my support for President Johnson's handling of the difficult Vietnam situation.

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 97 I find my name is not recorded. I was present and voted "yea," and I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

THE 17TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the House to the fact that today is the 17th anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel.

We all have cause to celebrate this anniversary of the day when a shining new star was added to the firmament of nations.

I personally feel a strong sense of satisfaction at the enormous progress Israel has made in these 17 years. I had occasion to visit Israel in 1952, when the Government literally did not know from 1 day to the next how it was going to pay for the next shipment to arrive in the port of Haifa. I was there again last summer and was thrilled to see the inspiring progress that has been made in every field.

Two of Israel's primary problems, as I know from my conversation with Prime Minister Eshkol last summer, are national defense and water. So far as national defense is concerned, Israel has made gigantic and remarkably sucessful efforts on her own. I trust that our Government will stand ready to make available to Israel such military assistance as may be required so as at least to maintain equilibruim in the Middle East. So far as water is concerned, Israel is taking full advantage of the available sources of natural water. This includes her share of the Jordan waters, within the limits proposed by the late Eric Johnston in his plan, which was generally hailed as a fair and equitable proposal for the distribution of the Jordan waters. Nevertheless, the time is not far off when natural waters will not suffice to meet the needs of the state of Israel and when it will be imperative for her to draw upon the limitless supply in the Mediterranean. Accordingly, I am glad that we are today cooperating with the state of Israel in a major effort to develop economical means to carry out this great task.

For the future, I look forward to the day when, pray God, there may be peace in the Middle East and Israel will be in a position to play a great role in contributing to the peaceful development of the entire area. Israel is already a bastion of democracy in the Middle East. She could be also a bastion of economic and social development for the many millions of people inhabiting that part of the world.

On this 17th anniversary, we can look back on the achievements of the past with satisfaction and look forward with confidence to an even brighter future for this state to which we have such a close and rewarding ties.

SEE AMERICA FIRST

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has called upon Americans to see America first and stop tourism to Europe this summer in the interest of reducing the deficit in the international balance of payments. To that end I note on the news wire this morning the fact that several hundred cadets are not going to be able to take their usual travel cruise around the globe this summer by military transports in behalf of their training. But I also note in the morning paper that "Recreation Superintendent Milo F. Christiansen and National Parks Service Director T. Sutton Jett have left to attend a recreation conference in the Mediterranean principality of Monaco, long a favorite playground for Europe's millionaires."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know who is doing what to whom and why in the matter of international travel?

USE OF SEATO IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken out long and often in this Chamber on the events in Vietnam. Yesterday, by an overwhelming majority from both sides of the aisle, the President received the endorsement of this body for his direction of American participation there. I went on record myself in support of the President. At the same time I called for continued exploration of any and all further possibilities for settling the Vietnam fighting.

Mr. Speaker, such a possibility exists today. I am talking about SEATO.

At the conclusion of the SEATO Council meeting yesterday in London, the members of that Organization, with the exception of France and Pakistan, strongly endorsed the efforts of the South Vietnamese to repel the invaders of their homeland.

SEATO was organized for this purpose. Article II reads:

> In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this treaty, the parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack and to prevent and counter subversive activities directed from without against their territorial integrity and political stability.

Article IV states:

> Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area * * * would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional process. If, in the opinion of any of the parties, the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any party is threatened in any way other than by armed attack or is affected or threatened by any fact or situation which might endanger the peace of the area, the parties shall consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense * * * it is understood that no action * * * shall be taken except at the invitation or with the consent of the Government concerned.

What a golden opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that we Americans should carry this burden alone. What is needed is the assistance and participation of other southeast Asia nations who themselves face a future common threat from Communist expansionism. I think this body should go on record strongly in support of efforts to utilize SEATO in Vietnam.

SEATO could very well be the key to peace in southeast Asia.

WE ARE STILL IN THE RED

(Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the executive branch of the Government announced the other day that the deficit for fiscal 1965 would be $1 billion less than the earlier projected $6.3 billion. I am sure the entire Nation was gratified to receive the good news. However, I am equally sure that a good many thinking

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150004-9

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150004-9

people were more concerned than gratified because of the remaining $5.3 billion in the red.

Mr. David Lawrence, editor of U.S. News & World Report, has put in the May 10 edition of that highly respected publication an editorial entitled "Only $30 Billion in the Red." Here Mr. Lawrence points out the folly of continued and increasing national debt. In the 5 fiscal years from July 1, 1960, the gross public debt will have increased by about $30 billion and the annual interest on the debt, which cannot be put off but must be paid every year, is running more than $11 billion.

It is not an easy thing to balance the national budget and it has not been done many times in recent years. It is easier to talk about it than it is to do it. Yet it can and must be done. Simple logic defies the indefinite continuation of deficit spending. Such is bound to produce economic chaos. No matter how difficult, we must summon the know-how and the self-discipline needed to balance the Federal budget and begin paying off the national debt.

Mr. Lawrence's editorial follows:

ONLY $30 BILLION IN THE RED

(By David Lawrence)

President Johnson, in a somewhat optimistic vein, the other day told the American people by television and radio and through the press that the deficit in the Federal budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, would be at least a billion dollars below the $6.3 billion which he had estimated last January.

This is supposed to be a sign of an improvement, if not a reversal, in the deficit spending which has now been going on year after year.

The sad truth is that in the 5 fiscal years beginning on July 1, 1960, the gross public debt will have increased by approximately $30 billion. The total interest now costs more than $11 billion a year.

Unfortunately, most persons in official life and also many others engaged in economic dialog are not disturbed by deficits totaling only $30 billion in 5 years. The thesis of the new school of economists is that deficit spending is the way to keep business good and that it doesn't matter whether the Government, year after year, is spending more than it is taking in.

The official budget estimates are often misleading. In the past 10 years, the original forecasts of the budget made 18 months before the end of a fiscal year amounted cumulatively to a total of only $200 million of deficit. But the revised estimates, made each time a year later, added up to an accumulated deficit of $36.9 billion. In that same 10-year period, the actual figures showed a deficit total of $40.8 billion.

The big fact is that the Government is running in the red year after year. Expenditures are kept down in some categories but go up in others.

The assumption is that, even with the large deficits, the United States will be able to pay its bills. But it can do so only with depreciated currency, and the risk to the average citizen is that prices will rise as the monetary unit dwindles in value. Many governments have had a tragic experience with such inflation.

Business conditions, of course, are regarded as good today, largely as a result of the recent cuts in tax rates. But how long will this last? For wages and prices as well as State taxes are continuing their upward trend. The mere size of the sales volume is not an indicator of a nation's ability to maintain its monetary unit on a stable basis.

The truth is that the Government is spending money for many things that it could well do without. This doesn't mean that the money is actually wasted, but it does mean that priority could be given to sound finance and the Nation would not suffer.

No administration, of course, can balance the budget at once. It must be a gradual process so that the economy can absorb the changes. But when year after year there is no sign that a balanced budget is even in sight, there is bound to be discouragement.

Meanwhile, the Nation will have to examine carefully all the official forecasts being made because experience has shown that, under both Republican and Democratic administrations, erroneous estimates have been offered. This is due to some extent to an inability to gage correctly future trends in business, both in this country and overseas.

The Eisenhower administration in January 1958, for example, predicted a surplus of $500 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959. But, due to a downturn in business which, during the same period, developed into a real recession, receipts were $6.1 billion less than anticipated. In an attempt to reverse the business curve, the spending went up by $6.7 billion. So the final outcome was a budget deficit of $12.4 billion.

Likewise, in January 1962 the Kennedy administration forecast a surplus of $500 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, but the estimate proved to be wrong by nearly $7 billion. This was because corporate profits had been estimated at $56.5 billion and turned out to be only $48.2 billion. Also, taxes from individuals did not come up to the figures that had been predicted. Much of this was due to the uncertainties in business occasioned by the unsettled conditions in the steel industry. The final result was a budget deficit of $6.3 billion.

It would be much better if an incumbent administration would make long-range appraisals and chart the budget trends for a given period of years rather than concentrating on a single year.

What America needs is a comprehensive program of expense cutting, along with a stimulus to business which will produce more tax receipts. Such a plan cannot be confined to a single year. There ought to be at least a 5-year look ahead, with a program for a balanced budget which would be accepted as the reasonable reflection of a sound trend in Government finance.

The American people would welcome an end to the deficit era—a total deficit of $40.8 billion in the last 10 years, with $30 billion of this piling up in the last 5 years. The official figure for the public debt now is close to $317 billion. It's the biggest debt that any nation has ever faced in the history of the world.

THE SHAME OF AMERICAN FARMING

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

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in a powerful article on the problems and conditions confronting America's itinerate farmworkers, Mr. Truman Moore, writing in the May issue of the Atlantic Monthly, has examined the price we pay for agricultural prosperity.

Mr. Moore is no abstract writer. He spent 4 years traveling and working with migrant farmworkers—talking with growers, union officials, ministers, and social workers—and so his comments are based on the facts and not mere flights of fantasy.

We are today concerned with the roots of poverty; of what can be done to alleviate the wretched conditions which afflict fully one-fifth of our people.

But as Mr. Moore points out:

Until we see the connection between migrancy—the corpses piled on the roadway, the children left to the darkness of ignorance and illiteracy, the despairing, destitute families groping for a way to live—and the bountiful supply of fruits and vegetables on every corner fruitstand or in every supermarket, no changes will come. Without this understanding, no war on poverty can hope to win more than a few skirmishes.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that our colleagues will find this to be persuasive commentary on one of the great social problems of our time, and I commend it to their thoughtful reading and consideration:

SLAVES FOR RENT—THE SHAME OF AMERICAN FARMING

(By Truman Moore)

Each year when the harvest begins, thousands of buses haul thousands of crews to fields across America as millions of migrant workers hit the road. They ride in flatbed trucks or old condemned school buses patched together for just one more season. They go by car: Hudson bombers with engines knocking, laying a smoke screen of oil; prewar Fords packed with bags, bundles, pots and pans, children crying. They go in pickups made into mobile tents—a home for the season. They ride the rods of the friendly Southern Pacific.

They come from farms in the Black Belt, from closed mines in the mountains of Kentucky and West Virginia, from wherever men are desperate for work. They come by whatever means they can find. These are the migrants—the gasoline gypsies, the rubber tramps—crossing and recrossing America, scouring the countryside in a land where the season never ends. There's always a harvest somewhere.

From Florida to Oregon the fruit tramp pursues the orchards. From Texas to Michigan the berry migrants work from field to field. Two million men, women, and children invade every State of the Union to pick fruit, to chop cotton, to scrape beans, to top oninons, to bunch carrots, to pull corn, to fill their hampers with the richest harvest earth ever yielded to man.

The circus and the college house parties leave Florida after Easter. The first week of April, the major league clubs wind up their spring training and go home to play ball. The snowbirds start back to the cities of the North with their tans. And the migrants form crews and follow the sun. Sometimes a single bus will carry a crew; sometimes they pass in ragged convoys as the migrant battalions rumble out of Florida and up the eastern seaboard.

