Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

percent more per student than does Mississippi.

If you go back to the 5-year charts and take the total received per State per student for each of the 5 years, Indiana under this plan would receive $365.65, per student whereas Mississippi would receive $383.65.

On a dollar basis Mississippi receives $18 per student more or Indiana receives $18 less when we spend $156.70 more or 40 percent more than Mississippi and we receive percentagewise 4 percent less on a dollar basis.

This sounds like a scheme to milk the large cities. I think I'm right.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD O. CREEDON,
State Representative, Marion County.

Aggression Is Hanoi's Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is almost incredible that after 25 years of watching Communist strategy, that anyone can say that the North Vietnamese are only seeking independence from Vietnam and that we are frustrating that goal. Is there anyone who seriously doubts what would happen if we allowed the Vietcong and their Hanoi masters to take over South Vietnam? There is no question in my mind that the people in South Vietnam would immediately find themselves in the same nationwide prison camp presently holding the people of North Vietnam and China.

The following article by Seymour Freidin from the February 19, 1966, edition of the New York Herald Tribune tells the story of Hanoi's aggression against the south:

AGGRESSION, NOT INDEPENDENCE, IS HANOI'S GOAL

(By Seymour Freidin)

SAIGON.—Only a frayed street sign welcoming Vice President HUMPHREY hangs limply as a reminder of the boisterous jet-borne caravan that whizzed around southeast Asia to proclaim the American intention to hang on in Vietnam. But a new sense of urgency has been gathered from the vapor trails.

A test of American stamina and North Vietnamese intentions opens a fresh phase in this ferocious war. It involves a presidential behest to get results fast and the Communist expansionist appetite.

It seems more tangibly apparent now that the regime of Ho Chi Minh is embarked on a vastly ambitious project. The Northern regime sees all southeast Asia as its own real estate in the foreseeable future.

This can be implemented only by armed force and by withdrawal of a confused and uneasy United States. The initiative comes from the north without any meaningful pushes by Red China.

It may come as a shock to many to learn that wispybearded, benevolent-looking Ho is by no means senile. He is the take-charge commander of a policy long ago examined for loopholes, plugged and now being executed.

His political and military entourage may differ occasionally on tactics. But there is unanimity on the strategic goal: shotgun amalgamation of all Vietnam and then, southeast Asia. That explains the contemptuous treatment of all peace initiatives and anguished pleas of sympathizers with the north.

Thus, the speculation that the Red Chinese will intervene if we augment both our armed strength and economic contribution appears unfounded.

Red China never had to compel North Vietnamese to build and expand their guerrilla infrastructure in the south. The Chinese had little whatever to do with the buildup of the Vietcong and it political arm. The north, its cadres blooded in battle and victory against the French, worked out its own plans and timetable for chopping up the south.

This blatant aggressiveness has been totally overlooked by those, many in so-called uncommitted countries, who hail Ho as an Asian Tito. Their proclamation of Communist-supported independence runs into a dead end on the Ho Chi Minh trail.

Tito, remember, made a working peace with the West when he was pitted against Stalin. He has, with ups and downs, made of it enduring coexistence. There was never a serious Titoist adventure in expansionism once he decided to impose his image on Yugoslavia.

It's a far different story with North Vietnam. Hanoi, flushed with the mystique of Dien Bien Phu, is actively engaged in imposing its will on its neighbors. Laos and Thailand are prima facie cases along with the carefully contrived mass subversion in South Vietnam.

Only the southerners and the United States stand in the way of this vast and arrogant ambition, which has been checked but still far from shackled. In a present regrouping period, Ho has unleashed mass terrorism against civilians to prove to the south at large that fearful penalties can be exacted if acquiescence cannot be extorted.

Last week pressure mines, powerful enough to blast our tanks, blew up a couple of buses. The death toll was 49 civilians and children. It happened on a dusty route never used by the military.

This cold-blooded act of terrorism has been duplicated in work gangs, blown to pieces because they tried to earn a living repairing some port facilities. A pattern of widespread, calculated terror, directed by North Vietnam, is beginning to stretch fearsome fingers across this torn-up country.

To counteract a cynical indifference to human dignity and even survival—which critics of our role here display no less than Ho himself—the process of pacification requires time, trial, and patience. Unfortunately, political ballyhoo may prevent us from achieving our objective: security on which Vietnamese can build hope.

If the administration anticipates shining results by mid-year elections, then the massive effort that will be applied to this program may ring as hollowly as any other politilacal stunt. Too much is at stake for impatience and electioneering. The other side desperately wants to husband time and so should we.

Dr. Bernard Braskamp

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, with profound sorrow I join my colleagues in expressing our grief over the loss of our Chaplain, Dr. Bernard Braskamp.

He was a great force for good in our midst and all of us are better for having known him. He was full of sympathetic and generous impulses toward us, and all mankind, and he will not be forgotten by any of us who served here with him.

We mourn his passing as a cherished member of our family circle, and I wish to join my friends and colleagues in expressing my great esteem for our friend and spiritual leader.

Mission Hailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB CASEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the mission of Vice President HUMPHREY is hailed by the Houston Post, which asserted that the purpose of his trip was "to reassure the leaders and people of the nations that remain free in that part of the world that the United States is not going to run out on them or renege on its promises to help them keep their freedom and independence."

According to the Post, the Vice President's trip was designed "to counter the harm done by noisy critics of this country's Vietnam policies and actions, Communist propaganda which pictures the American people on the point of revolt and demanding the withdrawal of this country's military forces from Vietnam, and possible misunderstandings over the fact that the United States is waging a peace offensive simultaneously with its military operations to aid the Government of South Vietnam."

The newspaper believes the Vice President is communicating, and while it is important and desirable that everybody understand our views, policies, plans, and intentions, "it is vital that they be understood by the people who are directly involved and who stand within the shadow of Communist aggression."

I offer this forthright comment in its entirety for the RECORD, convinced that others will want to study its contents.

[From the Houston Post, Feb. 15, 1966]

HUMPHREY MISSION VITAL

If there ever was any question about the purpose of Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY'S Asian mission, it is clear now that it is to reassure the leaders and people of the nations that remain free in that part of the world that the United States is not going to run out on them or renege on its promises to help them keep their freedom and independence.

He is seeking to counter the harm done by noisy critics of this country's Vietnam policies and actions, Communist propaganda which pictures the American people on the point of revolt and demanding the withdrawal of this country's military forces from Vietnam, and possible misunderstandings over the fact that the United States is waging a peace offensive simultaneously with its military operations to aid the Government of South Vietnam.

Because of his ebullient personality and infectious enthusiasm, the Vice President is

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

A New Bid To Sink the Drug Pirates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, a recent column written for the Chicago Daily News by Mr. John M. Johnston places into perspective the problem of the U.S. Government purchasing products from foreign firms which have pirated U.S. patents or production techniques.

Mr. Johnston's column follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News]

A NEW BID TO SINK THE DRUG PIRATES

(By John M. Johnston)

Back in 1960, when the late Senator Estes Kefauver was trying to get the drug industry to hold still while he fitted it for a pillory, he sternly forbade any nasty cracks about Italian pharmaceutical manufacturers at the hearings. Lyman Duncan, general manager of American Cyanamide's Lederle Laboratories, had referred to some Italian competitors as "a nest of pirates."

Any such conclusions would have run counter to Senator Kefauver's thesis, which was that unjustified prices by American drugmakers were robbing the people, whose friend and protector he was and hoped ever to remain.

The Senator's position is still shared in other Government circles, which consider foreign drugs a bargain. Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Democrat, of New Jersey, is trying to block such purchases by a law that would prohibit the Government from buying drugs made in violation of patents.

The total of such Government purchases has been placed at upwards of $27 million, although as far back as 1962, Dr. Edward Annis, president of the American Medical Association, was complaining of Defense Department purchases of tetracycline in Italy after it was known that the cultures from which this antibiotic was made were stolen in the United States.

Well, time and events grind on, and a few days ago a U.S. court in New York handed out prison sentences to six men involved in the multimillion-dollar conspiracy by which trusted employees of Lederle sold manufacturing secrets and "wonder drug" cultures to Italian firms.

Lederle asserted that it spent more than $30 million in the development of tetracycline and other antibiotics. It cost additional millions to design and perfect the production facilities. It is not astonishing that a manufacturer who could buy all this know-how from thieves for $100,000 could and did undersell American manufacturers and earn the praise of Senator Kefauver.

The Defense Department is free of blame for its purchases of foreign drugs. It is bound by a 1958 ruling of the Comptroller General that drugs for the military and veterans hospitals must be bought for the lowest possible price, patent pirating being none of its business.

The "wonder drugs" involved were Aureomycin, Achromycin, and Declomycin—all of the tetracycline family—and Aristocort, a steroid used to treat arthritis. The tetracyclines are used against bacterial diseases—pneumonia, typhus, meningitis, gonorrhea, and are said to be the most widely prescribed drugs in the world.

The present Congress will see another attempt to pass Senator WILLIAMS' bill to forbid Government purchase of products made from pirated U.S. patents or production techniques. Representative R. L. ROUDEBUSH, Republican, of Indiana, points out that such thefts have caused losses in the tens of millions to U.S. pharmaceutical companies, in addition to lost wages and lost taxes to State and Federal Governments.

Efforts have been made, particularly since formation of the Common Market, to persuade the Italians to join in the patent protection generally afforded for such discoveries. Self-interest has kept them aloof, although some Italian concerns, having some developments of their own, have indicated that they might like protection.

Until there is international respect for such property rights, it is clear that U.S. self-interest lies in the direction of the Harrison-Roudebush bill.

Investment in Federal Reclamation Is Sound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Sacramento Bee cites the progress of Federal reclamation projects in the Western States and rightfully calls them sound investments.

The editorial points out that nearly 90 percent of the total Federal investment in reclamation projects in 17 Western States will eventually be returned to the Federal Treasury from revenues received for electric power and water.

I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Feb. 21, 1966]

INVESTMENT IN FEDERAL RECLAMATION IS SOUND

The significant role large multipurpose Federal water projects have played in building the West was illustrated by a recent announcement by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall. He pointed out the contracts under which water and power users repay the Government for their share of construction costs have passed the $1.5 billion mark.

The good faith of the beneficiaries of these projects has been demonstrated clearly because the delinquency rate under the contracts is less than one-half of 1 percent. The contracts are with water user districts, individual farmers, cities and industries and they number more than 2,000.

The range from the largest single water contract with the Westlands Water District in California—where the $157 million cost of building an entire irrigation system will be repaid—to a small farmer in Oregon who is paying off $428 as his share of the building of the Klamath project.

Federal investment in reclamation projects in 17 Western States has reached $5.1 billion. Nearly 90 percent of the total eventually will be returned to the Federal Treasury from revenues received for electric power and water. The facilities for municipal and industrial water will be repaid in full with interest.

Electric power, mostly distributed by public power systems, has been a paying partner of irrigation during the 60-year history of the Federal reclamation program. Alex Radin of the American Public Power Association in a recent speech in Kansas City, Mo., reminded listeners that Federal reclamation investment represents a two-way street with benefits traveling both ways.

Another observer, Reclamation Commissioner Floyd E. Dominy, commenting on the fact that 90 cents out of every dollar invested is returned, had this to say: "No other resource development agency can show such a cash-on-the-barrelhead return."

These facts must be kept in mind as debate continues over proposals to build more Federal water projects. The economic well-being which westerners enjoy can be attributed directly to the existence of the great water and power developments pioneered by the Federal Reclamation Bureau.

As the West continues to expand, future projects will play an equally important part in maintaining a vigorous and stable economic growth.

Tax Scheme To Milk the Large Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, the Honorable Richard O. Creedon, member of the Indiana House of Representatives, has taken exception to a recent tax distribution plan for education.

Mr. Creedon, in a letter to me, notes quite properly that the plan is a scheme to milk the large cities.

Because of the light which Mr. Creedon's letter sheds on the real effect of this tax distribution plan, I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.,
Representative, 11th District, Indiana,
Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On the 29th of January I asked you for a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 24, 1966, containing the tax distribution plan for education as proposed by Representative HALL, Republican, of Missouri.

My comment at that time is on the bottom of the photocopy of the article that I sent to you where I said I was sure that this was a scheme to milk the large cities. It is.

His whole plan is set out on page 853 of the January 24, 1966, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I decided to do some arithmetic.

In the first year table, page 853, column 1, the State figures are divided by 12.07 to arrive at the number of students.

On page 856 chart No. 2 shows gross personal income and estimated expenditures for public elementary and secondary education as well as per capita personal income for the particular States.

Using the table for the first year on page 853, I compared Indiana and Mississippi and arrived at the number of students for the respective States. My arithmetic is that Indiana has 1.9 times as many students or 190 percent the number of students that Mississippi has.

Mississippi (chart 2) spends 5.34 percent of personal income for elementary and secondary education as prepared to Indiana figure of 4.87, which means that Indiana on a percentage of income basis spends 8.5 percent less.

However, our per capita income is 1.8 times as much as the per capita income of Mississippi.

On a dollar basis, Indiana spends $540.40 per student as compared to $383.70 or 40

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

unusually well qualified for this assignment. It remains to be seen how effective he will be as reassurer and morale reinforcer, but it is doubtful if President Johnson could have dispatched a better man for this particular job. Because the Vice President speaks with the authority of the President, it is hoped that his words will be convincing.

His assignment is most interesting, however, in that it shows the extent to which the office of Vice President has undergone a radical change within a very few years. Within the memory of most people, the Vice President of the United States was simply the man who presided over the Senate and succeeded to the presidency when and if a vacancy should occur.

The trend toward making him an active member of the administration in office by expanding his duties and responsibilities was started by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. President John F. Kennedy continued the policy. In neither case were the special assignments given the Vice President limited to the area of domestic affairs. Vice President Richard M. Nixon was sent on missions abroad, acting as special emissary and representative of the President, and so was President Johnson when he was Vice President.

In fact, President Johnson made a trip to southeast Asia comparable to that of Vice President HUMPHREY, in 1961, and when the spirits of West Berliners showed signs of sagging following construction of the wall by the Communists through the heart of their city, he was sent there to reassure the free German people.

Even if these foreign missions served no other purpose, they would be desirable as part of the educational process for Vice Presidents, to prepare them better for the duties of the Presidency if they should ever be called upon to assume them and to assure continuity of policies.

The Humphrey mission therefore would be desirable and worthwhile, even if there was no problem of morale and confidence. From all acounts the Vice President is doing an able job. At least he is communicating, and in view of all the clouds of confusion swirling over the world at this time, this is of great importance. It is important and desirable that everybody understand the views, policies, plans and intentions of the Government in Washington, with respect to Asia and to southeast Asia in particular, but it is vital that they be understood by the people who are directly involved and who stand within the shadow of Communist aggression.

The One-Man, One-Vote Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the dynamic and forward-looking 16th District Democratic Organization of Michigan urging full implementation of the one-man, one-vote principle:

RESOLUTION MADE AT THE 16TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT DEMOCRATIC ORGANIZATION

Whereas there are unwise attempts being made to alter the principle of one man, one vote, as stated by the U.S. Supreme Court; and

Whereas the one-man, one-vote principle is basic to the American concept of democracy; and

Whereas the vote of one person should be equal to the vote of any citizen; and

Whereas any constitutional amendment diluting the equality of the vote of some citizens is an attack upon the principle that "all men are created equal," as stated in the Declaration of Independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Michigan 16th Congressional District Democratic Organization go on record in favor of the full implementation of the one-man, one-vote concept, and opposed to any action which might alter this fundamental democratic principle.