The invasion hits South Carolina in May, North Carolina and Virginia by June. By late summer they have passed through Pennsylvania into New Jersey and New York State. Some go into Delaware and Maryland, others to Long Island, and a few on to Maine. By October the upstate crops are in, and the migrant tide flows back to the southern tip of Florida.

The workers find little to do in November. It is after a lean Thanksgiving and a bleak Christmas that hands are needed again in the fields and groves of the winter gardens.

From Texas the pattern is much the same. This is the home base of the largest migrant group. The exodus begins in early spring. Storekeepers close down for the season as the little towns depopulate. Everyone who can bend and stoop starts for the great corporate farms of the north and the west. From the steaming valleys of Arizona and

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150004-9

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150004-9

sist in discriminatory practices and would make it most unprofitable for those businesses which persist in doing so.

"None of these things," charged Mr. Moerdler, "has been done by Mayor Wagner."

STILL STUDYING

Though the mayor's failure to act on several "urgent" proposals on bias in the construction unions dates back to 1963, when he received a series of recommendations from the Commission on Human Rights and his own action panel (the mayor's office said yesterday he was planning a "progress" report), yesterday's controversy is only 1 month old.

On February 9, at a press conference announcing plans for "Co-op City," the mayor was asked what employment opportunities would be made available for minority group workers.

"We have been working on that problem," the mayor said. "Peter Brennan (president of the Building Trades Council) is working on that."

At this point, Mr. Brennan called out from the rear of the room, "Tell them it's all taken care of, Bob, that's all you have to answer."

That was all the mayor did answer and Mr. Brennan later was unavailable to outline exactly how it was all taken care of.

To get an answer to this question, the New York Young Republican Club wrote the mayor on March 10, citing the article from the Herald Tribune's "New York City in Crisis" series about the press conference.

In the letter, Mr. Moerdler demanded to know what Mr. Brennan had meant and "what guarantees have been given to assure that equal job opportunities will finally become a reality with respect to all construction in this city."

On March 13, Julius C. C. Edelstein, executive assistant to the mayor and his answer man, answered Mr. Moerdler.

According to Mr. Edelstein, the mayor "had no recollection of the exchange" between himself and Mr. Brennan although "he knows that an account along the lines you cite did appear in one of the newspapers."

"Indeed many reports are given currency these days whose accuracy the mayor would not care to underwrite."

Expressing the mayor's appreciation for the Young Republicans' concern as a "sign of the times and the year (an election year)," Mr. Edelstein said the alleged exchange does not reflect the mayor's attitude.

"The mayor," continued Mr. Edelstein, "has not ceased to exert both pressure and persuasion upon those few unions which have resisted steps toward the equalization of opportunity for admission into these unions. Contrary to the implications * * * substantial progress has been made by many of the unions in changing longstanding practices and rules. Of course, the progress made could not be considered sufficient in the light of the magnitude of the problem."

THE COUNTERATTACK

Failing to cite a single statistic or specific to document his claim of "substantial progress," Mr. Edelstein concluded by saying, "The question is, however, what efforts could have been exterted, and by whom, to have achieved a greater result? What power does the city government possess which, if applied, could produce this more gratifying result? Would shutting down city construction—a coercive measure which is suggested in your letter—contribute to the desired outcome? And by what steps?

"If such coercion is proposed as a proper measure by the city government, should it not also be urged upon the State government and upon the private construction industry, too?

"This is not to say that your letter indulges in such over-simplification. But the mayor thought I ought to call the possibility of it to your attention."

It was this letter—and another by Mr. Moerdler dated March 18—that led to the open controversy yesterday.

Though Mr. Edelstein, the mayor, and Peter Brennan could not be reached for comment yesterday afternoon, two reporters from the World-Telegram and Sun and a spokesman for the Human Rights Commission were.

The two newsmen, who also covered the press conference at which the exchange between the mayor and Mr. Brennan was reported in the Herald Tribune and denied by the mayor, corroborated the Herald Tribune's version.

AND STILL WAITING

A spokesman for the Human Rights Commission, which asked the mayor in 1963 to cancel contracts with construction firms shown to have engaged in discriminatory practices, said the commission is still waiting for an answer—and some action—from city hall.

Asked what Mr. Brennan meant by his statement that the matter was being taken care of, a spokesman for Mr. Brennan said yesterday that the building trades unions have been asked to send reports in to the central office detailing exactly how many Negroes and Puerto Ricans have entered each union.

When would some information be available?

"I just can't say," the spokesman said. "It will take us a while compiling the information."

In his letter of March 18, Mr. Moerdler told Mr. Edelstein, "If these various reports do not, as you suggest, 'reflect the mayor's attude on this matter,' it behooves him to speak for himself.

"It is difficult to believe that there is, as you suggest, a conspiracy afoot on the part of the press to publish reports '* * * whose accuracy the mayor would not care to underwrite.'

"Your question as to what an effective and conscientious mayor might do finally to end discrimination in this city is a most shocking admission of the moral decline of this city's government."

Mr. Moerdler concluded by saying he was delighted that the mayor appreciates the club's interest in the achievement of equal opportunity.

"Through such distinguished former club officers and members as Congressman LINDSAY, Senator JAVITS, Governors Rockefeller and Dewey, Jackie Robinson and the late Stanley M. Isaacs, to name a few, we have tried over the years to make our contribution.

"I hope that we can finally persuade the mayor to make his."

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. VIGORITO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

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

THE CHOICE IN VIETNAM

(Mr. KREBS (at the request of Mr. VIGORITO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, during recent weeks much has been written on the crucial matter of Vietnam. In my mind few newspapers have carried as clear an editorial as that of the Newark Evening News of April 28, 1965, which follows. I commend it to my colleagues and interested Americans as a lucid exposition of the grave situation facing our Government:

THE CHOICE

President Johnson's restatement of policy on Vietnam was incisive, directed as much to his critics at home as to the governments of Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow.

Nowhere was there an intimation of retreat from the position enunciated at Baltimore. The offer to hold unconditional discussions with any government, anywhere and at any time remains open.

Nor is there any slackening of the determination to resist Communist aggression with the most effective weapons at our command.

More cogently than any of his Cabinet officers, the President buttressed the case for bombing military targets in North Vietnam. In so doing, he relied upon this single, telling contrast:

On one side, bombs surreptitiously planted in movie houses, children's play fields and the U.S. Embassy in Saigon. On the other, bomb runs carried out against North Vietnam's bridges, radar installations and ammunition dumps where few, if any, civilians reside.

In light of this contrast, Mr. Johnson found it hard to understand, as others also must, how some persons can criticize the bombing of military targets in North Vietnam and "never open their mouth about a bomb being placed in our Embassy in South Vietnam."

Though he resisted the temptation, the President might as pointedly have asked his homefront critics what alternative they propose. Do they suggest we absorb all that is thrown at us without striking back? Or do they recommend withdrawal, leaving South Vietnam and the rest of southeast Asia to go under?

If either is their preference, they've been singularly silent about it.

Painful as may be this country's position in southeast Asia, it is difficult to see what course, beyond the one he is following, is open to the President. He has stated without equivocation his readiness to negotiate. He has made just as clear this Nation's determination to meet force with superior force.

The choice rests with the enemy. And the answer must come from Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow.

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. VIGORITO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

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

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. VIGORITO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

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

PROPOSED TAX CREDIT FOR HIGHER EDUCATION EXPENSES

(Mr. McCARTHY (at the request of Mr. VIGORITO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150004-9

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150004-9

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a tax credit to individuals for the expenses of providing higher education.

Under its provisions, persons paying for higher education would receive income tax credit on the first $1,500 expended for tuition, fees, books, and supplies.

The costs of higher education are heavy, both for colleges and for students. In 1961–62, for example, while tuitions were soaring and parents were groaning, student fees provided only 42 percent of the income of the average private institution in New York State. Congress has long recognized the burden institutions of higher education bear and the debts that we owe them for assuming the responsibility of educating our youth. These institutions, for example are tax exempt; there are numerous and generous Government programs for construction of buildings, for training of teachers, for research. Needy students, too, get assistance. The National Defense Education Act has served over 500,000 students with loans. And under the Economic Opportunity Act the very needy student is offered a work-study program to enable him to meet the costs of his education.

These programs are good; they are extensive; and they are indisputedly valuable. But just as many poor people are too poor to benefit from existing Federal aid programs—such as farm loans, or small business loans, or housing loans—many concerned parents are too rich for their children to qualify for scholarships yet not rich enough to pay school costs without considerable sacrifice and stress. The bill I have introduced today would help relieve a hard pinch on these family purses.

The average family income in the United States in 1963 was $6,249. College costs average $1,500 for public and $2,370 for private institutions. My point is clearly made: This represents a substantial chunk of the family's income. And a taxed chunk at that.

In addition, many, many families are trying to educate more than one child at the same time. Take my case as an example. I have five children—ages 7, 5, 4, 2, and 1. I hope to see them all in college some day. If this is possible, I could be paying four tuitions simultaneously for at least 2 years. Frankly, the prospect staggers me. Granted, this is an extreme case. But it does illustrate the problems that many families face in offering their children a college education.

Briefly, the bill provides a credit against taxes owed for the first $1,500 expended for tuition, fees, books, and suplies for a student in an institution of higher education. Room and board expenses are not covered by this credit. We propose that the credit be computed as follows: 85 percent of the first $200 expended, 30 percent of the next $300 and 10 percent of the next $1,000. A recent New York State regents study showed that the median tuition in private, 4-year, nondenominational collegiate institutions was $1,500 for 1964–65—just the amount that would be exempted under this bill. The family paying this amount in tuition would receive a credit of $360.

The sliding scale serves as a device to equalize the benefits afforded to students at private and public colleges. It provides most relief for the first few hundred dollars of tuition expenditure—and this is welcome relief for those attending public colleges where tuition and fees are low compared to private colleges.

A comparison can be made for New York State. I just noted that a family with a student in a private college in New York State, paying minimum costs of $1,500 for tuition and fees would receive $360 in credit.

The public State University of New York averages fees and tuition of $515 to $865. The credit afforded to people paying these fees would be $272 on the low end and $297 on the high end of the scale. The individual in the private college would be relieved of the burden of 24 percent of his expenditure up to $1,500, while the individual in the public school would be relieved or from 34 to 53 percent of his costs—indicating that those in public colleges benefit on a proportionately higher scale.

The credit is available to anyone who pays the costs for higher education—parent, student, or other benefactor. And a further control on its outflow is the limitation on benefits to higher income individuals. If the income of an individual paying education expenses exceeds $25,000, his credit is reduced by 1 percent of anything over that amount. Taxpayers in high income brackets get no credit at all, and the taxpayer with income of $30,000 per year receives substantially less credit than a man supporting his family on $15,000.

The middle- and upper-income earner, it becomes increasingly evident, is heavily hit by taxes, as is to be expected under our progressive tax system. Just this year, as we saw, this group of income earners found themselves owing the Government upwards of half a billion dollars over and above what was withheld from their salaries. An example is a $20,000-a-year man with a wife and two children. He found himself owing $707.21—beyond the $2,975.79 that had already been withheld for taxes from his earnings. Sending one of his two children to college would make an appreciable dent in his income this year.

The New York regents study estimates that by 1970 almost 35,000 students from the Buffalo area will be seeking higher education—a 35-percent increase over those who are now enrolled from that area. Many of the families I serve are middle-income families who would benefit from this legislation. During my campaign, I was repeatedly assured of their support for this measure.

The education of our youth is of essential importance to the future of this Nation. We have recognized this fact in our heavy support of institutions of higher education. But now is the time for us to help out the other participants in this complex area of higher education—the students and the families who make it possible for them to be students. Scholarships and loans cannot serve everyone in need—but legislation such as this tax-credit bill can ease the strain for some of those who bear the full burden of paying for a college education. I endorse immediate action on this legislation.

ISRAEL'S 17TH ANNIVERSARY EVENT

(Mr. FASCELL (at the request of Mr. VIGORITO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the 17th anniversary of the rebirth of a free Israel. For nineteen hundred years mankind was without the benefit of the nation which gave to man a new concept of God, the essence of three great religions, and the world's greatest Book.

There is no older section of the world of the Near East. It is a rugged land ravaged by time and filled with paradoxes which give rise to both hope and despair. Yet in this land can be found one of the most inspiring stories of this or any other century: the story of the birth of Israel, her struggle to maintain independence amidst hostile neighbors, and her efforts to extend freedom to people of all nations.

Israel is a small country but in less than 2 decades her people have built in their ancient homeland a strong and dynamic modern state. Once again Israel is enriching the lives of men through efforts of worldwide significance. Her unique and fertile culture is free once again to blossom into ideas whose beauty will stir the soul of the world as in the days of the Prophets. The Palestinian deserts bloom today through the miracle of modern agriculture and the perseverance of the Israel people. The sounds of industry echo through the Negev where once there was only the sound of the wind. Camels pass by modern buildings where scientists are unlocking the secret of the atom and working to make fresh water from the sea.

In these 17 short years Israel has been born, held off her enemies, who have unfortunately been many, and won a firm place among the free and progressive nations of the world. It is certain that the future of the new Israel will be as long and as rich as her ancient past.

An editorial from one of Florida's finest weekly newspapers, the Jewish Floridian, carried an excellent editorial commemorating Israel's anniversary.

The editorial follows:

ISRAEL'S 17TH ANNIVERSARY EVENT

The 17th anniversary of the State of Israel falls next Thursday, on May 6. The fifth day of the Hebrew month of Iyar marks the establishment of the modern Jewish republic, which was forged out of the ashes of the decimated Jewish community of Europe back in 1948.

Since then, we have seen a miraculous achievement in nation building that is almost unprecedented in our time. Section C of this week's edition of the Jewish Floridian is dedicated to this achievement.

Founded upon the tentative development of the earlier Yishuv in Palestine, the State

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150004-9

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150004-9

Appendix

Weirton Steel Co. Commended for Its Program of Air and Water Pollution Control—Senator Randolph Participates in Dedication of New Equipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Friday, April 30, 1965, a remote control switch activating a huge electrostatic precipitator at the Weirton Steel operation of National Steel Corp. was formally placed in service. This facility was installed to control air pollution from the open-hearth furnaces in Weirton, W. Va. As a member of the Senate Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, it was my privilege and responsibility to participate. The switch was thrown, the button was pressed, then came the satisfaction of seeing the redbrown plumes of smoke billowing from these open-hearth furnace stacks transformed within 2 minutes into clean air, leaving the precipitator stack.

State of West Virginia officials and National Steel Corp. executives present were aware that far more than a simple action of that moment was associated with this undertaking. Members of the West Virginia Air Pollution Control Commission, State Agriculture Commissioner Gus R. Douglas, and Samuel Kusic, representing an active State air pollution control body; Mr. C. G. Tournay, president of Weirton Steel Co., and his staff, representing an enlightened industrial management; and several million dollars, representing the cost of this facility; all working together were necessary to achieve this transformation. Let the record reflect, Mr. President, that when these basic ingredients are present, air and stream pollution problems, no matter how complex, can and are being solved at the State and local levels of government. These factors are effective in West Virginia. Other State and local officials at this significant ceremony were State Senators Chester R. Hubbard and William Tompos of the First District; members of the house of delegates, George G. Griffith and George Di Tokash of Hancock County; and Mayor Frank A. Rybka, of Weirton.

Prior to the ceremony, Weirton Steel officials explained in some detail to these guests, the full extent of their current air and stream pollution control progress. They discussed their new "mill of the future," under construction, consisting of a 300-ton basic oxygen process, a vacuum degassing unit and a continuous casting installation. For the first time in this country, these three units will function in unison to make a superior steel product, thus the name, "Mill of the Future." These facilities require large amounts of water for cooling, scale removal and dust collection—over 50 million gallons of water per day. The water treatment facilities planned by Weirton Steel will fit their name for this "Mill of the Future." They will recirculate 90 percent of this water through complex filters, oil and scale basins, clarifiers, and finally, polishing pressure filters. As water is returned to the Ohio River, it will meet the most stringent requirements for water quality.

Before the basic oxygen process effluent is released to the atmosphere, this air will be washed in a wet scrubber and another clean stack will mark the Weirton horizon. All of this at a cost of many millions of dollars.

The company management also discussed with us a new sulfuric acid disposal facility to completely eliminate the discharge of waste sulfuric pickling acid to the Ohio River. This installation, on which operating costs equal $1,000 per day, will collect and neutralize all sulfuric acid wastes from the Weirton Steel plant. At the same time, there is a complete remodeling of the cold rolling tandem mills to recirculate rolling solutions and install oil collection and removal basins to prevent rolling oils from entering the Ohio River. These installations represent current projects to reduce air and stream pollution at Weirton. Much more has been done and much more will be done. National Steel officials told me during this visit, that their current budget commitments at Weirton Steel for control of air and stream pollution equaled approximately $10 million. This has been committed by an industrial company working with local and State officials with no involvement of Federal authorities.

The Weirton Steel plant occupies a significant place in the economic, social, and civic life of the northern section of our State, where it employs almost 13,000 persons. Leadership in many aspects of civic affairs is exercised by company personnel, and it is noteworthy, in this respect, that the former president of Weirton Steel, the Honorable Tom Millsop, served as a mayor of that city and was responsible for much community progress and a strong sense of community purpose.

If all industrial management officials were as progressive and as civic minded as are those of the Weirton Steel, and if all State and local officials were as conscious of their responsibilities in the field of pollution control as are those now serving in West Virginia, the Congress would perhaps not need to act on Federal standards for air and water quality.

As legislators we must recognize that these large expenditures for cleaning our air and water and for the beautification of America do not result in any financial return to industry. On the contrary, they result in substantial costs.

As legislators, therefore, in addition to enacting abatement legislation based on enforcement authority, we should create an effective incentive for the continuation, acceleration, and expansion of abatement projects constructed at the initiative of industry. We can do so by supporting legislation that will give tax recognition to amounts expended by industry to improve the quality of air and water—our invaluable natural resources.

As I stated in my remarks at Wierton on April 30, it is my hope that the Congress will act during this session on legislation which would give to industry an accelerated writeoff of investments in pollution abatement equipment. As a cosponsor of S. 1670, which is now pending before the Senate Finance Committee, I believe that society as a whole should bear some of the cost of such equipment which is necessitated by the increasing industrialization of our country and the growing population density. For these reasons I shall press for early action on the Clean Air Act as well as legislation to bring some relief to those companies which seek to implement the goals of that legislation.

Retreat in Asia Would Be Avenue to Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD FULTON
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in a recent editorial of April 28, 1965, entitled "Policy Firmly Stated: Retreat in Asia Would Be Avenue to Disaster," the Nashville Banner calls for support of President Johnson's policy in Vietnam.

Asserting:

> President Johnson obviously has assessed the case, and is adhering to a policy course dictated by the realities..

The editorial adds: "There can be no wavering on that course of duty outlined," by President Johnson and reiterated in his news conference of April 27, 1965.

Mr. Speaker, under leave I request permission to insert the editorial from the Nashville Banner in the RECORD and com-

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150004-9

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150004-9

mend it to the consideration of my colleagues:

POLICY FIRMLY STATED: RETREAT IN ASIA WOULD BE AVENUE TO DISASTER

President Johnson firmly restated yesterday the U.S. policy in Vietnam; its purpose clearly defined, and underlined with the note of courage that forbids retreat. It was not a provocative discussion, but explanatory for any element on this side, or elsewhere in the world, needing the explanation.

There can be no wavering on that course of duty outlined. With evaluation of the crisis there as definitive as it was perceptive, the President warned that yielding by surrender would bring greater threats, and ultimately all-out war. He was on solid ground in reminding of the costs of retreat in every instance of that—from Munich to the present.

America is not the aggressor in Asia. Its military intervention there, solicited by South Vietnam, is for free world security, to which national policy and its alliances are committed. The increasing responsibility assumed has been in the light of communism's military threat—raised by both North Vietnam and Red China, their combined purpose the conquest of all Asia.

Halfhearted or fainthearted measures will not stem that murderous tide. Once a battle has been joined, there can be no substitute for victory.

President Johnson obviously has assessed the case, and is adhering to a policy course dictated by the realities. He has answered effectively the critics who—in this engagement, as others—have advocated the panic and pullout course, and whose policy concept would make every sacrifice to date a sacrifice in vain.

There are those, on the other hand, who have assessed the murderous realities of the Communist dogma—seeing it for what it is; and have believed for years that there would be no peace, security, nor guarantees of the preservation of freedom, until communism has been clobbered by somebody.

Whatever the course we pursue in meeting that threat to the free world and to the United States as our prime consideration, it won't be cheap. But it will be infinitely more expensive, in blood and substance, if the enemy is permitted to continue aggression and conquest unchallenged.

The President engaged in no rhetorical definitions avoiding references to the term of "war." That is the reality, declared or not. It is a war precipitated by the enemy, and must be won.

Mr. Johnson has stated clearly the willingness to discuss a settlement, and yesterday reiterated it. Nevertheless, with equal clarity he spelled out the course that will be pursued if the enemy persists in the campaign of murderous aggression.

It was time to junk the no-win policy which has encumbered the security operation since World War II.

America wants peace—but peace at any price is the avenue to disaster and to free world annihilation.

Heading Off Castroism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Heading Off Castroism," which was published on April 30, in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin.

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

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Apr. 30, 1965]

HEADING OFF CASTROISM

Since that fateful day 3 years and 11 months ago, when Dictator Rafael Trujillo stepped from his car at an intersection and was gunned down by assassins, ending 30 years of absolute power, the Dominican Republic has wobbled precariously between a leftist Castroite takeover and a rightwing coup by the fallen Trujillo's heirs.

Soon after his death, as President Balaguer struggled to satisfy demands for reform, the United States deployed a dozen warships off Ciudad Trujillo and sent Marine fighter planes skimming along the coast to help Balaguer persuade Trujillo's brothers it would be a mistake for them to pick up his mantle. It worked. Soon Ciudad Trujillo was renamed Santo Domingo.