MICHAEL BERRY,
Chairman, 16th Congressional District Democratic Organization.

Your Opinion, Please

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, for several years it has been my custom to take samplings of public opinion in my congressional district.

For each Member of this body, the job of keeping aware of the thoughts and beliefs of his constituents is one of his foremost duties. Yet it is not easy to keep in touch with the opinions of 400,000 people in the average congressional district.

In addition to the thousands of letters, telegrams, and telephone calls I receive, I appreciate the opportunity for personal contact with the voters. Obviously, we cannot contact them all as frequently as we would like, and the opinion poll is a useful supplement.

I have found such questionnaires to be helpful to me in measuring public interest and attitudes on important matters before the Congress. This practice has also stimulated discussion and thought among my constituents on the major problems we face as a nation.

This year I am again asking for "Your Opinion, Please." The list of questions is necessarily brief, but I believe they touch upon the most important issues before us.

The war in Vietnam is obviously of paramount interest to us all. Of growing significance are the various domestic programs of the Great Society, and the level at which they should be pursued. An imminent threat is also posed by increasing inflationary pressures which may be felt in every segment of the economy in the coming months.

It is always difficult to select just the right questions and to phrase them in a way which is easily understandable and yet will elicit a meaningful answer. I have reviewed the questions asked by a score of my colleagues in an attempt to get the best possible.

Each of the replies to these questions will be tabulated and the results will be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Here are the questions I am putting to my constituents:

	Yes	No
What course should the United States follow in Vietnam?		
Maintain present level of involvement	( )	( )
Suspend bombing of North Vietnam	( )	( )
Withdraw our Armed Forces	( )	( )
Intensify military action	( )	( )
Do you favor changing the term of the House of Representatives from 2 to 4 years?	( )	( )
Should the Federal Government pay a portion of the home rentals for some families, as proposed by the administration?	( )	( )
Should additional tax credits or deductions be allowed parents of college students?	( )	( )
The administration has asked $1.6 billion for the war on poverty—an increase of $400 million over the first year. Do you approve?	( )	( )
Do you believe there currently is a threat of serious inflation?	( )	( )

Kurt Debus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my position on the House Committee on Science and Astronautics has brought me in close touch with many learned scientists and experts in the field of rocketry. I know of no man whom I enjoy as much, nor for whom I have gained as much respect for than Kurt Debus, director of the Kennedy Space Center in Florida.

I was pleased to see that the Sunday Star honored Dr. Debus this past weekend as their headline personality, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this article:

[From the Washington, (D.C.) Sunday Star, Feb. 27, 1966]

HEADLINE PERSONALTY—DEBUS CUT HIS TEETH AT GERMAN V-2 BASE

CAPE KENNEDY, FLA.—The man who saved the day for Project Apollo yesterday is a saber-scarred engineer who has fired more big rockets than most people have seen.

As a result of his long experience with these temperamental "birds," Kurt H. Debus has long since learned never to flap, even when things appear most unpromising.

Yesterday while others here and at Houston, Tex., were making a decision to "scrub" the launching of a big Apollo-Saturn superrocket because of a cranky gas-pressure system, Debus was communing with himself at his desk in launch control here. Even after the decision was made—and announced—the mild-mannered rocket engineer did not give up.

WORKED WITH VON BRAUN

As a result of his thoughtful persistence, the unthinkable happened: A scrub was "descrubbed," and Apollo-Saturn 201 went on to a resoundingly successful flight that already has secured a place in the space record books.

Debus cut his teeth, astronautically speaking, on V-2 rockets at the Nazi missile

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

testing base of Peenemuende, where he worked closely with another German engineer, Dr. Vernher von Braun.

Debus and Von Braun came to the United States under the same postwar sponsored-immigration program and have since won high places in the U.S. space effort.

Debus is Director of the Kennedy Space Center here, a job parallel to Von Braun's position at the Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala. When men go to the moon about 1970, the last bit of earth their feet will touch before liftoff currently "belongs" to Debus.

SPARTAN IN EFFICIENCY

Graying and scholarly, Debus runs a center here, worth roughly a billion dollars, which is Spartan in its efficiency. He is one of the few space officials who has taken on a major project and carried out on time and within cost elements.

Debus and his principal associates are quick to disclaim the role of wonderworkers. They explain that their job has been construction of ground facilities, not rockets, modestly leaving unmentioned the fact that their works border on the fantastic.

On an average sunny Florida day, Debus can sit in his top-floor office in the KSC headquarters building on nearby Merritt Island and look a few miles north to the world's largest structure—a 525-foot vertical assembly building in which the first copy of the world's largest rocket, Saturn V, is beginning to take shape.

PAD WITHIN GAZE

Shifting his gaze a few miles to the east, he can make out the low-lying pad where the first flight-model of Saturn V will blast off sometime early next year. And like as not as he watches, a structure tall as a 40-story building will lumber slowly across the scene—a mobile launcher on a test run from the vertical assembly building to the pad.

Debus has been directly responsible for every manned launching that has taken place here, and for most of the big unmanned ones conducted by the space agency.

Rocket firings are his life—a far cry from the quiet academic days at Darmstadt University in Germany, or even from Peenemunde.

No one could have foreseen 55 years ago in Frankfurt, Germany, that the infant son of Heinrich and Melly Debus would be where and who he is today. The "where" transition sometimes surprises even Debus himself.

This drastic change of circumstances from pre-World War I Germany to space-age America has given Debus an accent that can only be described as "German cracker." He learned English as a second conversational language while working for the Army at Huntsville, in northern Alabama, and his way of speech reveals this.

"It's lucky anyone can understand me," he sometimes comments. Actually, Debus' English is fluent, idiomatic and not severely affected by mingling the tones of Darmstadt and Huntsville.

Every inch the suave, continental gentleman, Debus bears on the lower left side of his face "marks of honor" received in dueling encounters in his undergraduate days a la "The Student Prince." Many people assume the scars are sabrewounds but then unbelievingly shrug off the idea. No mistake, however: They are the real thing, right out of pre-Hitler Rhineland college capers.

A self-effacing man among extroverts, Debus is nowhere near so well known as Von Braun, the astronauts or such scintillating figures as Gemini Mission Director "Chris" Kraft. Friendly enough, he is not notably gregarious and finds his most enjoyable moments at home with the elaborate stereo hi-fi that he built. Classical music transports him, as a friend said, "to another world."

KURT H. DEBUS

Claim to fame: Director, Kennedy Space Center, Fla.

Home: Cocoa Beach, Fla.

Date of birth: November 29, 1908.

Education: Master's degree in electrical and high-voltage engineering from Darmstadt University, Germany; doctor of engineering.

Jobs: Assistant professor at Darmstadt; rocket engineer, Peenemuende missile base, Germany, member of "Von Braun group" at Fort Bliss, Tex., and Huntsville, Ala.; at Cape Canaveral (now Kennedy) since 1962; director of Kennedy Space Center since December 1963.

Family: Wife, Gay; daughters, Ute (Mrs. Adam Metheny) and Sigrid.

Hobbies: Classical hi-fi stereo music.

Gerald Yee Writes Winning Hawaii Entry in National VFW Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, one of the many worthwhile projects of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is their annual Voice of Democracy Essay Contest for high school students. The contest not only stimulates discussions in classrooms on the meaning of democracy, but it also provides an opportunity for the students to compete for educational scholarships ranging from $1,000 to $5,000. More than 300,000 students participated in the contest this year, and the winner from each State has been invited to our Nation's Capital for the final judging on March 8, 1966.

Representing the State of Hawaii is Gerald Yee of Honolulu, Hawaii. Gerald's winning essay, entitled "Democracy—What It Means to Me," reflects mature understanding and appreciation of his role in the democratic processes by which our country is governed. His essay is a tribute to the democratic environment that Hawaii has always provided to nurture its young citizens.

It is with great pride, therefore, that I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Gerald Yee's outstanding essay:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Gerald Yee)

Time: 1835.

Place: The United States, with the great French philosopher Alexis de Tocqueville making his historic visit to study the workings of democracy.

On a restful night, De Tocqueville sat down and began writing. He captured the essence of democracy when he scribbled: "Whenever the political laws of the United States are to be discussed, it is with the supreme authority of the people that we must begin."

Forty-six years before, in 1789, the fathers of our country hopefully made plans for the American ship of state, a new vessel to sail on treacherous uncharted seas amidst the darkest storms of autocracy and tradition. These men, hoping for a land where they could be free, carefully laid out the blueprints for this masterful undertaking. George Washington was elected captain, and the ship was run by a rare element—democracy. Kings and parliaments laughed, sneered, and literally spit upon this ship of state. Never before had they heard of a government where a man without property could elect his leaders, or where the most ragged pauper was being guaranteed the same rights as the gold-studded noble. However, in time these kings vanished from the face of the earth while the U.S. ship of state sailed on.

We are all part of the crew of this ship of state, which sails by the exercise of democracy on board. We students are delegated as many responsibilities as the rich man, poor man, and the worker, who each has his share in maintaining operation of democracy.

Now let us have a closer examination of democracy. We define democracy as (1) faith of the people to govern themselves, and (2) the belief that common men alone have the ability to unite the ship of state, bound by common interest and common goals to protect the freedoms and welfare of all. As a democratic nation, we believe that God himself gave us the natural right and encouragement to decide for ourselves what is proper. This is proven when the founders of this great country wrote the laws of the land with the highest regard for the rights which God so earnestly gave us.

Accordingly, the common man alone has the ability to band together with his fellow beings to form a democratic state, whereby each man is entitled to his share of freedom. This state, formed by wealth, workmen, and teenagers, must possess sufficient energy and kinship to weather the onslaught of external forces and the changing of times.

As high school students in America, we must not be led to believe that our role in preserving our democratic way of life is limited to just voting and watching television forums. On the contrary, preserving our democratic way of life consumes all the energy we can supply. Our role is to keep our ears, our eyes, and our minds open for several sides of an issue, including those of extremist groups, and to constantly safeguard our sacred rights.

For instance, the other day my friends were discussing the pros and cons of the Vietnam war. Several fellows decided, with great spirit, that they must show their feelings toward the war on a larger scale. They brushed several slogans on cardboard signs and demonstrated in full view of the public. Certainly, their privilege to protest or to promote a cause is an inherent and vital organ of democratic society.

As high school students, attending school is obviously one of the major methods in which our democratic way of life is already being preserved. A close examination of today's high schools show that students are being prepared to become active citizens. High school students are doing their part to keep democracy alive and working by taking advantage of citizenship courses, while classes in U.S. Government and American history open doors to the rich meaning of democracy. Other school activities allow the student to exercise his leadership skills, which are vital to the preservation of democracy.

By exercising the fundamentals in school, we students practice democracy by listening, watching, and doing. For example, we can follow the course of an election campaign and wind up with a student mock election concerning identical issues.

As students, we must always be on the guard for infringements on democracy and strive for a more democratic society. We can start first at home and in the community by informing other citizens of their rights and obligations in a democracy. Apathy in

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Alaska's National Guardsmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to a recent article by Mr. Bill Fox, a staff writer for the Anchorage Times, Anchorage, Alaska, entitled "Famed Alaska Scouts Protect 49th State Full Time on Part-Time Pay." In the concluding paragraph of his story, Mr. Fox states:

The scouts are in a class of their own and none of the regular guardsmen or servicemen in other branches of the Armed Forces will dispute it.

I am sure that anyone who reads the following article will agree with his conclusion:

FAMED ALASKA SCOUTS PROTECT 49TH STATE FULL TIME ON PART-TIME PAY

(By Bill Fox)

About 1,200 of Alaska's proudest National Guardsmen are currently attending their annual 2-week field training session at Camp Denali at Fort Richardson.

The 1st and 2d Scout Battalions of the National Guard, composed almost entirely of Indians and Eskimos from remote areas of the State, arrived at Fort Richardson Sunday and will remain there for 15 days of rigorous training exercises.

Members of the scout battalions are unique in that they perform nearly a full-time job on part-time pay. This, however, is not the only characteristic which sets this group aside from all other National Guard units across the lower 49 States.

Unlike other States, the guardsmen in Alaska convene for their annual tour of active duty in midwinter. The scout battalions are trained for combat in arctic and subarctic temperatures and thus their training is conducted in a period which properly prepares them for emergencies which might arise in their own villages.

The 1st Battalion, commanded by Maj. Bill Caldwell, has headquarters in Nome and covers an area stretching from Barter Island in the northeast to Stebbins and St. Michael along Norton Sound. In addition, the 1st Battalion maintains outposts on Little Diomede and St. Lawrence Island.

The 2d Battalion has its headquarters at Bethel and is commanded by Maj. Joe Pike, an American Cree Indian. This battalion maintains 29 units in towns and villages from Kotlik on Norton Sound to Dillingham on the shores of Bristol Bay. The 2d Battalion, mostly made up of Athabascan Indians, has a unit at Mekoryuk on Nunivak Island, as well.

Although men in both battalions are required to meet in their own units just 48 times in a year, many convene as many as 90 or more times. Being a member of a scout battalion carries as much status as being a member of the village council in some Eskimo communities. The scouts are extremely proud of their uniforms and the money which they receive for attending training sessions is an important factor in the economic growth of their home villages.

The scout battalions are trained to maintain a constant surveillance over an assigned geographical area, its adjacent waters, and offshore islands. The battalions can report any information which they obtain by way of radio and in most cases a native Eskimo dialect is much more effective for transmitting secret information than any standard type of voice code.

Each battalion contains slightly over 600 men, but is broken down by units within a village. The heaviest concentration of scouts exist in Point Barrow where there are about 90.

Although many of the scouts can understand and speak English, they are often reluctant to discuss their roles as scouts. One platoon sergeant from a small village on the northern coast of Alaska said most of his winters were spent hunting and most of his summers devoted to fishing. He said he maintained a dog team and added that it took about 800 pounds of fish to feed his dogs each year.

Most of the scout officers have attended training school outside of Alaska.

Many of the scouts prefer to wear their own mukluks while they are snowshoeing, rather than the regular Army-issued boots. One Eskimo said the Army boots were too stiff and made his feet sore.

The enthusiasm and pride of these scouts is so great that they carry their work far beyond the call of duty in many instances. Some of the units in the far Northwest have been responsible for recovering Soviet weather balloons which have enabled U.S. officials to determine just how advanced the Russians have become in their weather-probing operations.

Other units have made heroic rescues and still others have successfully guided unfamiliar units through the arctic wilds of northern Alaska.

The cost of conducting an annual encampment to bring battalions together is expensive, but worth while. Operation of Camp Denali for the 15-day period runs in the vicinity of $3,500. Rations for the more than 1,200 men are about $25,000. Transportation is $95,000 and payrolls amount to $165,000. In addition, $1,500 worth of petroleum, oil and lubricants is consumed and clothing and field supplies for each scout amounts to about $350.

Often, the process of bringing a scout from his home village to Camp Denali is a major operation and in some cases it is never completed. Last year 80 men were left waiting in their villages for 9 days before they were finally notified that the weather was too poor to permit air flights into their territory. Their active tour of duty was canceled.

This year about 40 men, who became restless and tired of waiting for a bush plane to fly them out to one of the key pickup points, boarded five snow vehicles and a dozen dog teams and traveled into Bethel from Kwethluk and Akiachiak.

One colonel suggested that perhaps the extra enthusiasm displayed by Eskimo Scouts was a symbol of their gratitude for being given the opportunity to learn their work as guardsmen and to travel around the State and into the southern 49 States.

In any case, the Scouts are truly in a class of their and none of the regular guardsmen or servicemen in other branches of the Armed Forces will dispute it.

Tony Plattner and the War in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that one of my constituents is throwing welcome light on what is happening in Vietnam by writing a series of in-depth articles for Aviation Week and Space Technology, the aerospace journal. He is C. M. "Tony" Plattner, of Walker, Minn., son of Mr. and Mrs. Clemens A. Plattner, the husband and wife team who edit and publish three newspapers in our State—the Walker Pilot, the Cass County Independent, and the Crow Wing County Review.

Tony flew fighter planes while a pilot in the Marine Corps from 1952 to 1956 after graduating as a mathematics major from Carleton College in Northfield, Minn. He attended the University of Minnesota School of Journalism after serving in the Marines, and then worked as an associate engineer for the Marquardt Corp.

Combining his practical flying experience with his technical training, Tony joined Aviation Week as a reporter specializing in aircraft engineering stories. He recently went to Vietnam for 2 months to report the air war there firsthand, flying missions ranging from B–52 bombing raids to light-plane spotter missions in a Bird Dog aircraft. His series on U.S. air tactics in Vietnam set a new high watermark in the reporting on that confusing war.

If there is no objection, I would like to insert an editorial from the January 3, issue of Aviation Week about how Tony is covering the Vietnam war.

THE LONG WAR

The Vietnam war is now in another pause that hopefully might lead to meaningful negotiations but more likely is simply a prelude to a greater escalation of that conflict. In addition to increasing in intensity and fury in Vietnam, the next phase of the struggle for a favorable balance of power in Asia is likely to spread into other areas of the southeastern peninsula, such as Laos and Thailand.

Main reason that the current pause is unlikely to produce significant negotiations is that the United States has not yet changed the basic strategic balance in Vietnam, despite an air bombing campaign against North Vietnam and a major increase in ground and air strength in South Vietnam. Notwithstanding the major increases in land, air, and sea forces in southeast Asia during the past 6 months, the strategy with which they have been employed has failed to achieve the desired U.S. goals. In the air, the limited and sporadic campaign of interdiction against Communist supply lines feeding the Vietcong in South Vietnam has proved ineffective because of the nature of the terrain involved and the limited scale of the air effort employed. On the ground the "sweep and clear" tactics have produced some bloody battles, but the Vietcong usually reoccupy the areas after the fighting ends.

The Communist forces in South Vietnam are now more numerous, aggressive, and better supplied than they were last spring before the U.S. ground force buildup and air interdiction campaigns accelerated. It is clear that not only will additional military forces be required in southeast Asia, but also that a radically different strategy for their use will be necessary to achieve a relatively swift and enduring decision.

The scale of the war in southeast Asia has been escalating steadily since President Johnson's inaugural 1 year ago this month. It is now reaching the stage where it will require major changes in American life if it continues much longer on a further escalated scale. The American people and the aerospace industry could be faced with the pros-

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

fight for liberty and freedom for all people rather than permit Communist aggression to spread throughout the world.

The following concurrent resolution was adopted by the South Carolina General Assembly on February 22, 1966. This resolution reveals the dedication of the people of South Carolina to the cause of worldwide freedom. I have respectfully requested that it be printed in the RECORD:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION DECLARING FEBRUARY 22, 1966, ALLEGIANCE DAY

Whereas in recent months we have seen throughout our Nation very unpleasant sights such as draft card burning, peace marches and other demonstrations generated by a small and determined minority against the position taken by our country's leaders in defending the principles upon which this Nation was founded; and

Whereas while we all recognize the right which freedom guarantees each of us to disagree with the principles of our Government, we do not believe that public demonstrations in the streets against our policy in Vietnam while American lives are being lost to defend our Nation and to preserve freedom throughout the world should be held and are detested and unsupported by an overwhelming majority of patriotic citizens; and

Whereas the Greenville Jaycees, the South Carolina Jaycees, and the Municipal Association of South Carolina are promoting February 22, 1966, as Allegiance Day and encouraging the observation of Allegiance Day throughout the State of South Carolina and the entire Nation with brief ceremonies on February 22, which is the birthday of the Father of our Country, George Washington, during which ceremonies we shall all rededicate ourselves and our communities to the principles upon which this Nation was founded and for which it stands today: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That February 22, 1966, is hereby declared to be Allegiance Day.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the South Carolina House of Representatives and concurred in by the senate.

INEZ WATSON,
Clerk of the House.

Lal Bahadur Shastri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was a profound shock to learn of the sudden death at Tashkent of India's Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri. All the world joins the people of India in mourning the passing of this great statesman.

Because of its relevance, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Gazette of India Extraordinary on January 14, 1966. The editorial follows:

The sudden demise at Tashkent of Lal Bahadur Shastri in the early hours of Tuesday, January 11, 1966, has plunged the nation into deep distress and grief. Lal Bahadur Shastri went to Tashkent in the cause of peace and it is a great tragedy that just when his persistent efforts towards settlement for an honorable and enduring peace in this subcontinent achieved fruition, fate delivered a cruel blow and removed him from our midst.

Born in 1904 at Mughalsarai in Uttar Pradesh, Lal Bahadur Shastri lost his father while he was still an infant. How this infant, born in a modest environment, rose to the highest political office in this country, is an inspiring saga of noble endeavor, unwavering sincerity of purpose and a high sense of patriotism and integrity in public life.

Lal Bahadur Shastri was only 17 years old when the call came from Mahatma Gandhi and without hesitation he plunged himself in the freedom struggle. He was imprisoned. On release, he entered Kashi Vidyapeeth at Varanasi and came under the influence of the savant, Dr. Bhagwan Dass. He took the Shastri degree from the Vidyapeeth (University) and reentered active politics.

At the age of 23, Shastri was married to Shrimati Lalita Devi, who has always stood by him as a steadfast companion, to the very end of his life of sacrifice and devotion to the nation.

Lal Bahadur Shastri had participated in all mass movements launched during India's fight for freedom and was imprisoned as many as seven times. In 1946, he was elected to the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly and was appointed Parliamentary Secretary to the Chief Minister. Subsequently, he was appointed Minister for Police and Transport. This portfolio he held for nearly 5 years.

In 1952, when the first general elections were held in India after attainment of independence, Lal Bahadur Shastri was entrusted by the Congress Party with the task of organizing the election campaign; the great success which the party secured at the polls in those elections was in no small measure due to his organizing capacity.

Lal Bahadur Shastri became a member of the Rajya Sabha (Upper House of Parliament) in the first session of Parliament. He was appointed the Union Minister for Transport and Railways in 1952. Four years later, he resigned his ministership because he felt he was constitutionally responsible for a railway accident in which many lives had been lost. This was symbolic of his stanch faith in and sincere endeavor to live up to the highest traditions of parliamentary democracy. Expressing his deep appreciation of this step in Parliament, late Prime Minister Nehru described Lal Bahadur Shastri as a man of the highest integrity with devotion to high ideals.

The call to assume responsibility of high public office came to Lal Bahadur Shastri again in 1957 when he was elected to the Lok Sabha (Lower House of Parliament) and was assigned the portfolio of Transport and Communications in the Union Cabinet. In March 1958, he became Minister for Commerce and Industry. Later, on the death of Gobind Ballabh Pant in April 1961, the important portfolio of Home Affairs was entrusted to him.

As Minister for Home Affairs, Lal Bahadur Shastri brought into play his gifts as an able administrator and he handled a number of complex and intricate political and administrative problems with sagacity and skill. He had a great capacity for resolving differences and brought to bear, on disputes and discords, the healing tough of his great personal charm, gentle persuasion and deep understanding. One of the difficult problems which he solved soon after his assumption of the office of Home Minister was the language issue in Assam. Amongst important matters which received his special attention during his tenure as Home Minister was a promotion of emotional integration amongst the people of India, a matter which always remained uppermost in his mind.

In August 1963, Lal Bahadur Shastri resigned from the office of Home Minister to devote himself to the task of revitalization of the Congress Organization. Soon after, he was called upon to join the Union Cabinet as Minister without portfolio. In that capacity, he lightened the burden of the heavy responsibilities of the late Prime Minister and on passing away of Jawaharlal Nehru, the mantle of the great leader fell on Lal Bahadur Shastri.

The smoothness with which the changeover took place was a measure of the nation's confidence in Lal Bahadur Shastri's capacity to direct the affairs of the country. And the nation was soon to find that its trust in him was fully justified. Onerous responsibilities of the high office unfolded his great qualities of leadership. In terms of time, the tenure of Lal Bahadur Shastri was a short one.

However, during the span of the 19 months that Lal Bahadur Shastri was Prime Minister, the country passed through a period of such severe stress and strain as would test the mettle of the highest leadership. During a crucial phase of our history, bristling with serious internal as well as external problems, he guided the destinies of the nation with strength, determination, wisdom and farsighted statesmanship. A man of genuine humbleness of spirit and of unfailing courtesy, Lal Bahadur Shastri was essentially a man of peace. He sought peace in the country, peace with her neighbors and peace throughout the world. His concept of peace, however, was one of peace with honor and, behind his modesty and gentle exterior, lay a firmness of purpose and a resolute will.

When, therefore, challenge came a few months ago, it found Lal Bahadur Shastri the firm sentinel of the country's honor, freedom and territorial integrity. In this hour of crisis, he provided the nation with determined and inspiring leadership under which the entire nation rose as one man to meet effectively the threat of aggression. These hostilities, which were not of India's seeking, however, did not deflect Lal Bahadur Shastri from his quest for peace and good neighborliness: The Tashkent agreement was his finest hour and a measure of his sincere effort in the direction of peace.

Lal Bahadur Shastri was a man of the people. Both as an individual and as a leader, he endeared himself to the people. His life was one of complete dedication to the service of the nation. Even in frail health, he did not permit himself rest or respite. His tragic end, which came in the wake of his vigorous pursuit of the Tashkent talks in complete disregard of mental and physical strain, was characteristic of his devotion to service of the country and to the cause of peace.

The country has lost Lal Bahadur Shastri when it had great need for his services and the people had discovered, in true measure, his great qualities of character and leadership. It is for the people of this country to prove worthy of the legacy which Lal Bahadur Shastri has left behind and to strive wholeheartedly and unitedly for fulfillment of the great tasks to which he addressed himself and for which he lived and died.

On the eve of his death, he said to the Defense Minister: "We have now to fight for peace with the same courage and determination as we fought against aggression." The nation can never forget these words which sum up his message to India and to the world.

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

pect of a long, bloody, and fruitless war that would make Korea fade into a minor skirmish by comparison.

Against this background Aviation Week & Space Technology again brings its readers a series (the third since 1964) of special reports from the combat zones of southeast Asia, written by a specially qualified staff member. The series that begins in this issue on page 16 is the result of 2 months of travel in southeast Asia by C. M. "Tony" Plattner, a member of this magazine's Los Angeles bureau who has an unusual set of qualifications for this task.

"Tony" Plattner served 4 years' active duty as a Marine Corps fighter pilot flying Vought F4U Corsairs and Grumman F9F-5's and is now a captain in the Marine Air Reserve flying Douglas A-4E jet attack aircraft. His 2,000 hours of flying time also include many pilot report assignments for A.W. & S.T. in a wide variety of aircraft. His latest before leaving for Vietnam last fall was a chock-to-chock exercise in the lefthand seat of the Douglas DC-9 (A.W. & S.T. Nov. 1, p. 37). He was educated as a mathematician and worked as an engineer in the aerospace industry and as a newspaper reporter before joining the staff of this magazine 3 years ago.

During his 2 months in southeast Asia he covered every form of air operations from the Strategic Air Command Boeing B-52 strikes based on Guam to the Cessna O-1E light plane spotter missions. He traveled over 1,500 miles in the combat theater visiting USAF, Army, and Marine air squadrons and flew combat missions as an observer in three types of McDonnell Phantom 2 strike fighters, a Bell UH-1D helicopter, a North American F-100F, and a Grumman OV-1A Mohawk Army reconnaissance aircraft. He also went on board Navy carriers operating off the Vietnam coast to report on their operations.

His series will provide A.W. & S.T. readers the same type of accurate detailed technical information on the aerospace equipment deployed in southeast Asia, its operational effectiveness and its future requirements, as did the 17-part series written by National Editor Cecil Brownlow after a similar assignment in Vietnam last spring.

The urgent need for this type of information was amply demonstrated by over 8,000 requests for reprints of the Brownlow Vietnam series received from industry and military organizations all over the world.

Editorial coverage from combat zones is both dangerous and costly. But the aerospace industry has come to depend on Aviation Week & Space Technology to provide it with this type of information that it so vitally needs. We will not shirk this responsibility in Vietnam or any other portion of this troubled globe.—ROBERT HOTZ.

Mrs. Robert McNamara: Wife of a Man Under Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

MRS. ROBERT MCNAMARA: WIFE OF A MAN UNDER FIRE

(By Lloyd Shearer)

Ladies of America. How would you like to pick up your newspaper each morning and read that your husband was cold, aloof, distant, unfeeling, and withdrawn * * * arrogant, austere, and strict * * * prudish, precise, and straitlaced * * * stiff, stern, rigid, and humorless * * * a walking encyclopedia * * * a man whose bloodstream consists of computers instead of cells * * * an inflexible automaton, stubborn and unyielding in the face of error * * * the second most powerful man in the Nation responsible for the war in Vietnam, the confusion in U.S. foreign policy, the Selective Service Act, the black market in Saigon, and the fate of this country? Also a lot of other downright distortions.

How would you like each day to have your husband sniped at by the press, the public, and the prima donnas of Congress?

How would you like to have him criticized, insulted, accused, condemned, disparaged, vilified, and lampooned? Especially when you knew from 25 years of marriage with this able, brilliant, dedicated, versatile man that practically all the criticism was incorrect.

This, in large measure, is the position Margaret McNamara, wife of Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, has found herself in these past 5 years.

A lovely, gracious, blue-eyed, shapely, petite brunette (5 feet 3, 116 pounds), a onetime California high school teacher (biology and physical education at Alameda and Sausalito), intelligent, well read, au courant with the latest events, Margaret McNamara comes well equipped to refute the criticism leveled at her husband. But she has never succumbed to the temptation.

I HAVE TO STRIKE BACK

"The only time I really get angry," she admits, "is when they accuse Robert of being dishonest. He may commit an occasional error in judgment—which one of us does not?—but dishonesty is so foreign to his character that I just have to strike back. Usually I write a nasty letter, get rid of my resentment that way, then tear the letter up.