Since then, the little country has managed one democratic election. But the winner, moderate and weak President Juan Bosch, lasted only 7 months before some of the military got fed up with his tolerance for the left and booted him out. The rest of the time, one or another junta, council, or strongman has kept things rocking along in this forlorn land, where two-thirds of the people are illiterate, and life is sustained by sugar exports and American aid.

Fidel Castro, sniffing opportunity near his doorstep, has helped to keep the pot boiling through the Communist 14th of June movement. On Tuesday, as a fumbling army coup aimed at restoring Bosch faltered halfway to power, the Fidelistas moved in, armed "the people," and military revolt became general chaos. An air force general, a stanch anti-Communist, Wessin y Wessin, rallied the country's best armed forces but could not immediately retake the capital. With American lives in danger, the President sent Marines and airborne troops to rescue them and protect U.S. property.

The wheel has come full circle. In 1961, we showed the flag to chase away the Trujillo tribe. Now, according to Congressmen briefed at the White House, our forces are there, at least in part, to try to head off the Castroites, should they look like coming out on top of the shapeless insurrection.

Any such intent must be officially denied, of course, for the Charter of the Organization of American States rules out any armed intervention by one state in the affairs of another under any grounds whatever. Wisely, the United States lost no time in convening the OAS, and it now appears that the OAS will assume the leadership in seeking a cease fire. It should also sponsor whatever military or other action is needed to restore order.

Our intervention, of course, gives communism everywhere something new to denounce, and it risks protracted involvement of our forces in the Dominican Republic. But another Communist state in the Caribbean cannot be tolerated, and the President's action meets this threat head on.

Investigating the Ku Klux Klan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, as we all know the House Committee on Un-American Activities has been at the center of controversy through the years. It is so again today as preparations are being made for its investigation of the Ku Klux Klan.

It is not my purpose today either to praise or criticize the committee. Among its members are friends for whom I have the highest regard, and in any case I could not begin to match the words already expressed by others, either in approving or disapproving specific actions or the overall conduct of the committee.

Nonetheless, I have been asked by constitutents having strong feelings about the committee and its work to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the April 16, 1965, issue of Commonweal, the respected journal of Catholic thought. Entitled "Gambling on House Un-American Activities Committee," the article questions the merits of the forthcoming Ku Klux Klan investigation. I am sure it will be of interest to my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, without objection, the article follows:

GAMBLING ON THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

The favorite reading material of the Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, if we accept the example of Imperial Wizard Robert Shelton, are the reports on subversion in the country issued periodically by the House Un-American Activities Committee. That the Klan should now be the subject of an investigation by the selfsame committee may be temporarily gratifying, then, if only for the irony. But in light of the House Un-American Activities Committee's history, the reckless charges, misuse of power, arrogant disregard of individual rights—all of which in this country have become synonymous with its initials—it seems the height of gambler's folly to expect that anything worthwhile will come of it.

The White House stated its preference for the House Un-American Activities Committee, over the responsible House Judiciary Committee, on the ground that the former is above suspicion of leftist tendencies, even in the South, and that a condemnation of the Klan coming from it will carry just that much more weight. However, to qualify as free of the Communist rot that supposedly is infecting the country, at least in the minds of white southerners, is merely to mark the measures of one's removal from reality. That is precisely why the House Un-American Activities Committee is untrustworthy for the serious task of investigation that the Klan's activities in the South demand.

The House Un-American Activities Committee has ignored extreme rightist and racist groups in this country for decades, even when some of them, the Klan for example, have been listed by the Attorney General's Office as subversive. Its obsession with ferreting out Communists has led it into actions that have brought discredit not only on it, but to some degree on the whole investigative function of Congress. To set it on the Klan trail now will not somehow suddenly transform it into a model agency of government. Instead, it sets a poor precedent by which the competence of official investigative agencies is determined by their political color. If the whole idea is simply to match prejudices, then the exercise of congressional authority may soon become accepted in theory, as it occasionally is in practice, as arbitrary.

This is particularly foolhardy in the present instance, for in investigating the Klan, the whole civil rights movement in the South will necessarily come under the House Un-American Activities Committee's capricious

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150004-9

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150004-9

Should the OAS fail to act against Cuba, we might hearken to the words of a former President, which were regrettably a substitute for action:

"Should it ever appear that the inter-American doctrine of noninterference merely conceals or excuses a policy of nonaction; if the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration, then I want it clearly understood that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations which are the security of the Nation."—John F. Kennedy, April 20, 1961.

In the Dominican Republic, as in Vietnam, we are confronted by a Communist "war of national liberation." The face of aggression has changed, but it is nonetheless aggression. It is not conducted by large armies crossing fixed frontiers. The aggressors are trained terrorists, subversives, propagandists who infiltrate backward nations, exacerbate tensions, loot and murder and create conditions of chaos. These wars are directed and supported and supplied by the Communists in Moscow, Havana, and Peiping.

Their ultimate objective is not just control of the Dominican Republic or seizure of all Hispaniola or even all Vietnam. It is the destruction of the one thing that blocks the road to world conquest: U.S. power.

These Communist revolutions have never granted the people the promised political or social benefits, promised of peace, land, bread, agrarian reform, free elections, there is the seizure of all property, impoverishment, totalitarianism and terror.

The one point about which every Communist is in total agreement is their mutual hatred of America and mutual recognition that our power and resolve alone thwarts the realization of their wildest dreams.

The greatest power in the history of the world cannot pick up shallow commitments, come home to wage gallant war on Appalachia while the states which would stand for their freedom if we would stand with them fall again into the agonies of Communist tyranny.

President Johnson has shown the proper use of power. The Communist road to world conquest is less certain and more hazardous than it was just a year ago.

A NEW WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH CATALOG AVAILABLE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, during consideration of expanded water resources research by the committees of Congress, and by the House and the Senate, considerable concern was expressed about expenditures for duplicating research projects.

The original water resources research bill, which I introduced in 1962, provided for the Office of Water Research to maintain a register or catalog of all federally sponsored water research and as much non-Federal and private research as the sponsors would voluntarily report. One of the purposes of the catalog was to avoid duplication of research projects. Another was to make knowledge of all such projects—and the results as projects were completed—widely available.

In processing the legislation, the task of maintaining a comprehensive record of water research projects was assigned to the Science Information Exchange at the Smithsonian Institution, where it could be kept with other scientific research data.

As one of its first projects, the new Office of Water Resources Research has obtained from the Science Information Exchange a catalog of all federally supported water resources research projects underway and published the catalog in a well-classified and indexed, 450-page volume.

The catalog lists a total of 1,546 project summaries under eight chapter headings including "Nature of Water," "Water Cycle," "Water and Land Management," "Development and Control," "Qualitative Aspects," "Reuse and Separation," "Economic and Institutional Aspects," and "Engineering Works."

There are four indexes, by corporate author, by subject, by supporting agency, and by principal investigator.

The publication of this first catalog is the achievement of a milestone in water research, Mr. President, which is very gratifying to me, and I have taken the floor to call attention to it in the RECORD because of the great potential value that the document will have as it is circulated and used in water research circles.

The catalog will do a great deal to prevent expensive duplication of research effort by both public and private agencies. With a shortage of competent hydroscientists, the savings in manpower which results from avoiding duplication may be even more important than savings in dollars.

The catalog will also have increased water problems with leads to sources of information, and as the catalog is reissued from year to year, the accumulated record of research underway and completed will have increasingly great value in this respect.

The catalog will provide those with value in the future as the Science Information Exchange is able to add non-Federal research projects.

Copies of the catalog are available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., for $2.50.

If that sounds like a commercial, it is intended to be, for I hope the document will come into wide use.

I congratulate all those officials who have had a part in the issuance of the catalog, including Dr. John Calhoun, who served as Acting Director of the Office of Water Research when it was organized, Dr. Roland Renne, the Director of the Office of Water Research, and his Associate Director, E. D. Eaton, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, and Dr. Monroe E. Freeman, Director of the Science Information Exchange of the Smithsonian Institution, for the very fine job they have done.

TAX EXEMPTION FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Evening Star explaining the procedures established by the Internal Revenue Service for military personnel eligible to claim the tax exemption, recently granted by Executive Order No. 11216, for those serving in Vietnam subsequent to January 1, 1964.

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

UNITED STATES SET TO SPEED TAX REFUNDS FOR VIETNAM SERVICE

The Government has set up a plan to speed income tax refunds to military personnel who served in Vietnam during 1964.

Thousands of servicemen paid taxes on military pay which President Johnson recently ruled was at least partially tax exempt.

The White House announced today that taxpayers who served in Vietnam in 1964 and have already filed returns may claim refunds by submitting amended returns.

To speed processing of the refunds, amended returns should be marked at the top of the form: "Amended—Combat Zone."

While tax returns on 1964 normally were due April 15, servicemen in Vietnam have been granted an automatic extension of time for filing. Any original claims and returns they file should be marked simply "Combat Zone" to speed processing.

The White House said servicemen filing amended returns, original returns or claims should attach a statement showing the number of months served in Vietnam in 1964 and the total amount of pay excluded from taxation.

PROTECTING OUR OWN—FOR ONCE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, none of us is happy that circumstances have forced us to send the marines to the Dominican Republic, but as the facts have unfolded none of us can doubt that there was no alternative if we were to protect our own national interests against a proliferation of Castroism in the Caribbean. It is gratifying indeed that responsible elements of the press have been sensitive to the realities of the situation and have thrown their support behind the President's commitment. In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an excellent editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer entitled "Protecting Our Own—for Once."

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

PROTECTING OUR OWN—FOR ONCE

There seems to be considerable surprise mingled with the expectable Communist uproar over the landing of American marines and airborne troops in the Dominican Republic to protect American lives and property. It has been a long while since we started our strength in our own interest.

Well, let them yelp. The United States has bent over backward—almost double—in the last generation to be a good neighbor to the whole world community, with particular emphasis on nearer neighbors in this hemisphere. As a result, we have endured the charming spectacle of having our libraries and embassies attacked, sometimes burned; our touring citizens insulted and at times imperiled; our envoys subjected to every kind of boorish behavior, and our avidly solicited investments wiped out.

If the landing in bloody Santo Domingo and the sealing off of our Embassy from the raggle-taggle assaults of every juvenile or adult Dominican delinquent betokens a "tougher line," most Americans, we believe, will agree it's time.

It is interesting what a thunderous clamor Fidel Castro is making in this connection. The lesson may have special meaning to him—he caught us when we were still trying to be polite if it killed us.

How many Castroists may be in the Dominican mobs is still problematical, but it is a certainty that if they didn't precipitate this crisis they made to order for them.

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150004-9

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150004-9

PEACE—BUT HOW?

Paris in the spring is lovely, but comments out of Paris this spring week have not been very helpful in bringing peace to southeast Asia.

French President de Gaulle, taking time out from his consultations with the visiting Soviet Foreign Minister, Andrei Gromyko, appeared on television in a fireside chat to express, among other things, his "severe disapproval" of the spreading southeast Asia hostilities.