"When someone you love has become the national sitting duck," she explains, "the constant target of criticim, it's only natural for his wife to become defensive. But over the years I've learned not to let it affect me too much. The antidote to falsehood, frequently born of jealousy, power struggles, superficial first impressions but rarely of knowledge, is truth. When you know what the truth is about your husband, the deep, verified-by-living-with-him truth, then when something isn't true, you don't let it bother you.

"'I'm sure the wives of Senators and Congressmen and other in Government service—someone like the President's wife, Mrs. Johnson, who's an old Washington hand—have learned the art of living with criticism—but it does take time, patience, and frequently great understanding.

"You see," Margaret McNamara adds, the voice soft, sincere, and friendly feminine, "there's always the problem of children. Our three are young, sensitive, easily hurt, and when their hard-working father gets 'blasted' as they put it, they wonder why. It seems so unfair to them.

"Take Margy, our eldest, 24 (a graduate student in anthropology at Washington University in St. Louis). Some of the boys she's dated have been classified 1A, and I'm sure they've let her know that they think her dad responsible, which of course, he's not. Before we left Ann Arbor for Washington, before Bob accepted President Kennedy's offer to join his Cabinet we'd all read Kennedy's book, 'Profiles in Courage.' We learned that the experiences of many people in Government aren't particularly easy. If a man believes he's right, if he's running against the tide, if he's breaking down old and established customs, Government service is no bed of roses. And when someone like Robert, for what he considers the benefit of the entire country, cancels contracts and shuts down unneeded installations after the most careful and thorough research, well, the hue and cry from the local level can become a deafening roar.

"But like us, the children have learned to roll with the punches, to understand what personal participation in Government entails. As President Truman said, 'If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen.' I guess we've learned to take it."

Before Robert Strange McNamara moved his family to Washington in early 1961, he worked his way up in less than 15 years at the Ford Motor Co. from administrative executive to controller (1949) to vice president in charge of all cars and trucks (1957) to president (1960). In 1959 his salary and bonuses came to $410,833. Had he remained as president in 1961 instead of resigning to accept the Defense position in Kennedy's Cabinet at $25,000 per year, his annual compensation would have topped the $500,000 mark. In addition he would have been able to exercise options on 60,000 shares of Ford stock, half at $23.71, half at $33 in a bull market which zoomed the stock to $117 a share.

When Henry Ford was asked recently what it cost Bob McNamara to leave Ford for Washington, he said, "We figure about $500,000 a year in salary and supplemental compensation plus about $3½ million in stock."

When McNamara worked for Ford he lived a peaceful life with free weekends in the college town of Ann Arbor, Mich. He attended the First Presbyterian Church, took a leading role with his wife in civic enterprises—they were among the first residents to sign a covenant designed to end racial discrimination in the sale of local real estate—and contributed independently to candidates of both political parties. He rose early, about 6, worked long and hard, frequently putting in 12-hour days, but he went skiing with his family in winter, climbed mountains with them in summer, lived the good and modest life devoid of status symbols. (The McNamaras still own and drive a 1960 Ford, a 1961 Falcon, buy their clothes off the rack.)

In a materialistic society where money is equated with power and success, it seems incredible, but the truth is—and this is fundamental to any true understanding of their philosophy—the McNamaras give scant though to the financial sacrifice or prestige involved in Government service.

"When Sargent Shriver came out to see my husband in 1960," Mrs. McNamara explains, "and told him that President Kennedy wanted him to serve in his Cabinet either as Secretary of Defense or Secretary of the Treasury, Bob was truly surprised. He'd only just been promoted to president at Ford the previous month, and his first reaction was to question his own qualifications for such high Government office. He quickly turned down the Treasury job because he said he hadn't had enough banking and fiscal experience.

"Later when he spoke to President Kennedy directly, he told him that his experience in defense was very limited. Bob had served as an officer in the Air Force during World War II but that was a good 15 years back. He recommended several other men and told the President in all honesty that he wasn't the man for the job. He just didn't have enough experience.

"The President said he wasn't aware that any training school existed either for Presidents or Cabinet members. And I think it was after that remark, perhaps a little later, that Bob asked President Kennedy if he himself had really written "Profiles in Courage." The President said yes, and Bob was most pleased, but he kept insisting that Kennedy was making a mistake in offering him a Cabinet membership.

"I can honestly say," Margaret McNamara declares, "that we never really thought about or discussed the difference in salary levels between Government and private employ-

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

ment. We had always thought—Bob had always thought—that at some time he'd like to give his time and effort to the Government when asked, never realizing that he would be asked as soon as he was. But when you're asked, you don't say no, not at least when you feel as strongly as he does, I guess as we all do in our family, about making some contribution to good government."

MIDDLE CLASS AMERICANS

Where and how the McNamaras developed their dedication to public service and their high quotient of idealism is difficult to determine. Neither comes from a family with any considerable history of government service. Both spring from the heart of the white collar American middle class.

Margaret McKinstry Craig (Mrs. McNamara's maiden name) was born in the State of Washington in 1915. Her family moved to California when she was a child, and she was raised in Alameda across the bay from San Francisco where her dad sold insurance.

Robert Strange McNamara (Strange is his mother's family name) was also raised with a sister, Peggy, in the San Francisco Bay area. They were children of a wholesale shoe company executive. The elder McNamara was 25 years older than his wife, and people who knew him describe the gentleman as "a stiff, dignified, businesslike man." It is entirely possible Robert McNamara inherited his devotion to hard work, his power of great concentration, his proven organizational genius, and his reserved manner from his father.

SWEET NOT SACCHARINE

Margaret Craig of Alameda High School and Robert McNamara of Piedmont High both attended the University of California at Berkeley, class of 1937. She was in Alpha Phi, pretty, vivacious, bright, naturally at ease with people. "If you ask me for one adjective to describe Margy," says a friend of long standing, "I would use the word 'sweet'—not in the cloying, saccharine sense, but in the sense of her being thoughtful and unselfish, the very feminine qualities you find in a well-bred young girl. She is still the sweetest, most considerate woman I know."

McNamara was a Phi Gamma Delta, popular, serious, brilliant, industrious. He made Phi Beta Kappa in his junior year, was a big man on campus. Both attended many of the same classes, but they never dated. In those years McNamara saw a great deal of Annie Lee Whitmore, an attractive coed at Stanford.

It was only after he'd returned from 2 years at Harvard Business School and worked as an accountant for Price Waterhouse & Co. that he and Margy began dating. Their courtship was relatively short and to the point. "We started going around together," Mrs. McNamara recalls, "in May 1940. About 4 months later we were married in the Episcopal Church in Alameda. It was on August 13. That same day we held our wedding reception on the docks. Then we caught a boat which took us through the Panama Canal to New York. That boat trip was our honeymoon."

When she examines her marriage, now in its 26th year, Margaret McNamara finds it full, exciting, constantly growing. "I'm so glad I married Bob," she confessed to a college classmate not long ago. "If I'd married someone else I'd probably be a happy bay area housewife today, living in a typical suburban world. But being the kind of man he is, interested in everything—art, music, literature, science, nature—Bob has made a wonderful life for his family. He's taught us all so much."

Subsequently a reporter asked Mrs. McNamara if living with a former college professor and corporation president, an expert on budgets, statistical controls, and quantitative analyses, hadn't given her an inferiority complex. "Your husband," he declared, "supervises a budget of more than $50 billion in the Defense Department. Who makes the budget in your household? Who makes the family decisions?"

Margaret McNamara quickly laughed. She likes to laugh, likes to smile. "I don't suffer from any inferiority complex," she said. "At least I don't think I do. Family decisions with us have always been a joint effort. Over the years I've become a little better organized, but I've also learned that sometimes Bob enjoys a little family disorganization. Then he straightens things out.

"As for the budget, we set that out together. Then I try to keep it. But it doesn't always work. I have a sliding rule I call accrual. That's my expansion program beyond the set budget."

What she has learned most from her husband, she believes, is the important technique of decisionmaking, of first realizing what is most important, then setting a goal, then implementing the method of achieving that goal. "Decisiveness," she admits, "was not one of my outstanding qualities when I first got married. But I've learned over the long pull to make decisions after giving them the best possible thought, the best possible care, and then not to worry about them but to go on to the next goal."

If admittedly her husband has taught her much, what has Margaret McNamara contributed to the marriage? In addition to three bright, well-raised children, Margy 24, Kathleen 21, a student at Chatham College in Pittsburgh, and Craig 15, at St. Paul's School in New Hampshire—she has contributed a well-run household, and atmosphere of love, loyalty, and livability, an always available companionship, a calm, friendly, supporting disposition, and what a doctor friend aptly terms "the contagion of consideration." She makes relatively few demands of her husband.

Secretary of Defense is a mankilling job. It drove James Forrestal to suicide years ago, and it is amazing that Robert McNamara can maintain the pace he does, 12- to 18-hour days, 6 days per week, flights to Europe, Texas, Vietnam, periodic appearances before congressional committees, constantly spouting impressive quantities of knowledge, constantly replenishing the source of energy which drives him inexhaustibly on.

One reason he's able to continue this furious regimen, and still maintain good humor, unharried manner, excellent physical condition, and admirable emotional balance is that his wife is cheerfully willing to go along with the almost superhuman goals he sets for himself.

KEEPS BOB AT EASE

In her scheme of marriage, she is primarily a wife and mother, in that order. "What I try to do," she says, "is keep Bob at ease. He generally gets up at 6, and so do I. I make him his breakfast about 6:30, and he leaves for the Pentagon about 6:50. This gives me a chance to read two newspapers (the Washington Post and the New York Times). Since the children have all gone off to school I've taken on some local community action projects in Washington, because I feel very strongly about home rule. Citizen participation at the local level is terribly needed in the city of Washington. I also spend time on the poverty program, visiting Women's Job Corps, and I'm also interested in the nationwide beautification program. That's why when the President's wife asked me recently to represent her at the Governor's conference on beautification in California, which I consider my home State, I couldn't turn her down."

Another reason the McNamaras accomplish a great deal is that they are not particularly social creatures. They seem too inner-directed for that—she less than he—so that very rarely do they ride the Washington, D.C., cocktail circuit. A certain amount of socializing especially with other Cabinet members is necessary, but their idea of an evening well spent is to retire after dinner and read in bed. A few weeks ago the following reading matter lay beside their bed: "Report to Greco" by Nikos Kazantzakis, the Kennedy books by Schlesinger and Sorensen, "History of the Sierra Nevada" by Francis Farquhar (the McNamaras and their children have climbed the Sierras for years), issues of the New Yorker magazine containing the serialization of Truman Capote's "In Cold Blood."

Except for an occasional high-level meeting and weekend interruptions Secretary McNamara does no work at home. "He leaves everything packaged right on his office desk," Mrs. McNamara reveals. "He doesn't want to rehash or re-do it or go through it all again. Home to him is a place where he can relax and recharge his batteries. And I try to keep it that way. We have a cook and a woman who comes in to clean a few days per week. And that's about all. Bob returns home from work anywhere from 7 p.m. to 9, earlier on Saturdays, and I always wait to eat with him. He's a man who enjoys overworking himself, and I don't mind the long hours he puts in. It's just that the pressures keep mounting. That's what brings on fatigue, and that's what worries me."

By nature, however, Margy McNamara is no worrywart. She is one of those delightfully optimistic women who soar through life giving strength by giving love and understanding. Of the oftrepeated charge leveled against her husband that he is "a human I.B.M. machine," she says: "Ask the people who've met and talked with him. They'll tell you he's got a marvelous sense of humor. It's true that he suffers fools badly especially if they impede his work, but he's a friendly, polite, decent human being, a marvelous father who smiles with and at his children, who helps them with their homework, especially math—really he's a good man.

"I think this image of his being distant and interested only in computerized judgments springs from many factors. To begin with he's easy to caricature especially by cartoonists. He wears glasses. He's tall. He parts his hair neatly and cleanly a little to the left of center: There is very little that's humorous about the problems he faces or the decisions he must make. They don't lend themselves to the emotional approach but their effect on people is very emotional and very serious. So those who don't know him regard him as forbidding. But ask the people who've hiked and skiied with him. He's a man who enjoys much more than work."

In discussing his life with the man she calls "Kip," Margaret McNamara makes her marriage sound like a carefree, memorable picnic from its very inception. She glosses over the early years of World War II when her husband, rejected for service by the Navy because of his eyes, went to England, was there commissioned a captain in the Air Force. She says relatively little of her duty tour as a GI bride, of moving 13 times with an infant during the course of the war, of living in a basement in Salina, Kans., of contracting infantile paralysis along with her husband and of being hospitalized for 9 months. She says nothing about the months of waiting when McNamara was shipped overseas to Calcutta and she found herself traveling from Boston to Alameda to Kansas City to Washington.

LUCKIER THAN MOST

"Compared to most young brides with husbands in the service," she declares, "I was lucky."

Reporters who've covered McNamara since he arrived in Washington more than 5 years ago, say he's much more diplomatic now in handling people, particularly low I.Q. Con-

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

of independence in Lithuania. The following resolution was unanimously adopted, which was duly signed by Albert G. Vinick, president, 4227 Euclid Avenue, East Chicago, Ind., and Peter Indreika, secretary, 3946 Parrish Avenue, East Chicago, Ind.:

Whereas the United States of America has been in the forefront of the United Nations' activities ending foreign colonialism in numerous Asiatic, African, and European country's; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has been and still is striving in many devious ways to win official recognition by the free world of its rapacious and illegal occupation of Lithuania, and the other two Baltic States of Latvia and Estonia; and

Whereas despite the fact that many former colonial territories have been liberated and admitted into the United Nations as sovereign states in the last 20 years, the Soviet Union, while speaking out strongly for the abolition of all colonialism, has in actuality made Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the newest colonies in the Soviet Russian empire: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we again express our gratitude to our Government for the firm and unwavering policy of nonrecognition of the illegal Soviet occupation of Lithuania and the other two Baltic States, and request our Government to use every opportunity to raise the question of the liberation of these nations; and

That our Government refuse to ratify the Counsular Convention with the U.S.S.R., which would only be the means for the Soviet Communists to establish more espionage centers for subversive activities in our country; and

That this resolution be esnt to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Senators, and Members of Congress from our States, and to the press.

The President's Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, there is an apparent, and I might add, unfortunate, lack of understanding of U.S. objectives in Vietnam.

Once again, our President enunciated these objectives in clear, unmistakable language last week in New York. In commenting on this speech, the Chicago Sun-Times said the President's reiteration of our aims "should be sufficient to end the current debate" over U.S. policy in Vietnam.

I commend this editorial and insert it in the RECORD:

THE PRESIDENT'S ANSWER

President Johnson has answered the criticism raised against the administration's Vietnam policy in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings.

The President explained, again, that the U.S. course of conflict in Vietnam is limited in its objective to stopping Communist aggression. The U.S. purpose, he said, is "not conquest; it is not empire; it is not foreign bases; it is not domination." He said that the United States does not threaten Red China.

These are familiar points. To them Mr. Johnson added another. In answer to those who debate whether the Communists should have a share of the Government of South Vietnam he said, "We stand for self-determination—for free elections—and we will honor their results."

No free elections can be held in South Vietnam so long as the Communist terror tactics of brutal torture and wholesale assassination of village leaders hold much of the countryside in thrall. Safety, enforced by military means, and hope, in the form of agricultural and industrial aid and education, must be brought to those who have suffered through more than 20 years of war. That is the reason for and the objective of the U.S. course in Vietnam, and the reiteration of those aims should be sufficient to end the current debate.

The Greatest Danger on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting at this time that Columnist David Lawrence should point out to the American people his views on "The Greatest Danger on Vietnam." His column was published in the Washington Star on February 25, and follows:

THE GREATEST DANGER ON VIETNAM

(By David Lawrence)

"This is it"—few people are making such a comment out loud about Vietnam, but many are thinking it to themselves. For more and more it is beginning to be realized that the United States is passing through its biggest crisis since World War II. The conflict in Vietnam is no small or isolated affair. It has become worldwide in its significance, and it could turn into a larger war if the American people are misled into thinking that "peace at any price" is worthwhile.

The greatest danger is not in Vietnam but in this country, where well-meaning but confused and uninformed persons are unwittingly engaged in helping to bring on the very calamity they profess to be against—a major war.

The fallacies being spread are numerous. It is being assumed, for instance, that the President alone is making the policies. Actually, he is surrounded by advisers of the highest rank in civilian and military positions. They are not partisan in their thinking—they are conscientious and patriotic Americans anxious to assure the safety of this country. Republican leaders, too, are openly supporting the policies of the Government.

Nobody, of course, wishes to see a large war precipitated, but this is certain to happen if the enemy begins to take seriously the demonstrations and speeches inside the United States which give an impression of cravenness and weakness. Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, in his report to Congress this week, said:

"If we and our free world allies fail to meet the Chinese Communists' challenge in southeast Asia, we will inevitably have to confront it later under even more disadvantageous conditions. The road ahead will be difficult and sacrifices will be required of our people, both in money and in lives. But we have no other reasonable alternative if we are to preserve the kind of world we want to live in—a world in which each nation is free to develop in its own way, unmolested by its neighbors, free of armed attack from the more powerful nations."

Today, the Communist-controlled government in North Vietnam doesn't want to talk peace. When negotiations are mentioned, it is insisted that the Vietcong—the Communist faction in South Vietnam—must be recognized as the sole representative of the South Vietnamese people.

President Johnson's role has been exceedingly difficult as well as delicate. It would be safer for his planning tactics if he didn't have to make any public statements about the future course of the war. The enemy should be left guessing. But the President understandably finds it necessary, in order to quiet fears at home, to deny publicly that he means deliberately to "escalate" the war or to engage in hostilities with Communist China, the chief backer of the North Vietnamese Armies. The President said in a speech this week:

"If the aggressor persists in Vietnam, the struggle may be long. Our men in battle know and accept this hard fact. We who are at home can do as much. There's no computer that can tell the hour and day of peace, but we do know that it will come only to the steadfast—never to the weak in heart."

Johnson was first accused of not wanting to negotiate peace, but he has sent many ambassadors and recently Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY around the world to make it clear to all countries that America wishes peace. This, however, has been construed abroad as a sign of weakness, and Johnson is finding it desirable to repeat frequently that American policy is not weakening.

Actually, as the President has just said, the tide of battle has turned. There is evidence of a desire throughout the world to reinforce the American military effort in Vietnam. South Korea, Australia, and New Zealand have already sent forces there. Other nations are giving more and more indications of their support.

The Vietnam war, indeed, has taken on a worldwide meaning and is clearly being defined as a struggle between the free world and the Communist revolutionaries who seek to impose their will on helpless peoples. There's really only one way to shorten the war, and that is to bring about a united America and to put in proper perspective the utterances of the misguided persons in public and private life who don't seem to understand the kind of enemy the United States is fighting in Vietnam.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the partial text of a speech I delivered at the Lincoln Day dinner of the Republican Party of Brown County, Wis., in Green Bay on February 22, 1966:

Lincoln has many messages for modern-day Americans. He spoke eternal truths which will long serve to guide us in our affairs. There is one message he addressed particularly to Republicans. He said:

"It is exceedingly desirable that all parts of this great Confederacy shall be at peace,

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

and in harmony one with another. Let us Republicans do our part to have it so. Even though much provoked, let us do nothing through passion and ill temper."

I think this is wise party policy for Republicans at any time but particularly now when our Nation faces such critical problems, both at home and abroad.

We must reserve our ourselves the right to dissent; no free nation can long remain free without it. But we know that the right of dissent, like every other right, carriers with it a responsibility. That responsibility is to make sure that our dissent is not frivolous, self-serving, or, at worst, harmful to the national security. It should not spring, as Lincoln advised, from "passion or ill temper." It ought to be considered and constructive.

The Republican Party has met this test with flying colors during the continuing crisis in Vietnam.

We are not, as are some members of his own party, stabbing the Commander in Chief in the back with criticisms which impugn the motives of our country and give aid and comfort to the enemy. We have criticized, certainly. But I think the record is clear that our criticism, because it is aimed at the support of the American effort, has given no ammunition to the Communist propaganda machines.

Republican criticism stems from a deep concern. It is a concern for the future of this Republic.

We are concerned that the sacrifices being made in Vietnam shall not be made in vain—that we do not lose what our troops are fighting so valiantly to preserve. We fear that, if we make the wrong choices, freedom throughout the world will be gravely endangered.

It so happens that I strongly agree with the bipartisan policy which finds us fighting on the side of the Vietnamese in order to prevent their enslavement by communism through the use of force and terrorism. Freedom in this world is a lost cause, it seems to me, unless someone is willing to stand up and fight to prevent its permanent disappearance. If we deny freedom its chance in Vietnam, freedom is in danger throughout the world. If successful in Vietnam, the so-called Communist wars of liberation—the modern method of aggression—will continue. Eventually and inevitably this Nation will be forced to take a stand at another place. The costs then—in lives and treasure—could make the Vietnam war look like a minor skirmish.

I fervently hope this Nation has not forgotten the lessons of two world wars. The first lesson we learned is that the aggressor—whether he be Kaiser Wilhelm or Adolph Hitler, or Mao Tse-tung—will continue his aggression just as long as it remains profitable. The second lesson is that the United States, if it wants to save itself, must act to stop the aggression sooner or later. And the third lesson is that the longer we wait, and the more courage and power we allow the aggressor to achieve, the bloodier and more costly is the final struggle, with the outcome more and more in doubt.

If Communist aggression in the Far East continues to be profitable, if it is allowed to succeed at little cost, that aggression will continue. Those who want us to get out of Vietnam owe it to us, I believe, to tell us where they believe we should make the next stand. If they say that the success of Communist aggression in Vietnam means the end of Communist aggression in south Asia, then I must say that every logic and every lesson of history is dead against them.

I do not believe Americans will accept that kind of advice. On the contrary, I believe Americans generally are in strong agreement with the policy which finds us in Vietnam—the policy that says the United States, in its own self-interest, cannot allow piecemeal Communist aggression to succeed and become profitable.

Yet, one can feel across the land an uneasiness among our people over our position in Vietnam. I submit, however, it is not the basic policy which concerns Americans. It is the conduct of that policy.

This uneasiness over the conduct of our policy in Vietnam strengthens the position of those who advocate, either directly or indirectly, abandonment of south Asia to the tender mercies of the Communists. It would be a great tragedy if they prevail. It is for that reason that Republicans feel a deep obligation to point out the errors of omission and commission which are threatening a policy essential to the preservation of freedom and our own security.

I suggest that we greatly need two things from the President and his administration. The first is candor and facts. The second is a clear-cut decision. The President is reputed to be a great politician, but I think he underestimates the capacity of the American people to support difficult decisions once they are given possession of the critical facts. It is high time that we started getting the unvarnished truth about Vietnam. The administration's record of playing square with the American people on Vietnam is an extremely poor one.

The President misled the people in the 1964 campaign. He gave the country, as we Republicans well remember, the impression that there would be no enlargement of our military activities there. The American people were not told, in 1964, the seriousness of the situation in Vietnam. We now know that the Communists were close to winning the war in the 1964 and early 1965 period.

We have been consistently misled by administration officials. Secretary of State Rusk told us in April 1963, that the corner had been turned. In October of that year, Secretary of Defense McNamara predicted that, by the end of 1965, the major part of the American military aid program could be ended. Yet only a short time ago, he would only go so far as to say "we have stopped losing the war."

Very often, in addition, the President's actions in regard to Vietnam seem more to confuse than to enlighten; they give the impression of an administration either thoroughly uncertain about its objective or more interested in creating some kind of effect upon public opinion than in actual results.

Thus, we have the hastily arranged Honolulu conference with its emphasis upon economic progress in Vietnam; we have the hastily arranged Humphrey visit promising new programs and more American gold at every stop; we have the sudden presentation of the Vietnam issue to the U.N. Security Council, a matter in which we have apparently since lost interest.

It is no wonder that Washington is talking about, and Americans are feeling, a "crisis of credibility." That is what Ambassador Goldberg calls it, and really, it's just a fancy way of saying that people are getting in the habit of not believing their Government is telling the whole truth.

The first thing we need, then, is some old-fashioned candor from the administration. We ought not to have to guess the factual situation in Vietnam and the Far East; we ought to be kept fully advised. We ought not be kept in the dark as to what our real objective is in Vietnam; we ought to be told and Hanoi should be told. We ought not be flimflammed as to the kind of sacrifices that will be required to reach our objective; we ought to be informed. Above all, recognizing that for security's sake, we cannot be told everything, we ought not to be misled by either false optimism or pessimism as to the true situation.

When the people have been given the facts, this administration needs to make a national decision. It has to decide whether it is fighting a war in Vietnam or whether it is not. I do not say this facetiously; I say it in all seriousness, and I say it again, and underline my words.

We are engaged in a war in Vietnam but this nation has not yet made a decision that it will fight a war in Vietnam. On the contrary, the administration has avoided that decision. Instead it has been trying to find a consensus rather than to create a consensus.

War is a serious business which ought not be undertaken without having success as a goal. Successful war requires knowing what one is fighting for in specific terms, in military terms, if you will. It requires a willingness to commit power to achieve those objectives. It requires sacrifices and it requires, if public support is to be kept as it must be kept, that those sacrifices be shared as equally as possible. War requires resources and, unless it is a very small war indeed, it requires a nation to pass up temporarily its less urgent needs in order to fill the immediate critical ones. War requires dedication and concentration of effort.

We are committing hundreds of thousands of men and billions of dollars to armed conflict in Vietnam without fulfilling any of these requirements. The people do not know what our military objectives are in Vietnam. We have not been willing to commit the power needed to achieve whatever those objectives are; we are instead holding back power. We are not cutting back domestic programs to pay for the war; we are, in fact, adding new ones and enlarging others. We are not concentrating our efforts on the war; we are simultaneously engaged in every kind of activity under the sun, including the greatest roadbuilding program, the most costly exploration program and the most expensive foreign aid program in the history of the world.

We are, in short, engaged in war in Vietnam with all that means in terms of death and privation for our fighting men, without having decided to fight a war, with all that means in terms of hardship, sacrifice and risk for the people back home.

I, for one, do not believe this situation can long prevail. The first kind of war cannot be successful without the second. The American people will, I believe, either be summoned to join in a national decision that we mean business in Vietnam, or the American people will one day reject the mounting costs and casualties of a half-hearted war being fought by a nation that can't make up its mind what it's fighting for. If that happens, if this Nation sneaks out of Vietnam in abandonment of both principle and the friendship and trust of a free people, then I fear indeed that we will have set the stage for an eventual vast world conflict we are all trying so desperately to avoid.

How can we as a people, how can our fightingmen, how can Hanoi or Peiping be convinced we have really determined to fight this war when they see some of the things going on here at home—on the domestic front?

Look at the budget—the financial plan of this Nation—which has been presented to us by the President.

In a time of war, particularly one which comes when the economy is booming, when shortages are appearing, when the demand for manpower is intensifying, a nation needs to adopt a budget of restraint. It needs to adopt a budget which says, "Let's proceed with caution; there is possible trouble ahead." It should shun like the plague an expansionary budget in an already greatly expanded economy, lest it supply those last few breaths of air which cause the balloon finally to burst.

Yet, how would you characterize a budget which proposes that this Nation not only

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

undertake all its normal expenditures while paying the heavy costs of the war, but proposes to increase domestic spending for new programs just enacted and, on top of everything else, proposes new programs which will cost still more money?

This is not a war budget: it is the kind of budget you would propose if you wanted to stimulate a depressed economy in peacetime. It is potentially a very dangerous budget: it can bring on economic dislocations, miserable in themselves, but exceedingly harmful to any war effort.

This is a budget which proposes to spend the fantastic amount of $112.8 billion in 1 year—more than this Nation has ever spent in any other year, including the World War II years. But that amount understates actual spending; $6 billion from the sale of assets has been used to reduce the spending estimate; actual expenditures will be almost $119 billion and will be kept that low if, and it's a big if, Congress is able and willing to go along with a great number of phony cuts in the budget.

There has been a $37 billion a year increase in the level of spending since 1961 and don't think this has been all because of the war. Only a third of that increase can be attributed to Vietnam.

While the administration was trying last year to convince Hanoi of our seriousness in Vietnam, the administration was prodding the last session of Congress to turn out the largest program of domestic spending this Nation has ever seen. It is difficult to blame anyone for thinking that this Nation was more concerned with its domestic affairs than with fighting a serious war.

As a result of that program enacted last year, as the result of continuing large-scale appropriations for new programs, look at what our people, our fighting men, and our enemy can read in the newspapers. Here are three items I came across within the last few days.

Remember we are a nation at war—an extremely costly war.

Item No. 1. From the Washington Evening Star. "Washington is receiving a Federal beautification grant of $483,000 for landscaping around buildings. Other cities who are receiving grants are Pittsburgh which will get about $465,000 and New Haven, about $325,000."

Item No. 2. From the newsletter of the National Education Association. "The U.S. Office of Education is concerned lest some of the nearly $1 billion Congress made available under title I of the (education) act go down the drain because local school districts haven't yet figured out how to use it properly."

Item No. 3. From the Washington Daily News. "The Baltimore Health Department has requested a Federal grant of $300,000 to conduct an antismoking campaign—in the fifth grade of the city's public schools."

Does this sound like an administration which has decided to make the hard decisions required by the kind of war in which the Nation is engaged?

We did not act like a nation at war in 1964, nor in 1965, nor are we doing so today and as a consequence, the war drags on. We apparently will not act like a nation seriously at war during fiscal 1967—if we are to enjoy all of the luxuries which we will lavish on ourselves under the President's budget.

What about the period beyond that? After all, we are told we will be heavily engaged for a long time in Vietnam—some high officials even talk about a generation of conflict.

But, Hanoi and Peiping, if they look at the budget closely, will conclude that we must be planning to get out, because we will be in a frightful fiscal situation if the heavy costs of the war continue into the next fiscal period. That is so because this budget is being financed with future revenues. We are selling assets; we are taking advantage of windfalls; we are speeding up tax collections to reduce this year's deficit. There will come a time, and soon, when those wells will run dry, and then we will either have colossal deficits, or colossal tax increases, or both, plus Federal controls, if the war continues. A nation which has made a decision to fight a bitter war to a successful conclusion would not dare take such a grave risk.