How anyone would dare continue fighting in the face of the French President's majestic disapproval may be puzzling, but that's humanity for you. Unfortunately, De Gaulle did not present any further positive proposals as to how the war can be ended other than to say what he has said before—that the area ought to be neutral and independent, "free of any encroachments."

In most of this the Johnson administration can agree, although it is not certain whether the French leader is as equally displeased with Communist encroachments in South Vietnam as he obviously is with the presence of American forces in the area.

An hour after De Gaulle spoke, President Johnson held a news conference in which he reasserted America's determination to arrive at a peaceful settlement and our hopes of preventing the war from getting any bigger. Mr. Johnson said he would talk "to any government, anywhere, any time, without any conditions." If the same kind of statements were coming from the Communist side, the hostilities could end forthwith.

But the United States does not propose to turn tail and run. If it be true that the Johnson administration now is overemphasizing the factor of outside aggression from Hanoi, after several years of American insistence that the struggle was primarily internal, it cannot be denied that outside aggression plays an important role. If North Vietnam—or, more likely, Red China—were willing to call a cease-fire, the bombing and bloodletting could come to a halt while the diplomats came to the conference table.

Ex-Senator Goldwater's comments in Paris were not helpful, either, and we can only hope that people elsewhere do not mistake the Arizonian's words for America policy. Mr. Goldwater said he rather prays that Red China will give the United States the provocation to attack Red China's military and atomic installations.

Nations in the past have gone to war over much less provocation than Red China already has given. But nations in the past did not possess the means to blow each other off the face of the earth. The war ought to be ended, not expanded. However, one may argue over strategy and timing, basic American policy now can hardly be other than Mr. Johnson summed it up in his press conference—"firmness with modernization, readiness for peace with refusal to retreat."

Baseball: A Study in Cupidity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions in the past I have sought to direct the attention of my colleagues in the House to the sorry situation which exists today in organized professional baseball.

I have done so in an effort to spur action by Congress on legislation which would put baseball under Federal antitrust regulation. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 6, which has that purpose.

It is my belief that lucrative radio and television contracts have changed the essential nature of professional baseball. This belief was confirmed by a recent report in Broadcasting magazine which showed that the rights to broadcast games have netted the major leagues $25,310,000 for the 1965 season. Sponsors of these programs will pay the networks about $85 million this year.

These figures are ample proof that baseball today is big business and must be regulated in the public interest.

It has become evident that without such regulation the owners of the major league clubs are tempted to flaunt the best interests of the fans in their search for greater and greater profits.

Nowhere is the evidence of baseball greed more evident than in my own home city of Milwaukee. The Milwaukee Braves will go to Atlanta, Ga., next year—not because Atlanta is a better baseball town—but because of lucrative radio and television contracts.

Milwaukee proved that it is still the town that set the National League season attendance record on opening day. Through the efforts of a community organization called Teams, Inc., an attendance of 33,874 was achieved. This was one of the largest opening day crowds in either league.

Since then attendance has fallen off sharply and it is not strange that it has. Milwaukee is a city which has been hurt by big league baseball, and particularly by the Braves clubowners.

The Milwaukee baseball situation was the topic recently of two articles which appeared in the May 4 issue of the Milwaukee Journal. One was by Red Smith, the world famous sportswriter, and the other by the Journal's noted sports editor, Oliver E. Kuechle.

Their columns document the results of the cupidity of baseball's owners both in Milwaukee and elsewhere. Because of the pertinency of these facts to the effort to put organized professional baseball under antitrust regulation, I am inserting the two articles and commend the attention of my colleagues to them:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, May 4, 1965]

(By Red Smith)

BRAVES OWNERS OFFER A STUDY IN CUPIDITY

In Chicago, where the White Sox and Twins were fighting for first place, Sunday's doubleheader drew 42,367, Comiskey Park's biggest crowd since August 1963.

In Kansas City, where the Athletics lay a moldering in last place with a 6-game losing streak and only 2 victories for the season, 2 games with the Angeles drew 9,171.

Weather was good all over and nowhere was it better than in Milwaukee, where summer came rushing in after a frosty spring. Skies were clear and the thermometer reached a high of 86°. It was too fine to sit around drinking beer, and on a pleasant May Sunday there isn't much else to do in Milwaukee. Lake Michigan and Oconomowoc Lake are still too cold for swimming. The bass season isn't open yet. It's a bit too early to drive up to Door County to see the cherry blossoms.

GOOD OLD DAYS

It was, in other words, the sort of day when you either take the kids to the zoo or go to the ballgame. In his time there, Lou Perini could take a sellout of 40,000 for granted, especially with a live pennant contender like this year's Phillies in town.

So the Braves, who played to 19 million customers in 12 seasons since they settled in the American cheeselands, lost twice to the Phillies before 8,630 witnesses. This was the day's smallest crowd in the major leagues, but considering the way baseball people run their business, it was a triumph. Things will be worse before they are better for the Chicago owners of the Boston-Milwaukee-Atlanta carpetbaggers.

This is the story thus far for the lame ducks of County Stadium:

On opening day, a civic organization called Teams, Inc., bought out the park for $35,000 and resold 33,874 tickets for a profit of about $13,000.

For the second game, 3,362 seats were occupied in 40° weather. It was still chilly for the third game when 3,391 attended. Temperatures climbed into the 60° for the fourth game, but attendance dropped to 2,804. Then the St. Louis Cardinals, champions of the world, came to town.

They opened before 1,677, the smallest crowd ever to attend a big league game in Milwaukee. To be sure, the weather was bad again, so bad that only 862 tickets were sold at the gate. The other 815 had been sold in advance.

The next day a new record was set, 1,324. When 2,182 showed up for the Cards' third game there, it brought the total for the St. Louis series to 5,183. At about 28 cents a head, the Cardinals didn't clear expenses.

INCOME BELOW $700 A DAY

By then the Braves had played 7 times at home before total crowds of 48,614, slightly over the 1-game record. However, attendance for the 6 games after the high pressure opener added up to 14,740 for a daily average of 2,456.

Business like that means a gross daily income below $700 for the visiting team, which has to transport, house, feed, and pay the wages of a 40-man party.

Yet, baseball people have never discovered that they are business partners. They see a lodge brother losing his shirt in a bush league operation and don't realize that he's stripping them to the waist, too. The league president does not raise his voice to protest the despoilation of a city and a territory. The baseball commissioner does not lift a finger.

The other owners say, "It's his business," but it is their business too. The welfare of every club should be the president's direct concern, for what is bad for one is bad for all. "It's a league affair," the commissioner says, but when a fertile baseball territory is ravished, it should be baseball's affair.

VANISHING FANS

We have had many examples of what happens to baseball interest in a city which baseball abandons. In 1947 the Yankees, Giants, and Dodgers drew 5,387,256 customers in New York. The first year the Yankees had the field to themselves, New York attendance was 1,428,438. More than 4 million fans had vanished during the winter.

In 1948, the Braves and Red Sox played to 3,104,237 in Boston. In 1962, when Tom Yawkey had the only store in town, he sold 733,080 tickets. Two and a quarter million fans had got lost.

Next year, unless a court prevents it, the Braves will ship their carpetbags to Atlanta. Warren Giles will make a pious statement saluting once again the pioneering spirit of the National League, whose fearless missionaries are carrying the baseball gospel into the Deep South for the first time. He will be inspiringly eloquent.

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150004-9

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150004-9

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, May 4, 1965]

TIME OUT FOR TALK—BRAVES BRING UP REAR IN ATTENDANCE

(By Oliver E. Kuechle, sports editor)

We now come to the merry month of May and the Braves fervently hope it will be merrier at the turnstiles than the last weeks of April which preceded it. Through this early stage of the season, Milwaukee, with its attendance of 62,653 on 10 dates, happens to be low town on the totem pole, low not only in the National League but in the American. It is a dubious distinction for a city which only a few years ago was the turnstile toast of all baseball.

Weather to blame? To a certain extent although other cities had cold, miserable April weather, too. A subtle but growing take-or-leave-it attitude toward baseball? Possibly, although under the stimulus of expansion and new stadia there are still areas of strong interest. An almost indifferent promotional approach by the Braves themselves? Very likely. They are practicing an unmistakable economy this last season here, and a deep community wound because of the Rover Boys' shift to Atlanta a year hence? No question.

This last, perhaps, explains better than anything else what is happening. The community wound is deep.

AVERAGE ATTENDANCE: 6,265

But let attendance statistics through May 1 speak their piece. In average attendance per game, the Braves stand at the bottom of the heap, although they have kissin' cousins in the Cubs and Reds in the National League and in the Twins and A's in the American.

National League

Team	Total	Dates	Average
Dodgers	395,550	13	30,426
Mets	132,324	5	26,464
Astros	288,065	11	26,187
Giants	131,057	7	18,722
Cards	125,972	8	15,746
Phils	79,613	6	13,268
Pirates	53,708	5	10,741
Reds	88,991	10	8,899
Cubs	47,524	6	7,920
Braves	62,653	10	6,265

American League

Team	Total	Dates	Average
Yanks	145,292	8	18,161
Sox	126,153	8	15,769
Angeles	77,280	6	12,880
Senators	71,201	6	11,866
Tigers	92,450	8	11,556
Indians	89,843	8	11,230
Orioles	65,959	6	10,993
Red Sox	41,810	4	10,452
A's	67,659	9	7,517
Twins	25,545	4	6,386

Into these figures, of course, enter various individual influences—some teams play doubleheaders, some don't; some play traditionally good draws, some don't; some play in new stadiums, some don't; one has the President in attendance on opening day, the others never have him; some have to start their Saturday games at 4:45 p.m. because of ABC's television commitments to the west coast, others don't. In the long run, it levels out fairly well but only in the long run.

STILL THE SAME

Curiously, opening day attendance, which is often achieved under forced draft as it was here or in Cleveland or in Cincinnati, does not markedly alter the overall April picture when considered separately—in a few instances a little, but not much. And the Braves, even with subtraction of opening day attendance down the line, remain at the bottom of the heap.

Here are the April attendances minus the first day's crowds:

National League

Team	Total	Dates	Average
Dodgers	358,949	12	29,912
Astros	245,413	10	24,541
Mets	94,325	4	23,581
Giants	93,058	6	15,545
Cards	101,608	7	14,515
Phils	47,690	5	9,338
Reds	60,524	9	6,725
Pirates	25,519	4	6,380
Cubs	27,773	5	5,554
Braves	28,779	9	3,198

American League

Team	Total	Dates	Average
Sox	107,870	7	15,410
Yanks	107,080	7	15,927
Angels	66,002	5	13,200
Tigers	59,792	7	8,542
Red Sox	23,792	3	7,931
Indians	45,508	7	6,501
A's	49,550	8	6,194
Senators	27,647	5	5,529
Orioles	26,504	5	5,301
Twins	10,157	3	3,386

Weather? Indifference? Lack of promotion? Community hurt? All of them probably enter into this, most of all community hurt. Milwaukee just refuses to forget. Maybe the good month of May with sunshine can heal some of it—if the team itself does a part.