Abraham Lincoln, to preserve the Union, and in defense of freedom, summoned up the entire energies of the Nation to fight a brutal war, brother against brother. "The man," he said, "does not live who is more devoted to peace than I am, none who would do more to preserve it, but it may be necessary to put the foot down firmly."

I think America is now waiting for the foot to be put down firmly. It is waiting for the national decision which sooner or later must be made. It is waiting for a decision, not to prolong a bitter war, but to shorten and end it; it is waiting for a decision which, in the long run, will enable us to prevent a major war which would set the world aflame.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Tablet of Thursday, February 10, 1966, and the Bridgeport Post of Monday, February 14, 1966:

[From the Brooklyn (N.Y.) Tablet, Feb. 10, 1966]

JAMES FARLEY RINGS THE BELL

(By Patrick F. Scanlan)

We have read many articles and speeches and have witnessed considerable debates and lectures on the situation in Vietnam, but no speaker has said as much as James A Farley in an address he delivered in Dubuque, Iowa, last week. Mr. Farley speaking:

"President Johnson did not adopt a war policy. He had war thrust upon him. Our position in South Vietnam is not like a Normandy beachhead. It is more like a Dunkirk. The President is in the same position as Winston Churchill in 1940. He is a receiver in bankruptcy of the policy of appeasement. Appeasement has brought our affairs in Asia to this sad state. Continued appeasement will not only lose Vietnam, it will lose us our Asiatic allies and greatly impair our Atlantic Alliance.

"The President, like Churchill, can only offer us blood, sweat and tears; but if we attempt to run away, the pressure will increase every time. The fact is that had the policy of the President been adopted in 1946, instead of 1966, there would be peace in the Pacific right now."

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post, Feb. 14, 1966]

POLICY OF APPEASEMENT

Former Postmaster General James A. Farley has voiced an interesting view on the war in Vietnam. Speaking at a dinner in Dubuque, Iowa, the onetime National Democratic chairman said:

"President Johnson did not adopt a war policy. He had war thrust upon him. Our position in South Vietnam is not like a Normandy beachhead. It is more like a Dunkirk. The President is in the same position as Winston Churchill in 1940. He is a receiver in bankruptcy of the policy of appeasement. Appeasement has brought our affairs in Asia to this sad state. Continued appeasement will not only lose Vietnam, it will lose us our Asiatic allies and greatly impair our Atlantic Alliance.

"The President, like Churchill, can only offer us blood, sweat, and tears; but if we attempt to run away the pressure will increase every time. The fact is that had the policy of the President been adopted in 1946, instead of 1966, there would be peace in the Pacific right now."

Statements like this are making the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur a greater man all the time.

Protection for Americans in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note in a recent issue of the Washington Post, an editorial devoted to the late Newcomb Mott, of Sheffield, Mass., and to the events and circumstances of his tragic and shocking death in Soviet Russia.

The editorial stresses a point I have made consistently throughout the now famous Mott case. It was a point I made at the time of his trial and sentencing last fall, and again when the news of his death came as such a blow to the free world.

That point is, of course, that we must take every step in an effort to prevent such a thing ever happening again. I made the point, and I continue to believe, that an improved consular treaty with the Soviets would provide both nations with the means to avoid an irrevocable action, to expedite notification procedures, and to permit certain steps to be taken on behalf of the individual involved before the inexorable machinery of the Soviet Government is set in motion.

I have speculated in the past that Newcomb Mott might be alive and free today if such a treaty had been in force last summer when young Mott was arrested for illegally crossing the Red border. I happen to believe this very strongly, although it is hardly constructive to be able to say, "I told you so."

What is constructive, however, and what is vitally more important is that we take steps to prevent another Mott tragedy. We must take the initiative in providing safeguards for Americans traveling not only in Russia but anywhere behind the Iron Curtain where the fingers of the secret police can reach with impunity.

We who have been closest to the Mott case, the Massachusetts congressional delegation, have repeatedly called for a full and complete investigation of the circumstances of young Mott's death. Since this implies full cooperation of the Soviets, however, it is unlikely that we will ever really know the truth.

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Nevertheless, we have insisted that the State Department exploit every possible means to learn the truth. We have called upon the administration to act in this regard.

The consular treaty is quite another matter, of course, and, as I have said, it is a far more important matter. Here the burden of action is upon us, upon the legislative branch rather than the executive. More specifically, it is upon the Senate.

The proposed Soviet-American Consular Treaty would hold the Soviet Union to reasonable standards in notifying the American Embassy of a U.S. citizen's detention. It would also permit access to him during the initial period of his detention, rather than only at the time of his trial as in the Mott case.

In spite of these and other important provisions which would work to the obvious advantage of all U.S. travelers in Russia or elsewhere in the Soviet orbit, the treaty has been bottled up in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It has been the victim of opposition from those who fear what the Soviets might have to gain, rather than optimism for what the United States might gain. It has been opposed by those who would safeguard American security by raising the Iron Curtain a little higher and making it more opaque. It has been opposed by those who would prefer to risk further sacrifice of men like Newcomb Mott than to concede that protection for Americans abroad can best be achieved through bilateral agreements. Their solution is to advise Americans to stay out of Soviet countries.

It is my hope that the Members of the other body will soon see the error in their judgment and will take action on this vitally important instrument. I would remind them that by turning their backs on this treaty they are serving only the forces of hatred, prejudice, and international tension and misunderstanding which, more than anything else, were the direct causes of Newcomb Mott's ordeal.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial which I have already mentioned contains these and other points which I feel are worthy of attention by the Congress. I have unanimous consent that the editorial appear at this point in the RECORD:

EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

The erratic performance of the Soviet Government, in the Mott case and others, gives the State Department no choice but to warn American tourists of the hazards they may encounter in Russia. Ordinarily the Department would have no business intervening in a citizen's plans to visit a country with which diplomatic relations are maintained. It would be derelict, however, not to warn that tourists who inadvertently run afoul of Russian laws may be treated with undue harshness for political reasons.

If the warning costs Moscow some American tourist dollars, then the Russians are lucky because they have it entirely within their power to resume fair treatment of tourists and render the warning obsolete. Doubtless this will be a matter for intense private discussion between Intourist, the official travel agency, and the KGB, the secret police. Almost certainly the Mott case and others like it are the work of the KGB.

Lest one forget, an effective partial recourse is available in the Soviet-American consular treaty, which has yet to be ratified. It would hold Soviet authorities to reasonable standards in notifying the American Embassy of an American's detention and in permitting access to him. It would thereby remove much of the arbitrariness from the Soviet handling of American prisoners and much of the grounds for apprehension from Americans contemplating travel in Russia.

The consular treaty remains lodged in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee largely because its opponents conjured up the specter of a threat to American security. The tragic death of Newcomb Mott, while a Soviet prisoner, should make clear the advantages of protection to Americans which the treaty would provide.

Stay in and Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the administration's firm but cautious stand in Vietnam was given backing by the newspapermen in Colorado.

The Denver Post reports:

Ten Colorado newspapermen interviewed by this paper unanimously agreed the United States shouldn't get out of Vietnam. The editors and publishers declared to the last man that America was in the fight to win, and shouldn't pull out.

Because many of my colleagues will be interested in this survey taken at the 88th annual convention of the Colorado Press Association, I am making the article available for the RECORD, where it may be read in its entirety:

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, Feb. 18, 1966]

STAY IN AND WIN—TEN EDITORS AGREE ON VIET ISSUE

(By Donna Logan)

Ten Colorado newspapermen interviewed Friday by the Denver Post unanimously agreed the United States shouldn't get out of Vietnam.

The editors and publishers declared to the last man that America was in the fight to win, and shouldn't pull out.

They were questioned at the Brown Palace Hotel where newspaper executives from throughout the State are attending the 88th annual convention of the Colorado Press Association.

The editors were asked: "Should the United States get out of Vietnam?" Their answers:

Fred Pottorf, editor and publisher, Holly Chieftain, Holly, Colo.: "No. We ought to strengthen our position in southeast Asia as well as strengthen the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO). We should stay over there and destroy their supply routes and win the war."

Dick Hilker, editor, Jefferson Sentinel, Lakewood: "No, I don't think we should get out. We might as well fight there as someplace else, even though Vietnam may not be the easiest place to defend. We've made a commitment there and we might as well keep it."

R. W. Cook, Meeker Herald, Meeker, Colo.: "I'd say not. I think the Government is pursuing the correct course and they have all the facts and know what they're doing. I think it's the right thing."

Dewey Brown, publisher, Montezuma Valley Journal and Cortez Sentinel, Cortez, Colo: "No, I don't think so. A year ago I thought the United States was playing footsie in Vietnam, but I don't think so now and I think we should continue our efforts there. It isn't just a matter of saving face. We're too far committed to get out now."

Preston Walker, editor, Grand Junction Daily Sentinel, Grand Junction, Colo.: "No, I agree with the President's position and I think if we get into a fight we ought to stay in it until we win. The pacifists and demonstrators here are weakening our position. I'm with the President in supporting our policy there."

Fred Betz, Jr., copublisher, Tri-State Daily News, Lamar, Colo.: "No. I think we are committed there. We should push for investigation and discussion of the war in the United Nations—that's the best answer. But until then I think a harder effort on our part is needed. I'm sorry the issue didn't get before the U.N. sooner."

Chuck Leckenby, editor, Steamboat Springs Pilot, Steamboat Springs, Colo.: "I don't think we should have gotten involved in the first place, but now that we're there we would lose prestige by getting out. We should negotiate for a cease-fire and try to develop the country economically because the longer there's fighting the worse it will be on the country."

Chuck Stoddard, editor, Craig Empire Courier, Craig, Colo.: "No. We ought to work even harder on their supply lines and blockade the Communists. We can't win the war in the jungle without losing thousands of American lives, so I think we should concentrate on knocking out their supply routes."

F. G. (Doc) Kirby, editor, Alamosa Valley Courier, Alamosa, Colo.: "No. It's a matter of principle and a matter of stopping communism. We would suffer a loss of prestige if we got out now. We're pledged to defend the people there and that's what we should do."

Joe Payton, editor and publisher, Wet Mountain Tribune, Westcliffe, Colo.: "No. We shouldn't get out until we win. Absolutely."

Allegiance Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, February 22 was Allegiance Day in my home State, South Carolina. I am advised that the people of my State responded in tremendous numbers to the Allegiance Day celebrations conducted in every county seat in South Carolina. I believe this date was chosen appropriately, since on that date we also observe the birthday of our first President, George Washington.

In stressing this occasion in South Carolina we wish to publicly proclaim our feeling of confidence in the policy of the administration to assist Vietnam, or any other Communist-threatened nation. The ultimate question to be resolved is whether or not the United States will deter Communist aggression, infiltration, and domination of Vietnam, or possibly, the entire area of southeast Asia. I believe the United States has chosen wisely in its determination to

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

of the executive departments and—in fact—the commissioned officers of the armed services.

The Senate agrees, for the Senate has passed a bill to the effect but the matter has been stalled in the House and is bottled up in the House Judiciary Committee.

That bill should be called out of committee, taken to the floor of the House and approved.

It is conceivable that some future Attorney General could appoint—as Director of the FBI—a man who might not share Edgar Hoover's concern about communism.

If that should happen, and the FBI should fall heir to the same, careless kind of security that has marked the State Department, then, indeed, the security of this Nation would be in peril.

Think about it.

Criticism of British Shipping to North Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken many times about the free world ships entering the port of Haiphong. I have placed in the RECORD the statistics on this shipping.

My good friend, Bo CALLAWAY, in a speech before the Atlanta Rotary Club, quoted these figures and "incurred the wrath" of the British Consul General.

I place in the RECORD an article from the February 15, 1966, Atlanta Constitution and a copy of a letter Congressman CALLAWAY wrote the Consul General. I agree wholeheartedly with Bo CALLAWAY.

The material follows:

BRITISH CONSUL CRITICIZES CALLAWAY'S TRADE BLAST

Criticism of British shipping to North Vietnam by Representative HOWARD (Bo) CALLAWAY touched off an exchange between the Congressman and British Consul General Thomas Sharman Monday.

In a speech before the Atlanta Rotary Club, CALLAWAY said the United States must blockade the port of Haiphong to end the war and criticized Washington's refusal to ask our allies to stop commercial shipping to North Vietnam.

Then he said most of the ships entering Haiphong are British and added, "We're not even getting our British allies to stop shipping. How can we back our troops?"

After his talk, Consul Sharman was among members of the audience who gathered around to talk to CALLAWAY. When the two came together, Sharman began gesturing and seemed to speak in angry tones.

He ended the conversation with a brisk, "Good day, sir," and walked quickly from the room.

Later he said in a prepared statement that he had told Representative CALLAWAY that he thought his comments had given an "unfair and unbalanced impression" of the actual situation in Vietnam shipping.

CALLAWAY had said "that in 1964, some 400 free ships, mostly British, entered the Haiphong port, and in 1965 there were 200, again mostly British."

In his statement, Sharman said:

"I told Mr. CALLAWAY at the end of the meeting that I thought he had given an unfair and unbalanced impression in speaking only of free world shipping, mainly British, carrying materials into Haiphong and in not having mentioned the giant Russian planes delivering supplies to the North Vietnam Government. Such British shipping as goes into Haiphong does not carry strategic materials."

Sharman quoted a statement by Secretary of State Dean Rusk saying he was not aware of any munitions supplied by the British by ship to the Vietcong and citing drastic reductions in free world shipping to North Vietnam.

ONLY $500,000

Exports and imports together between the United Kingdom and North Vietnam last year came to only half a million dollars, the Atlanta-based consul general added.

CALLAWAY said he stood by his speech.

Speaking to newsmen on other topics, CALLAWAY predicted a 2-percent increase in corporate taxes and an increase in personal income taxes from the administration.

Mr. THOMAS SHARMAN,
Consul General, the British Consulate, Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR MR. SHARMAN: I sincerely regret that your abrupt departure on Monday at the Atlanta Rotary prevented our discussing further the matter of allied shipping to North Vietnam.

From what you said to me, and your followup statement to the press, I understand your position to be that British shipping to North Vietnam is nonstrategic; that it has been substantially reduced; and, that my criticism of British shipping without mentioning Russian aircraft deliveries gave an unfair impression of the situation.

Mr. Sharman, I find your position utterly indefensible, for the obvious reason that any nation—and especially a nation at war—expects more from its allies than it does from its enemies. I am totally at a loss to understand why Britain, as a long-standing friend, would insist that its actions be judged identically to the actions of a long-standing and present enemy. To do so, I feel, would insult our friendship, and therefore, I choose not to make such a comparison. Instead, my colleagues and I ask Britain to let its actions stand on their own merits or demerits, and to answer to them in that light.

Certainly we feel that British shipping to North Vietnam is entirely unjustified, if for no other reason than that free world shipping of nonstrategic goods frees Communist shippers to carry the instruments of war. But more important than this is the principle involved: that as long as our enemy is engaged in a war effort against America and American men, we cannot condone our friends supplying even so much as a spool of thread to that effort. I do not find our position unreasonable, but I would never have believed that we would have to express it to a friend of such long standing, and worse, that it would be rebuffed.