The schedule the rest of the way is favorable. Milwaukee had only eight playing dates in April and will have 10 in May, 17 in June, 10 in July, 17 in August, and 11 in September—early September.

Remarks by Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus R. Vance, April 27, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some remarks by Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus R. Vance, Tuesday, April 27, 1965:

REMARKS BY DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE CYRUS R. VANCE BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ORDNANCE ASSOCIATION, SHERATON JEFFERSON HOTEL, ST. LOUIS, MO.

I deeply appreciate this opportunity to speak before a group so concerned as you are with the security of America, and so directly involved in the preservation of its strength and freedom.

Tonight, I want to speak of Vietnam.

On April 7, you heard the President address this subject at Johns Hopkins University. He explained, on that occasion, why we are in Vietnam.

We are there to honor a longstanding pledge to the independent people of that land.

We are there to strengthen world order and the faith of free people everywhere in our commitment to their stability, their security, and their independence.

We are there because we have learned that aggression, unmet anywhere, opens the gate to aggression everywhere.

And we are there—not just with soldiers, sailors, and airmen, but also with doctors, scientists, and teachers—to lend a hand as the brave Vietnamese people climb the hill to a broader vision of a peaceful, more abundant tomorrow.

The President made it unmistakably clear that we will remain in South Vietnam as long as we are needed:

"We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement."

At the same time, while maintaining our full commitments to Vietnamese independence, we remain ready for unconditional discussions. And we look forward to joining with all the nations of southeast Asia in a great, cooperative effort to develop that region for the welfare of all.

In the wake of the eloquent speech at Baltimore, it is clear that there is now far greater understanding of the conflict in Vietnam. But there are still some who will not heed the facts.

Here and in other lands, some still question the nature of the aggression we oppose, the identity of the aggressor, and the role we are playing. Let me set forth some of these questions, and let me answer them with truths which cannot be denied.

Some say that this is just a rebellion, inevitable, and probably justified, and they ask: "What evidence is there that the war in South Vietnam is a creature of the Communists, controlled and supported from the north?"

The evidence is overwhelming that this is not an indigenous rebellion but a war, directed, controlled, and supported from Hanoi.

We know, first of all, how the North Vietnamese have organized to control the war in the south. Within the Central Committee of the Lao Dong Party—the Communist Party led by Ho Chi Minh—there was once a committee for supervision of the south which has now become the so-called reunification department. This agency issues political policy directives to the central office for South Vietnam, located in Tay Ninh Province to the northeast of Saigon.

In the south, the National Front for the Liberation of South Vietnam is the screen behind which the Communists operate. It is worth nothing that Hanoi demanded establishment of such a front 3 months before its formation was actually announced in December 1960. It is also worth noting that the front's representatives, when traveling abroad, do so with North Vietnamese passports and sponsorship.

Closely paralleling and coordinated with the political effort, the military affairs of the Vietcong are controlled by the North Vietnamese Ministry of Defense, through the military section of the Vietcong central office. Other agencies in Hanoi exist specifically to execute policy in the south, to control clandestine intelligence operations there, and to influence world opinion in favor of the so-called National Front for Liberation.

We know of this apparatus, and the constant policy and operational control which it exercises over the Vietcong:

By interrogation of prisoners.

By capture of many documents.

And by various intelligence sources.

We know, too, the historical pattern o Communist expansion—a basic ideology centralized control, a direct relationship be tween Communist forces in every land, and professed intention to impose the Commu nist system on all countries. We see direc reflection of this in documents such as th one found on the body of a Vietcong soldic in Ban Me Thuot as long ago as August 196 To quote it:

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150004-9

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150004-9

"In implementation of the decision of the Third Congress of the Lao Dong Party [the North Vietnamese Communist Party], the NFLSV [the national front] was set up to unify the revolutionary struggle, to overthrow the United States-Diem regime, to establish a popular government of democratic union and bring about the peaceful reunification of the country. The revolution for the liberation of the south would never succeed if the party (i.e., the Lao Dong Party) were not directing it."

There is also evidence in the cells of activists which were left behind at the time of partition to prepare clandestinely for future operations, while others were taken north to be trained and then returned for insurgency.

We hear and read the constant propaganda broadcasts and leaflets from Communist China, Hanoi, and the Vietcong front in South Vietnam. Their matching tones, aims, and even words are much more than coincidence.

The Buddhists identified the source of their nation's problems in a communique, issued 2 weeks ago, which closed with the prayer that "the country and religion * * * be freed soon from the control and oppression of Communists."

There is evidence in the unanimous testimony of every South Vietnamese leader since partition—Buddhist, Catholic, military, civilian. No matter their differences, none has shown sympathy for the Vietcong. None has called this a civil war. All have agreed that the Vietcong movement in South Vietnam is the aggressive creation of Hanoi, and subject to its direct control.

Finally, as the most tangible evidence of direct Hanoi support, there are the men, weapons, and supplies infiltrated from the north to the south.

We know of the two Xuan Mai camps, near Hanoi, major training bases for the large infiltration groups which are set for guerrilla operations in both South Vietnam and Laos. We know of other camps and staging areas—at Vu Con, Dong Hoi, Vit Thu Lu, and many other places. We have identified at least one major element—the 70th Transportation Group—which exists solely to move infiltrators from north to south. We have identified another unit specially organized for sea infiltration.

But, people ask, aren't the infiltrators just a trickle, a tiny flow of symbolic sympathy for the rebels in the south?

We have calculated the number of infiltrators carefully, keeping our estimates intentionally conservative. No man is counted unless his presence has been established by at least two Vietcong prisoners, two Vietcong documents, or one of each. Still the figures are impressive, revealing a river rather than a trickle, a conscious, mounting effort to destroy South Vietnam with a flow of trained, indoctrinated, hard-core guerrilla fighters and terrorists—39,517 since 1959—and that total is unquestionably low.

Our best estimate is that the infiltrated manpower from North Vietnam—after allowances for casualties at the overall Vietcong rate of roughly 15 percent per year—represents a majority, and certainly the key leadership and technical skill, of the hard-core Vietcong.

Another point of significance is the marked rise we now see in the percentage of infiltrators who are inhabitants of North Vietnam, most of whom have never seen the south. In earlier days, most of the infiltrators were South Vietnamese, trained in the north by the Communists, and then returned south for subversion. But we now estimate that, in 1964, some 6,000 of the infiltrators—75 percent—were North Vietnamese, with no shred of a reason to move south except to wage war.

Other people, perhaps granting the evidence of infiltration, ask about the arms which the Vietcong use. Isn't it true, they ask, that most of the Vietcong weapons have simply been taken from government forces, clear evidence that there is no real will to resist this uprising in the south?

The answer is no; that is not true. The great bulk of the Vietcong weapons—certainly 60–70 percent, including nearly all of the heavier and more modern ones—come from external Communist sources.

It is true that the Vietcong use weapons cached in 1954. It is also true that the South Vietnamese, from 1961 until today, have lost 39,000 weapons, but in the same period the Vietcong lost 25,000, and so the Vietcong gains have netted them only some 14,000 arms. This is only 10 to 15 percent of their total requirements or, most favorably, only 30 percent of the requirements for their regular, main force units alone. The remainder—some 35,000 weapons for the regular, main force Vietcong troops, and between 50,000 and 100,000 for the Vietcong irregulars—must, and have, come from outside.

Related to this, it is heartening to observe the trend in weapons losses in 1965. For a long while, the ratio of losses was 3 to 1 in favor of the Vietcong. But this year the ratio is 1 to 1—a favorable sign.

Thousands of Communist-bloc weapons already have been captured this year, in every corps area in South Vietnam. As an example, in a recent major action in Chuong Thien Province, Government forces fought two units of Vietcong—the 96th Battalion, and a guard battalion of military region 9. In this encounter, 90 percent of the small arms, and 100 percent of the larger weapons captured by Government forces were of Communist-bloc manufacture. These included, for example, 20 Soviet 7.62-millimeter rifles; 52 Chinese Communist 7.62-millimeter carbines; 4 Chinese Communist RPD 7.62-millimeter machineguns; and a number of Czech arms.

The trend in capture of 7.62-millimeter weapons and ammunition is now becoming significant. This is materiel not used in Vietnam by either the South Vietnamese or by us. It is materiel which can only come from out-of-country sources, and that which we have found has all been manufactured in Communist-bloc countries. From many provinces comes increasing evidence that all main and local Vietcong forces are being equipped with 7.62-millimeter arms: One example is the action I have just mentioned in Chuong Thien. The large vessel sunk along the South Vietnamese coast in February contained 500,000 rounds of 7.62 ammunition along with 60 7.62-millimeter weapons. In the week of April 10–17 750,000 rounds of 7.62 ammunition were captured in Phu Yen. In Dinh Tuong, also in April, 174,000 more rounds of this ammunition were taken.

Prisoners have confirmed beyond doubt the arming of Vietcong units with this new materiel. As of now we believe that 6 battalions are so equipped—Battalion J–108 of the C–58 Regiment; the 801st Battalion; a North Vietnamese Army battalion which I shall mention in a moment; the 303d Battalion; the 96th Battalion; and the Guard Battalion at An Xuyen. In addition, 17 other battalions are thought to have 7.62 weapons already.

As if all this were not sufficient, proof has now come to us of one more clear link in the chain of aggression which extends from Hanoi to the home villages of the south. We can now confirm that a combat unit of the regular North Vietnamese Army—the 2d Battalion, 101st Regiment, of the 325th Division—has secretly entered South Vietnam and is located in northwest Kontum Province. There may also be other elements of this division in this area.

We have had previous indications of this from various intelligence sources. We were also alerted, in an encounter on March 29–30, between the Government's 21st Ranger Battalion and this force. At that time it was clear that the South Vietnamese forces had met a professional enemy unit—disciplined, skilled, aggressive, and more heavily armed than other Vietcong units. And we have confirmed this identification by extensive interrogation of a prisoner taken from this regular, North Vietnamese battalion.

So when people ask: "Is there proof of external control and support?" "If it exists, isn't it minor?" Or, "Isn't this a genuine civil uprising rather than aggression?" I point to all this evidence and, in turn, I ask these questions:

"Who are the leaders of this 'native rebellion,' if rebellion it is?" "Why—until the last few days—the total anonymity in this so-called revolution?" Why do northern Communist names come first to your mind—Ho Chi Minh and Vo Nguyen Giap?"

If 39,000 armed South Koreans were to penetrate North Korea and wage a war directed by Seoul, what would the Chinese Communists call this—a popular rebellion, or aggression?

If 39,000 armed West Germans were to penetrate East Germany and wage a war directed by Bonn, what would the Soviets call this—a poplar rebellion, or aggression?

If, still, it is maintained that this is a civil war, with the people rising up against an unpopular government, recall these facts:

At the time of partition, 900,000 Vietnamese refugees freely chose to leave the Communists north for South Vietnam.

In recent months, some 200,000 more have fled from their homes in Vietcong-controlled areas of South Vietnam to seek the protection of the Government.