My colleagues in the Congress and I have and shall continue to press for a cessation of free world shipping to our enemy, and I can promise you that our exchange has only added to my determination that this be done.

Sincerely,

HOWARD H. CALLAWAY.

Residence of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include statistics prepared by the Office of the Veterans' Administration Controller on the State of residence of veterans at the time of separation as of December 31, 1965:

State of residence at separation from the Armed Forces[1] of estimated number of cold war veterans[2] in civil life, Dec. 31, 1965

(In thousands)

State of residence at separation [1]	Number
Total	3,825
United States	3,780
Alabama	61
Alaska	4
Arizona	29
Arkansas	36
California	328
Colorado	41
Connecticut	51
Delaware	10
District of Columbia	16
Florida	96
Georgia	72
Hawaii	15
Idaho	18
Illinois	206
Indiana	101
Iowa	60
Kansas	41
Kentucky	70
Louisiana	66
Maine	27
Maryland	62
Massachusetts	106
Michigan	177
Minnesota	80
Mississippi	36
Missouri	92
Montana	14
Nebraska	32
Nevada	8
New Hampshire	15
New Jersey	116
New Mexico	22
New York	320
North Carolina	85
North Dakota	18
Ohio	202
Oklahoma	56
Oregon	46
Pennsylvania	261
Rhode Island	17
South Carolina	44
South Dakota	14
Tennessee	78
Texas	198
Utah	18
Vermont	9
Virginia	77
Washington	69
West Virginia	58
Wisconsin	95
Wyoming	7
Outside United States	45

[1] Based on "permanent address after discharge" as recorded at time of separation on DD Form 214: Armed Forces of the United States Report of Transfer or Discharge. State estimates are based on a randomly selected 1-percent sample of these reports.

[2] Persons who served in the Armed Forces only after Jan. 31, 1955. Excludes men who served under the 6-month Reserve training program.

Taylor-Made Bridge Falls Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, Joseph C. Harsch has written a penetrating analysis of the current Washington scene in a recent article of the Christian Science Monitor. There is much logic and credibility in his statement:

TAYLOR-MADE BRIDGE FALLS SHORT

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson has attempted to bridge the gap between himself

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

and the Vietnam war rebels in his own party. He sent highly respected Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor to the witness stand of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to tell the rebels that the purpose, the means, and the weapons in the war are all strictly "limited."

At the end of 6½ hours of ordeal for the general, the Senate rebels were not convinced that the gap was not closed.

LIMITS QUESTIONED

Then it was Dean Rusk's turn. As the Johnson administration's chief foreign-policy spokesman, the Secretary of State pointed out that American policy in Vietnam has been repeatedly reaffirmed by Presidents and by Congress. He also referred to the solemn obligations of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization treaty as the legal basis for the U.S. commitment in Vietnam.

Mr. Rusk then invited Congress to vote again on Vietnam war policy "if there is any doubt about it," and contended that the whole structure of world peace was at stake in Vietnam. These two statements drew fire respectively from Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon and Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, the committee chairman. Senator FULBRIGHT contended the Vietnam conflict does not involve the vital interests of the United States but might nonetheless become "a trigger for world war."

The rebellion in the President's party is precisely over the issue of how limited the Vietnam war is intended to be. Among his critics, the suspicion is lively that the American involvement is "open ended" and could eventually "escalate" into a major war with Communist China and conceivably even a world war involving the Soviet Union.

General Taylor's assignment had been to end the rebellion by satisfying the desire for reassurance about the plans and purposes of the White House. According to the general, the strategic purpose is limited because it consists solely of applying just enough military force to North Vietnam to cause it to desist from its aggression in South Vietnam.

But he was unable to be precise about the amount of force which would be necessary to achieve this purpose. Would it be 600,000 men against the present 200,000? The general agreed that there probably would be some increase in the number of American troops sent to Vietnam, but could not say what the limit might be.

CONGRESS NOT SATISFIED

The weapons used are limited, according to the general, because of U.S. unwillingness to employ nuclear weapons.

The geographic area of the war is limited because bombing outside of South Vietnam is confined to strictly military targets in North Vietnam.

But all this failed to quench the rebellion because it identifies limits presently put upon the policy but fails to provide assurance against the lifiting of limits to higher ones at another time.

The Congress is left at the end of the second week of the hearings still unhappy about the course of the Vietnam war and in a state of unsettled friction with the White House.

The President is left in the position of many a general in the past who found himself reluctantly involved in a battle at a time and place not of his own choosing.

PERSONAL ISSUE AT BASE?

How it all started is a matter for some future historian to sort out in detail. Existing information would suggest, at least superficially, that a simple personal issue between the President and Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT provided the original spark.

The Senator wrote a report on the intervention in the Dominican Republic which was highly critical of the administration. The President countered by cutting the Senator off the White House guest list. The feud was on.

Everything since has seemed to make it worse. Slighting remarks the President is alleged to have made about the Senator, and others, in private conversations have been reported back. The Honolulu trip may or may not have been intended to take headlines away from the Senate hearings, but Senator FULBRIGHT and his colleagues believed that it did.

DEPRESSION CLIMATE RECALLED

It has become one of those issues which will go down in history. It has altered the President's relations with the Congress sharply, and perhaps permanently. The air in Washington is different. For veterans with long memories there is a similarity to the mood of Washington in the days just after the great depression of 1929 broke. Herbert Hoover the great engineer, suddenly became a highly vulnerable political target.

Today, as in the last part of the Hoover administration, many a member of the President's party is wondering whether the Vietnam war may not turn out to be as bad for Democrats in 1966, and conceivably 1968, as the depression was bad for Republicans from 1932 down to World War II.

As for the outside world, it is left in a state of necessary uncertainty about the future course of American policy. The President has made one concession to his critics. He has had General Taylor declare that policy and purpose are all strictly "limited." But there is still no official proof that today's limits will not be raised tomorrow, or the day after.

Democracy—What It Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, the winner of the VFW Voice of Democracy contest from the State of Maine is a constituent of mine, Miss Diane Louise LeBlond, a student at St. Joseph High School in Biddeford, Maine. Her essay "Democracy—What It Means to Me," is a moving statement from a concerned young American and I make her remarks a part of the RECORD so that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read them:

"DEMOCRACY—WHAT IT MEANS TO ME"

(By Diane Louise LeBlond, St. Joseph High School, Biddeford, Maine.)

"To some generations, much is given; of some generations, much is expected." These words were uttered by Franklin Delano Roosevelt at the 1936 National Democratic Convention. But where do we, the teenage population of America 1965 fit in? What is our role in the march of democracy today?

Certainly no other generation has been blessed with the same opportunities we have. A greater percentage of young people is attending college now than ever before and the number is increasing steadily every year. New and interesting careers are being opened to our generation because of the immense strides the United States has made in scientific fields in recent years. We hold the rights our forebears struggled for so many years to assure us. Above all, we live in a democracy—the most powerful, respected democracy on the face of the earth. All of this has been handed to us on a silver platter, and, consequently, we too often take these gifts for granted.

We are very quick to claim all of these privileges and very voluble indeed in our protests whenever we feel our rights are being encroached upon. But I fear that too many among us would be very surprised and even offended if told that our rights are accompanied by duties and that unless these duties are discharged, we have no rights at all.

What, then, is expected of us as the civic, social, and moral leaders of a tomorrow that looms large and near? These great expectations can be summed up in two words—education and involvement.

We owe it to ourselves and to our country's future to obtain the finest and most complete education we possibly can. To be a completely educated individual means to be a moral, tolerant human being. One is not tolerant who refuses to share a lunch counter, or a bus, or even a drinking fountain with a person whose skin color merely happens to differ from his own. One is not moral who would allow a fellow human being to be harmed, even killed in his presence without even taking the trouble to call the police. One cannot call himself educated who does not develop an interest in current events, who does not bother to form sound opinions concerning current issues. And one is not educated who is a follower of the crowd, unconvinced of its principles but never daring to be different, never attempting to stand up and be counted according to his real beliefs.

Once we are well educated concerning the facts and the issues, we are ready for the second step—involvement. We are ready to act as teenagers all over the country are acting, crusading for worthwhile causes. Teenagers are crusading for civil rights. They are supporting their chosen political parties, joining Teenage Republicans, Teen Dems, organizing get-out-the-vote drives, alerting their elders to the issues, to the candidates and to the importance of informed, intelligent voting. They are doing volunteer work with orphans, with dropouts, with retarded children. All over the country, teens are our strongest Peace Corps boosters, our most militant war-on-poverty workers.

They are today's responsible, dedicated teenage generation laying a solid foundation, striving to become tomorrow's better educated, moral, tolerant, and democratic society. They are realizing that with every right comes a duty. Moreover, they are coming to see that the satisfaction derived from performing these duties is so great as to be its own reward. They are summoning each and every one of us to carry the torch that has been passed to a new generation—our generation. And it is only when we become illuminated with this fire of devotion to our country and to our fellow man that we will come to know the true meaning of democracy.

Resolution of Lithuanian-American Council, Lake County, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 20, 1966, the Lithuanian-American Council of Lake County, Ind., held a mass meeting and banquet commemorating the anniversary of the declaration

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

telligencer written by Don Page, entitled "Puget Sound: What It Is," who analyzes this great area where I come from.

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

PUGET SOUND: WHAT IT IS

(By Don Page)

We're back on the beat after a month or more with the savants and titans of the underwater world, finding out about Puget Sound's impressive stake in oceanography. We hope you're reading the series that resulted. The writing may not be any great shucks, but the things we talk about there are exciting.

One thing you won't read in the oceanography series but one that impressed us is a general summary of Puget Sound. It's taken from a UW survey of more than a decade ago. The language is technical in places, but the information is solid.

We got it from Dr. Richard Fleming, of the UW Oceanographic Department. We're passing excerpts of it along to you here. It's basic information. We think you'll find it interesting. Here it is:

"Puget Sound includes the inland waterways extending southward into the State of Washington from the eastern end of the Strait of Juan de Fuca. These channels, sounds, and inelts are long and narrow and occupy a basin roughly 90 miles north and south, 40 miles east and west. Mountain ranges surround three-quarters of the area. The water area at mean higher high water is 767 square nautical miles."

Going on to more technical descriptions of shapes and bottoms, the summary tells how glaciers formed the Puget Sound Basin:

"Glacier-borne sedimentary materials deposited in a basin between the Olympic Mountains and the Cascade Mountains during the early part of the Pleistocene epoch were deeply entrenched by stream and glacial action in the latter part of the Pleistocene. The resulting steep-sided valleys, one of which had not been subsequently filled with sedimentary debris, now forms Puget Sound.

"The mainland and island coastlines are irregular and backed by cliffs. The beaches are narrow and confined to embayments, except for tidal flats on the river deltas.

"Submerged shallow shelves are extremely narrow or entirely lacking, and in most areas the sea bottom slopes steeply to depths of 300 to 600 feet.

"The greatest depth of 930 feet is located just north of Seattle. Puget Sound contains several elongated basins that are partially separated from the Strait of Juan de Fuca and from each other by shallow ridges or sills, such as those located in Admiralty Inlet, Tacoma Narrows, and the entrance to Hood Canal, where the depths range from 150 to 200 feet.

"Material on the sea floor varies from rock outcrops through boulders and cobbles in areas of strong tidal currents, to sand and mud on the slopes. In some areas firm clay and compact glacia till are exposed on the slopes. The bottoms of the deeper portions of the basins are covered with soft mud.

"The tides in Puget Sound are of the mixed type showing a large daily inequality between the heights of succeeding low tides. The average daily range at Seattle is 11.3 feet.

"The maximum range of spring tides rarely exceeds 16 feet. There is a general increase in range as the tide progresses from the Strait of Juan de Fuca to the heads of the inlets, with a delay in time of high water of about 1 hour.

"Due to the large area of Puget Sound and its narrow entrances, tidal currents have exceptionally strong tropic velocities, attaining 4.7 knots in Admiralty Inlet, 5.1 knots in Tacoma Narrows and 7.2 knots in Deception Pass. Elsewhere in Puget Sound the tidal currents are generally less than 1 knot.

"Water temperatures in Puget Sound are relatively uniform throughout the year. Because of the mixing produced by the tidal currents, surface temperatures rarely fall below 44 degrees even in winter, except in the headwaters of Puget Sound where the accumulation of cold river waters and relatively quiet conditions will permit the formation of ice during extreme cold weather.

"The same mixing processes tend to maintain relatively low surface temperatures during the summer, and except in shallow and isolated areas surface temperatures above 60 degrees are rare."

The summary goes on to tell how such streams as the Skagit, Stillaquamish and Snohomish spill an average of 40,000 cubic feet of fresh water per second into the sound. The spillage varies from 14,000 to 37,000 cubic feet per second according to the season. But its busy tides and current keep the sound's salinity level relatively high.

That's Puget Sound as it looks to the scientists. We hope you enjoyed this profile of an old friend and either learned a few new facts about it or were reminded of some you'd forgotten.

UN

Is Confusion a U.S. Secret Weapon?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it is most interesting that Carl T. Rowan, formerly on the White House staff under President Johnson, should now write a column about the confusion existing in the policies of this administration. In his column, published in the Washington Star on Friday, February 25, he asks the question "Is Confusion a U.S. Secret Weapon?" Certainly no writer has a more intimate knowledge of the White House policymaking machinery than has Mr. Rowan. His column follows:

IS CONFUSION A U.S. SECRET WEAPON?

(By Carl T. Rowan)

In 1928, the Italian dictator, Benito Mussolini, made this caustic comment about American Government:

"Democracy is talking itself to death. The people do not know what they want; they do not know what is best for them. There is too much foolishness, too much lost motion. I have stopped the talk and the nonsense. I am a man of action. Democracy is beautiful in theory; in practice it is a fallacy. You in America will see that some day."

Dictator Mussolini is dead and American democracy probably never was more alive—yet the dictator's warning seems particularly pertinent these days.

The country may not be talking itself to death insofar as the Vietnam war is concerned but it sure has talked up so much confusion that the American people do not know what they want or what is best for them.

I left government 5 months ago thinking I knew what U.S. policy in Vietnam was. Today I haven't the remotest idea.

Lt. Gen. James Gavin went before a congressional committee to urge an "enclave" theory that administration spokesmen already had assailed for days.

The President then was quoted as saying that Gavin was more or less in agreement with his policies.

ROBERT F. KENNEDY, in what almost everyone interpreted as a major break with the administration, urged that the Communist Vietcong be offered a share in a coalition government in South Vietnam.

The displeasure of the Johnson administration seems emphasized by the speed with which the Kennedy proposal was denounced by Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, Under Secretary of State George Ball and McGeorge Bundy, the President's special assistant for national security affairs.

Then up pops a story quoting Gen. Maxwell Taylor as saying that KENNEDY's views are "very, very close" to his own and to those of the administration.

Taylor is former Ambassador to Saigon, presently a key adviser to the President and the man Johnson counted on to defend the administration against attacks from Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT and other members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

During the committee hearings, Taylor and FULBRIGHT seemed to have diametrically opposed views on Vietnam. Well, wonder of wonders. The New York Times of February 22 has a page 1 headline saying ,"FULBRIGHT Backs KENNEDY on Role for the Vietcong" and the New York Herald Tribune has a page 1 headline saying, "Taylor Siding With KENNEDY on Viet Plan."