At no time in the war, at its terrible worst, has any significant refugee group of this sort fled from government areas to Vietcong areas or to North Vietnam.

No single responsible leader, no major interest group or party in South Vietnam, has ever shown sympathy or support for the Vietcong.

No great, popular revolutionary figure has arisen from the faceless Vietcong. And no local Vietcong leader has been able to maintain control without the use of force, terror, and the constant threat of death for any opponent.

More than 50,000 soldiers of South Vietnam have been killed or wounded in battle for their country since 1960. Last year alone, the South Vietnamese Army suffered 25 percent more battle casualties, proportionately, than we incurred in the entire 3 years of the Korean war. And still they fight on. Is this a nation with no will to resist?

No, this is a nation which will resist—not only in its armed forces but also in its civilian populace where, despite the terror and the murder, there are always new leaders ready to take over in the villages for those who have been assassinated. This is a nation which is strongly resisting, not a popular uprising but a calculated, brutal, and bloody aggression from without. The South Vietnamese are not deluded about this. At every hand, they have evidence of what rule by the Hanoi-controlled Vietcong would mean. In the Vietnamese villages and countryside—where people ask no more than the freedom to live, work and bring up their children in peace—assassinations, bombings, kidnapings, armed assaults, and sabotage have become the tragic way of life.

In 1960, Communist terrorist assassinated or kidnaped over 3,000 South Vietnamese. Death came by knife; by pistol shots in homes in the middle of the night; by snipers' bullets in the fields; by bombs; by savage beatings; and by protracted, ruthless torture. And those who were kidnaped were seldom seen again.

Since 1962, more than 3,500 separate acts of terrorism, armed attack, and sabotage have occurred, affecting tens of thousands of individual South Vietnamese.

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150004-9

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150004-9

In 1964, 436 local officials were murdered; over 1,100 other officials were taken by kidnaping to an unknown fate; 1,359 other civilians were murdered; and another 8,400 were kidnaped by the Vietcong. Over 11,000 innocent humans in all—murdered or dragged away from their families and homes to captivity, forced labor, and much worse. In America, in proportionate terms, this would have meant 143,000 of our citizens slain or kidnapped in 1964 alone.

This bleeding and intimidation of the people and the local governmental structure in South Vietnam has gone on for 8 years. They go on today—against the women and children as well as the men—for what more effective way is there to dominate a populace than to kill its leaders and trained officials, to threaten the women with horror, and to kill the children of those who oppose the aggressors.

This is the nature of the aggression and of the aggressor in South Vietnam today. This is what the Vietnamese face and why they fight. And this is why we have pledged to help them.

Yet people ask—even Americans—how can we justify the use of our military power in South, and particularly North Vietnam?

We can justify it in South Vietnam because a sovereign and independent nation had asked our help in advising, supplying, and supporting its forces as they resist armed aggression and terror from without.

We can justify it in North Vietnam because, as all the evidence shows, and as President Johnson, has said, Hanoi's control and support of the Vietcong insurgency is "the heartbeat of the war." Once again here, South Vietnam has requested our assistance and we have responded. The South Vietnamese, and we, want Hanoi to know that its attack on its neighbor must cease.

It is important to understand the nature of our operations in North Vietnam, and to contrast them with those of the Communists against South Vietnam. There are too many who have recklessly applied the adjective "barbaric" in the wrong place.

Our aerial operations are carefully controlled as to area, target, and munitions. They are almost surgical, aiming to cut the lines of control and supply running from north to south, but carefully avoiding essentially civilian targets.

Which is "barbaric," the bombing of an infiltration bridge, or the beheading of a mayor? Which is "barbaric," the strafing of a military convoy heading south, or the systematic murder of innocent villagers?

The only action we could not justify would be failing to help South Vietnam. Of this, we will not be guilty. In operations in the north and in the south—and both are necessary—we will continue to stand with the valiant Vietnamese, giving them whatever kind and measure of help is needed and appropriate.

And so, in sum, I say to all who question what we do:

In the face of all the evidence, what other course can honor take? Indeed, what other course is there in our own self-interest? How else can we sustain the faith of all the free lands in America's will to resist aggression and bring an end to the day of the assassin? How else can we face our own national conscience?

Our aim is peace. Peace for all men, and freedom for them to build their own futures. We stand in Vietnam—and we will stay there—to give its people a chance at this greater destiny.

We will leave when the terror halts and the killings cease. We will leave when the aggressor leaves, and not before. And on that day, we would turn with all the peoples of southeast Asia; yes, with South and North Vietnamese alike—to the building of a free and more abundant future.

William J. Driver, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address made by Mr. William J. Driver, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, on the occasion of the dedication of the new Washington, D.C., Veterans' Administration hospital. It is indeed encouraging to know that this is the 69th VA hospital dedicated since 1947, and that several thousand additional beds have already been authorized throughout the country and are in the process of being constructed.

The address follows:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY HON. WILLIAM J. DRIVER, ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS, ON THE OCCASION OF THE DEDICATION OF THE WASHINGTON VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 28, 1965

Mr. Vice President, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, today we join together in a ceremony that has become characteristic of the Veterans' Administration: the dedication of a new hospital, incorporating all the latest advances in medicine, engineering, and architecture.

This is the 69th VA hospital dedicated since 1947. Nineteen additional hospitals are now under construction or planned. These hospitals and expansions of others will bring over 19,000 new beds into the VA as older and outmoded hospitals such as Mount Alto are gradually retired.

This progress did not come about automatically; it is the result of the unceasing effort of those who have made excellence in veterans' medicine their personal concern. Many of these men are with us here today. All have contributed, but none more so than the man who it is my great honor to introduce to you.

There are in this land today many enduring monuments to the vigor, enlightenment, and courage of HUBERT HUMPHREY'S Senate career.

In my view, none is more important, none is more enduring, none is more expressive of the compassion that is central to his character, than his constant struggle to assure that there be no compromise with the quality of medicine for America's veterans.

In defending the integrity of the VA medical program, he has said: "One of the most important obligations of the Nation [is] providing the finest possible medical care for our wounded and ill ex-servicemen."

In alerting the Senate to the growing number of aging veterans, he said: "No single agency of the U.S. Government will be or is meeting the medical needs of a larger group of senior citizens than the Veterans' Administration. It is not simply the responsibility to meet the problem of diseases of the aged, but, rather more positively, to help our veterans enjoy the fullest of health."

In stressing the contribution made by VA research to the health of veterans and all our citizens, he said: "I feel that the research increases which the Congress has granted to VA in recent years are a fitting tribute to the important results achieved to date and are appropriate recognition of the significance of constantly seeking new answers to the medical needs of America's ex-servicemen, as well as the needs of our entire population."

He summed up his views on our national obligation to veterans and their dependents when he said: "The veterans of our Nation have made tremendous contributions to the welfare of our people, in time of peace as well as in time of war. Their patriotic devotion and loyal service merit the attention and gratitude of all Americans." And he assured his fellow countrymen that he would continue "efforts for adequate recognition by Congress of the needs and welfare of our veterans and their families."

He has more than fulfilled the promise of that assurance. He has more than kept faith with America's veterans, for he has been their advocate, their spokesman, and their champion against the forces of indifference.

Chicago Daily News Commends Sending of Marines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of April 30, 1965:

RESCUE IN THE CARIBBEAN

When American citizens are in danger, it is the duty of the American Government to do what it can to protect them. Clearly, Americans were in danger in the Dominican Republic, overrun by revolution, and President Johnson's decision was to land a detachment of marines to help bring our civilians out safely.

There is hardly room for dissent from the commonsense and justice of this action. The Dominican Government, or what was left of it, acknowledged it could not guarantee the safety of the Americans. Under such circumstances, international law allows for rescue missions.

Even so, the cries of "imperialism" and "intervention" arise, and it must be conceded that the history of U.S. operations in the Caribbean renders suspect any overt action involving marines. The Leathernecks have been used before to police the area and set up friendly governments.

The dispatch of the marines in this instance could serve no such purpose. Tough as they are, a few hundred marines could scarcely take over the country, and they had their hands full protecting stranded American tourists in a wholly justified rescue operation.

The subsequent dispatch of paratroopers is a different matter. The Johnson administration clearly is prepared to do whatever becomes necessary in light of the near-total breakdown of order in the Dominican Republic.

The exact situation in the strife-torn nation is difficult to fathom, but it would be surprising if Castroites failed to snatch whatever benefit they could from the disorder. It is very much in the U.S. interest to make certain that they do not seize control of the Government.

Direct intervention, if it comes to that, should be at the behest of the Organization of American States, which has been summoned to meet in Washington. Members of the OAS who were at first critical of U.S. moves involving the marines have begun to change their tune as the full scope of the Dominican breakdown becomes apparent.

We hope the presence of the marines and soldiers, bent on rescue, serves as a deterrent,

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150004-9

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150004-9

Indeed, this was the intent of Congress in authorizing funds for the program; Congress stipulated that the program be developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served.

One of these groups is the lower East Side action project, which was created in 1962 by a 27-year-old psychologist, Laurence Cole, and his wife, Michelle. In 3 years this group has achieved remarkable results in working with members of a teenage gang. The story of the group's efforts is outlined in a statement by Mr. Cole, which I submit for inclusion in the RECORD. I also offer the Post editorial, titled "Of Poverty, Politics, and People," which mentions the LEAP project in my district as one of the independent agencies which should be recognized as the poverty program is organized.

The statement and editorial follow:

LEAP

The lower East Side action project was opened in the fall of 1962 among the remnants of an abandoned grocery store. It began as a recreational center for neighborhood youngsters when all other agencies were closed or had excluded them as unacceptable. The boys who came in 3 years ago were members of a teen gang of Puerto Rican and Negro boys. They had an extremely antisocial reputation.

They met LEAP and found a flexible yet consistent group of adults who said only that they were there and available. The kids tested and found that these people were indeed available.

The first year, LEAP's members accounted for 24 arrests, mostly for petty crime. Lawyer Arthur J. Gilligan, later to become the chairman of LEAP's board of directors, defended the boys. Usually they had been defended by court-appointed lawyers. Mr. Galligans labors, given without fee, helped to prove to the boys that their isolation was a thing of the past, and their alienation was somehow lessed. The third year of LEAP's existence showed two arrests compared to the 24 the first year for the same group of boys.

Dropouts are back in school. Boys who were experimenting with drugs are no longer doing so. Families who never had the opportunity to really get to know each other did so using LEAP as common ground.

LEAP provides recreational, legal, psychological, vocational, medical, and social services for the boys. It has done this with most professional services donated and with a constantly emptying treasury.

It exists as proof that an organization can emphasized smallness, individual growth, and adult flexibility and achieve the results the large, well-funded statistically-oriented programs only hope for. It exists as a model for many others that will certainly follow LEAP's lead.

LEAP fills a noticeably vacant space in delinquency prevention; the space left vacant by ignoring the expressed needs and aspirations of delinquent and predelinquent youth in favor of the imposition of doctrines from above that are proven in their irrelevance and impatience.

LEAP has proven also that unorthodoxy does not mean irresponsibility. Its active board of directors includes doctors, lawyers, legislators, and people prominent in the social services. It has been made a tax-exempt organization by the Internal Revenue Service and is chartered as a nonprofit corporation by the State of New York.

As a demonstration project LEAP would like to show that its unique approach could be implemented in other areas.

[From the New York Post, Apr. 18, 1965]

OF POVERTY, POLITICS AND PEOPLE

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL has never manifested any profound hostility to the uses of patronage and his crusade against the structure of New York City's antipoverty program will inevitably evoke cynical comment. But the issues raised at the hearings of his Subcommittee on Education and Labor should be not lightly dismissed. The danger that the antipoverty drive may become an aid program for well-fed bureaucrats is a real one; it is well to have the storm signals hoisted now.

Congress, in allocating funds for this national effort, stipulated that it be "developed, conducted and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served." There was valid reason for this provision; it was designed to protect the program from political exploitation and high bureaucratic living.

Obviously some centralized controls are needed. But authentic community representation and participation are essential—in every borough. Such independent agencies as the lower East Side action project and the East Harlem Tenants Council, which have deep local roots and sensitive awareness of neighborhood problems, should be given real recognition; they may have far more to offer than many conventional operations imposed from above.

To the extent that the Powell hearings have focused attention on such matters, they may have salutary results. We hope the spirit of these warnings will be felt in Powell's bailiwick as well as other areas.

Vietnam Negotiations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert an editorial in the RECORD which appeared in the Denver Post on April 23, 1965. This article points out some things about this country's effort in Vietnam that have frequently been forgotten in recent weeks.

This editorial demonstrates the clear thinking that has long been characteristic of the Denver Post. I recommend it for the reading of all my colleagues:

HOW TO NEGOTIATE BY SHOUTING

One might think, from all the talk and protest meetings in this country, that the North Vietnamese had offered to negotiate an end to the Vietnamese conflict, and that the United States had refused. So perhaps this is a good time to straighten out the record.

First thing to recognize is that negotiations already have started, in a peculiar sort of way. The United States and North Vietnam have been shouting at each other over the roar of battle, as it were, for several weeks now.

What they're doing in this long-range shouting match is dickering over what to negotiate about, and probing for some hint of agreement on what terms they can aim for in negotiations.

So far, if we may use a recently fashionable term, there is not much sign of a consensus.

But it is only fair to say that President Johnson has gone much further in seeking one than have the North Vietnamese. He and he alone has offered "unconditional discussions" on any phase of the conflict, anywhere, at any time. And he alone has offered, in his billion-dollar Mekong Basin development proposal, any view of what a peaceful Vietnamese future might hold.

The North Vietnamese, for their part, have offered only to consider talks if their own four-point peace formula is used as the basis for the talks.

Since a key point of that formula calls for settling the internal affairs of South Vietnam "in accordance" with the program of the National Liberation Front—political arm of the Communist Vietcong—there is little chance of that formula being used.

Only sign, in fact, of any consensus is that both President Johnson and the North Vietnamese have suggested a return to the principles of the 1954 Geneva agreement as a basis for peace. The distance from a consensus may be judged by considering the first section of that agreement, which ended the French Indo-Chinese War.

That section called for temporary division of Vietnam along the 17th parallel, pending general elections in 1956 in both halves of the nation, intended to produce a unified government and country.

Now North Vietnam is insisting on eventual reunification, but President Johnson has come out firmly for an independent South Vietnam.

Also, there is the matter of elections. The Communists contend that the revolt in South Vietnam is due to the refusal of the old Diem regime, backed by the United States, to carry out those elections promised in 1956. This is true.

However, there also have never been any free elections in North Vietnam, nor any offers to hold them. If reports about popular feelings in North Vietnam are true, the Communists are unlikely to consider general elections a fit subject for negotiation.

So much for chances of reviving the Geneva agreement; it is possible, but seems a long way down the road.

In short, that shouting above the roar of battle seems likely to continue for awhile.

Observance of 50th Anniversary of Massacre of Armenians by the Turks

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the year 1965 marks the 50th anniversary of the saddest and most tragic event in the long and proud history of the Armenian people.

The Armenians, although the smallest of the Allied nations to participate in the struggle against Germany and Turkey in World War I, contributed more to the Allied cause in terms of casualties than any other single Allied state, large or small.

More than 1,500,000 Armenians perished during the Turkish genocide in the years 1915–18.

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150004-9

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150004-9

It is important that this event not be allowed to pass without the citizens of the United States of America pausing a moment in tribute to the memory of these martyrs.

It is important that we Americans know that these brave Armenians gave their lives so that the cause of virtuous democratic government, freedom, justice and human rights be served; and in advancing that cause, the Armenian victims advanced the cause of America and that of all freedom-loving countries in this world.

Such great sacrifices and devotion to the cause of freedom must not be forgotten in this year 1965, one-half century removed from the tragic events of 1915.

Unconditional Discussions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to a perceptive editorial on the subject of Vietnam which appeared in the New York Times of April 28, 1965 under the title "Unconditional Discussions."

This editorial makes clear, as I pointed out in the House yesterday commenting on the President's request for a supplemental appropriation, that it is the Communists, not ourselves, who have refused to accept the idea of negotiations on Vietnam without preconditions. The editorial also points out the usefulness of the proposed conference on Cambodia as one which might permit the exploration, at least "in the corridors," of the possibilities of a settlement in Vietnam.

The editorial follows:

UNCONDITIONAL DISCUSSIONS

President Johnson could not have been more emphatic yesterday in reaffirming his proposal of unconditional discussions to seek a peaceful settlement in Vietnam. He defined his proposal, which he said will remain open, as an offer to discuss "any subject and any point of view with any Government concerned * * * anywhere, any time, without any conditions." There is no doubt that the country supports such a policy.

The decisions that lie ahead, unfortunately, are likely to be more complicated. The first response to the President's April 7 offer arrived within 24 hours. It was the public Soviet proposal of a conference on Cambodia which might permit informal talks on Vietnam as well. It was almost 3 weeks later before Washington could decide there were no traps in this offer and could reach agreement with Saigon to accept.

Meanwhile, Peiping, which opposes negotiations, evidently went to work on the Cambodians. Within hours of his talk with Premier Chou En-lai in Jakarta, Prince Sihanouk in mid-April began raising obstacles to the conference he had sought persistently since 1962. The objections of Cambodia's ruler to the participation of Washington and Saigon obviously are designed either to prevent any meeting at all or to force admission of the Vietcong's National Liberation Front, with which neither Washington nor Saigon is willing to talk.

The next move is up to Moscow, which now has Britain's agreement as co-chairman to arrange a meeting of the nine participants to the Geneva parley of 1954. Soviet Minister Gromyko evidently told French leaders in Paris yesterday that Moscow was determined to press ahead with the idea of a Cambodian conference. But until the terms of the Soviet proposal are outlined, it will not be clear whether Moscow is resisting Peiping, yielding to it or seeking some middle course.

The Communists have laid down many conditions for Vietnam negotiations, so many that it is impossible to tell which ones they are serious about. President Johnson indicated yesterday that he is prepared to discuss these and any other subjects with Moscow, Hanoi, and Peiping—without commitment, of course.

If the Communists insist on conditions, they must expect to be confronted with conditions in return. A Cambodian conference would permit this whole problem—and it is a major one—to be explored in the corridors. It is difficult to see how any progress toward peace can be made if the channels to such exploration are kept closed.

Foreign Policy Gains Stature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of Members of the House of Representatives to the editorial of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, of April 24, 1965, entitled "Foreign Policy Gains Stature." This editorial goes far to delineate the administration's commitment of our Nation to freedom and the opportunity for self-determination for any nation in this world.

Our President has courageously led our Nation and the world in this time of stress, even in the face of great pressures that would have him do otherwise.

The editorial follows:

FOREIGN POLICY GAINS STATURE

The firm stand of President Johnson in the agonizing Vietnam crisis, while it has met with criticism in some world areas—as well as at home—has developed a new respect for American foreign policy in the community of nations.

In the face of repeated threats of reprisal from Peiping and Moscow, the President has remained steadfast in his commitment to halt Communist terrorism and aggression in southeast Asia. He has, at the same time, held the door open for negotiation.

The world should entertain no doubts as to America's course and intentions in its challenge to the Red expansionists.

In the past, the United States has been accused of not being tough enough, of condoning anti-American acts by nations and individuals when reprisal would have been justified, and of being a paper tiger in the jungles of aggression.

Mr. Johnson's firm policy has changed all this.

America's friends and enemies—and the neutralists—now can realize that this country's attitude has stiffened toward those who benefit by its aid but feel free to side with adversaries.

Mr. Johnson's canceling of a visit by Pakistan's President Ayub Khan is an example of the toughness that now infuses U.S. foreign policy.

Pakistan's increasing friendliness toward Red China is annoying to the administration. Ayub was not wanted as a guest. He was told so. In earlier days, Ayub would have been welcomed despite his admiration for enemies of the United States.

An unfortunate aspect of the snub to Ayub was India's coupling the cancellation with a U.S. request to Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri to postpone his visit to Washington until later this summer.

The administration purportedly did not want Shastri here while the foreign aid debate was in progress lest some remark made by him would jeopardize an aid allotment for India.

India resented Shastri being linked with Ayub and suspected the visit delay was a reprisal for Shastri's Vietnam views, which are critical of U.S. policy, especially the northern bomb raids.

It is to be hoped that the Indian misunderstanding can be cleared up. But India should get the hint that there is a hazard in trying to work both sides of the street.

Departure of the United States from its nice guy role in world affairs is a heartening development. It was not endearing the Nation to its friends or gaining the respect of its enemies.

Uphold the Law: A Citizen's First Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Miss Virginia Fohl, a student at Stark County's Perry High School, was author of the essay that won third prize in the Law Day, U.S.A., essay contest sponsored by the Stark County Bar Association. The essay has a message to all young Americans:

UPHOLD THE LAW: A CITIZEN'S FIRST DUTY

From the beginning of civilization, man has recognized the need for laws to maintain and develop his civilizations. From the 10 Commandments to the 12 Tables of Rome, through the Magna Carta, and down to our own Constitution of the United States, men have been governed by laws. Even in ancient eras, laws were unavoidably necessary to hold in check those who would have otherwise encroached upon the rights of others. They were necessary to insure safety, to prevent conflicts, to determine ownership, and to set up lines of succession. Man often chafed under rules, but the successful man learned to abide by them, and he expected his neighbors to obey them also.

Especially in today's world, in which the Common Market has expanded, the Communist satellite nations have begun to assert themselves, and in which the number of new nations in Africa keeps increasing, is upholding the law important, for all of them are looking to the United States for guidance. Because of our prominence as a world power, these nations are following our example.

The U.S. Constitution is one of the most important documents in the world; it guarantees every citizen the right to vote, to bear arms, and to pursue happiness. Foreign countries might be persuaded to incorporate some of its ideas into their own constitutions, if these nations felt our Constitution has produced results. If these observers see a nation where each citizen respects his fel-

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150004-9