A White House spokesman first told me that Taylor's remarks had been misconstrued. Newsmen later quoted Taylor as saying that KENNEDY's remarks had been misconstrued.

So KENNEDY's staff and White House officials spent the better part of the day explaining that KENNEDY didn't mean exactly what he originally said; and if he didn't advocate what the White House thought he advocated, well, KENNEDY wasn't in as big a quarrel with the White House as anybody thought.

But this is only a fraction of the confusion, the contradictions, the ambivalence that permeates the American scene.

The President launches a high-powered "peace offensive." His emissaries roam the world and his Secretary of State says he would "be in Geneva tomorrow if I thought there would be anyone there to talk to."

But a few days later a militant President speaks scornfully of "special pleaders who counsel retreat in Vietnam," calling them "a group that has always been blind to experience and deaf to hope."

The Vice President is sent abroad on a moment's notice, purportedly to light a fire under those engaged in the civilian side of the struggle, those trying to build a "great society" in southeast Asia. But the journey draws to a close with talk of more troops from Korea, of fighting men from the Philippines and remarks giving the impression that we expect to fight our way out of our Asian dilemma.

Maybe all this doesn't add up to the "foolishness," the "lost motion," that Mussolini spoke of. Maybe it's supposed to be confusing.

Maybe time will prove that it's all a new dimension of psychological warfare in which we get Hanoi, Peiping, the Soviet Union, and our allies so confused that everybody gives up.

Freedom Foundation Award to Dr. James W. Turpin, of Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on the anniversary of Washington's birthday

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

this year, the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., made seven special awards for "Freedom Leadership," and one of the individuals cited was Dr. James W. Turpin, of Ashland, Ky.

I call attention to his citation for "courageous and compassionate answer to the challenges of the time" through his organization Project Concern, Inc. Originally, Dr. Turpin's project had the objective of helping Chinese refugees in Hong Kong and it has grown to aiding mountain tribesmen under siege in South Vietnam.

Dr. Turpin's efforts have resulted in the creation of hospitals, clinics and self-help medical training programs in South Vietnam to which he has given unselfishly of his time and work after leaving his own private medical practice.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for today an article from the February 22, 1966, edition of the Ashland Daily Independent, published in Dr. Turpin's hometown, as well as an article from the Lexington Leader of that day, and I call attention to this outstanding work and to the other Kentuckians cited by the Freedoms Foundation this year.

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

[From the Ashland (Ky.) Daily Independent, Feb. 22, 1966]

FREEDOM LEADERSHIP MEDAL AWARDED DR. JAMES TURPIN

Dr. James W. Turpin, a native of Ashland, today was awarded the "Freedom Leadership Medal" by the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa.

The award was one of seven special awards made to six individuals and one city.

The U.S. Armed Forces and Department of Defense were given the coveted "George Washington Award," the foundation's highest.

Dr. Turpin, of Coronado, Calif., won the award for his work in establishing, through Project Concern, Inc., the medical mission clinics in South Vietnam.

The citation read:

"For his courageous and compassionate answer to the challenges of the time through 'Project Concern,' a voluntary medical mission to the people of Vietnam.

"For his indefatigable personal efforts in creating hospitals, clinics, and intensive self-help medical training programs in the jungles and villages, and his resourcefulness in the face of Communist aggression.

"For correlating the teaching of the ideas of freedom to the physical healing activities in the clinics.

"For his personification of America's spirit of concern for others through personal initiative, individual enterprise, and self-reliance."

Dr. Kenneth D. Wells, president of Freedoms Foundation, released a list of more than 1,200 awards to American organizations, schools, and individuals from all walks of life throughout the Nation who are being honored in the foundation's 17th annual national and school awards program for their contributions toward a better understanding and a greater appreciation of the American way of life.

Another "Freedom Leadership Medal" went to Army Capt. Roger H. C. Donlon, Fort Bragg, N.C., a Medal of Honor winner whose inspiration was the sight of the American flag flying on U.S. ships during daily trips to the beaches of South Vietnam—Old Glory cannot be flown in that nation.

Joseph A. Brunton, Jr., New Brunswick, N.J., chief executive of the Boy Scouts of America, received the "American Patriots Medal."

Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., New York City, won the "Free Enterprise Exemplar Medal"; he is a corporation executive.

The other four honors were "National Recognition Awards." Recipients were:

Marie Davis Hunt, Worcester, Mass., for leadership in the establishment of "The Isaac Davis Trail" as national memorial and the role she played in the observance of "Patriots Day" each April 19, to commemorate the first shot in the Revoluntionary War in 1775.

Mattie Coney, Indianapolis, Ind., for leadership in "Citizens Forum" a community organization teaching citizenship in inner-city neighborhoods.

Mail Call Viet Nam of Bryn Mawr, Pa., a letter writing campaign initiated by Dr. and Mrs. Ornsteen to boost the morale of servicemen.

Maj. Gen. H. Nickerson, Jr., USMC, Camp LeJeune, N.C., for starting instruction in citizenship so soldiers would realize the call to military duty did not lay aside the citizen.

For Dr. Turpin, son of Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Turpin of 2419 S. Belmont Street, who are in Valley Forge with their son, it was the second time in 2 years he had been honored nationally. The U.S. Jaycees named him one of the Nation's 10 outstanding young men.

Three years ago, Dr. Turpin left Coronado and a lucrative medical practice with his wife, four children, $6,000 and a dream.

The 38-year-old made his dream a reality by establishing Project Concern, a nonprofit organization incorporated in California.

He went to Hong Kong where he established a floating clinic to which thousands of harbor dwellers who live on sampans and junks flocked. More than 40,000 Chinese are superstitious that ill fate awaits them if they ever leave their floating homes.

About 500 are treated daily and 1,000 children are given subsistence rations to ward off disease and sickness. For most, it is their only meal.

Later, Dr. Turpin moved to Vietnam, set up an 18-bed hospital in the village of DaMpao in the Montagnard County 150 miles northeast of Saigon, and worked only a short distance from the Ho Chi Minh trail known as a Vietcong artery for moving men and supplies southward.

More than 100 doctors, nurses, and village medical officers trained by Dr. Turpin and his staff serve the Hong King and Vietnam clinics.

The dream is still alive and eager as the "need to be needed" continues. Dr. Turpin's next goals are clinics in the Vietnamese province of Phubon and into northern Thailand.

Twelve other individuals and groups from Kentucky were selected for 1965 Freedom Awards by the foundation. They include:

Beechmont School; Holy Rosary; Hugh Haynie, editorial cartoonist, the Courier-Journal, and Martin J. Robards, editor of the Louisville & Nashville magazine, all of Louisville.

Sp5c. Virgil T. Elam, U.S. Army, Belfry; Sp4c. Kenneth D. Proffitt, U.S. Army, London.

Pfc. John M. Kroll and Pfc. Melvin L. O'Neill, U.S. Army, and GMT-2 Douglas F. Synder, U.S. Navy, Ft. Campbell.

Sp5c. Robert D. Brown, Maj. Frances K. Smith, and 2d Lt. John A. Under, all U.S. Army, Ft. Knox.

Kentucky Court of Appeals Judge Morris C. Montgomery, Lawrenceburg, was one of the jurists to be recognized.

[From the Lexington (Ky.) Leader, Feb. 22, 1966]

KENTUCKIAN WINS TOP FREEDOM AWARD FOR MEDICAL AID TO SOUTHEAST ASIA

VALLEY FORGE, Pa.—A Kentuckian who quit a lucrative medical practice to establish medical-aid missions in southeast Asia was among 39 Americans named to receive the Freedom Foundation's highest awards today.

The award ceremonies are held annually on George Washington's birthday.

Dr. James W. Turpin, 38, of Ashland, Ky., organized "Project Concern, Inc." after leaving his California practice. Project Concern spread from its original objective of helping Chinese refugees in Hong Kong to aiding mountain tribesmen in South Vietnam.

The 39 awards are given for the recipients' contributions "toward a better understanding and a greater appreciation of the American way of life."

The foundation's highest single honor, the George Washington Award, was awarded to the Defense Department and U.S. military servicemen in Vietnam and around the world.

Twelve other individuals and groups from Kentucky were selected for 1965 Freedom Awards by the foundation. They include:

Beechmont School; Holy Rosary; Hugh Haynie, editorial cartoonist, the Courier-Journal, and Martin J. Robards, editor of the Louisville & Nashville magazine, all of Louisville.

Sp5c. Virgil T. Elam, U.S. Army, Belfry; Sp4c. Kenneth D. Proffitt, U.S. Army, London.

Pfc. John M. Kroll and Pfc. Melvin I. O'Neill, U.S. Army, and GMT-2 Douglas F. Snyder, U.S. Navy, Ft. Campbell.

Sp5c. Robert D. Brown, Maj. Frances K. Smith, and 2d Lt. John A. Under, all U.S. Army, Ft. Knox.

Kentucky Court of Appeals Judge Morris C. Montgomery, Lawrenceburg, was one of the jurists to be recognized.

The Congress and the FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the following "Editorial Of The Air," which was presented by Mr. William Freehoff on radio station WKPT in Kingsport, Tenn., discusses the legislation that would require the appointment of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation be made with the advice and consent of the Senate.

As the station's policy states, "We ask only that you think about it;" and therefore, I recommend this thoughtful presentation to my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD:

THE SENATE SHOULD HAVE A SAY

(By William Freehoff)

Within a few years, John Edgar Hoover will retire from active service with the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

A successor will have to be named and that—we suggest—is a matter of extreme importance to the security of this Nation.

No appointment will be of greater importance than that of a Director for the FBI—the only Federal agency the Communists have been unable to penetrate.

Yet, the choice of a Director is up to the Attorney General alone. The advice and consent of the Senate is not required.

It should be for the Director of the FBI has become a key position in our Government.

And, since the security of the Nation is involved in this matter, the Senate should have a hand in picking the Director as the Senate has a hand in the choice of the heads

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

"I thought she was going to cry," a woman said, after Mrs. Thomas went inside.

"Not on your life," her husband answered softly. "She wouldn't let that happend."

Now, the big cars began to arrive in a quick, sleek stream. The riders were Congressmen, Senators, military men, and other officials from Washington, D.C.

They arrived so quickly, the spectators on Clay Street were unable to recognize many faces. Hardly anyone saw Gov. John Connally go in, but the onlookers didn't miss Senators RALPH YARBOROUGH and JOHN TOWER riding together.

"How about that," an old man in a cowboy hat loudly exclaimed. "Never thought I'd see those two being so friendly."

No one replied to him, but some disapproving looks told him he was off base.

Finally, the word spread that the funeral service was underway, but the crowd outside stayed on. The sidewalk on Clay between Main and Travis was packed solid.

There was a lot of talk about Congressman Thomas, about how powerful he was in Washington, about how his office door was always open and about how he never failed to reply quickly to any man's letter.

One man told how Congressman Thomas always came to the Houston Post Office employees' annual picnics.

"And it didn't make any difference if he was running for office," he added. "He was always our friend. He never got so big he didn't want to rub elbows with working people."

Then, just before the service ended, and the long drive to the cemetery began, a bum—or maybe just a poor man—hobbled up on a crutch, surveyed the crowd and lines of limousines.

He let out a low, amazed whistle.

"Criminy, would you look at those cars. What's going on here, anyway?"

"Sshh," a lady in a red suit said, "You can see it's a funeral."

"Who died?" he asked, whispering quietly this time.

"Didn't you know? It's the Congressman—Albert Thomas."

[From the Houston Post, Feb. 19, 1966]

MRS. THOMAS URGED TO SEEK HUSBAND'S SEAT

A move is afoot to get Mrs. Albert Thomas to fill her husband's seat in Congress.

John McClelland, candidate for State representative, position 4 in the 22d legislative district, is a leader of the effort to petition Mrs. Thomas to run for the interim congressional term of her husband.

Thomas died Tuesday and was buried Friday.

"We hope to encourage and get Mrs. Thomas to run and get elected for the interim term ending January 1, 1967," McClelland said.

He said it was possible that Thomas' name on the May 7 Democratic primary ballot for a new term would receive a majority of the votes.

This would then make it possible for the county Democratic executive committee to select Mrs. Thomas as the Democratic nominee in the November general election, McClelland said.

Baytown chemist E. A. (Woody) Rose is the only person to file for the Republican nomination.

State Representative Bob Eckhardt and Larry McKaskle, a former aid to Mayor Louie Welch, filed for the Democratic nomination in the May Democratic primary along with Thomas.

Despite his death Thomas' name will be on the primary ballot since he had paid the full $3,000 filing fee.

Mrs. Thomas has made no comment concerning the move to get her to fill the vacancy caused by her husband's death.

McClelland said that "because of her 30 years in Washington with her husband she could pick up much more easily than anyone else the programs he initiated and was working on at the time of his death.

"This committee intends to not only work actively, along with other volunteers, in getting petitions signed, but also to campaign on Mrs. Thomas' behalf to get her elected if she heeds the desire of those who want her to run," McClelland said.

Governor Connally left for Laredo Friday with no indication he would call the special election to fill Thomas' unexpired 2-year term over the weekend.

Eckhardt and McKaskle have indicated they would be candidates in the special election. Others may also pay the $500 filing fee.

However, it was reported that McKaskle might change his mind and support Mrs. Thomas.

Asked about the report, McKaskle said, "I have no comment to make until I first talk with her.

"Mr. Thomas was a very good friend of mine. So is Mrs. Thomas."

Eckhardt declined comment on the possible candidacy of Mrs. Thomas and his own political plans in connection with the congressional vacancy.

There have been reports that one Texas Congressman has tried to get Eckhardt to pull out in favor of Mrs. Thomas.

"I have taken the position there ought to be at least a short political moratorium until after the (Thomas) funeral, and I don't think it appropriate to discuss the situation at this time," Eckhardt said.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Feb. 24, 1966]

A TRIBUTE

(By Maurine Parkhurst)

There have been so many splendid tributes to our late and beloved Congressman Albert Thomas, and our typewriter feels inadequate to compete with these, but our sincere affection and admiration has to thump itself into print, too.

"He was a friend of many"—this has been repeated over and over but he brought to each a deep personal feeling and sincerity. He was always kind because it was his nature, just as he was a gentleman because he could not have been otherwise.

We were respectful of his abilities and titles but these never got into the way of our warm affectionate relationship with him.

He and Lera were a magnificient team, with her dedication and service just as untiring and sincere. Her decision to further offer her services is the only light to come of this saddened dark. She has our wishes and affection—but then she has always known that.

HARRIS POLL SHOWS AMERICAN PEOPLE SUPPORT DOMESTIC PROGRAMS AND DO NOT THINK A WAR IN VIETNAM JUSTIFIED REDUCTION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, there has been much talk among many people that the American economy cannot continue to support our domestic programs in the face of our Vietnam expenditures and that there would have to be drastic cuts.

In his state of the Union message, President Lyndon B. Johnson stated:

I believe we can continue the Great Society while we fight in Vietnam.

When I returned to Congress this session I pledged to the people of Texas that I would support legislation that would insure that the great programs passed during the first session of the 89th Congress would be run effectively. I also expressed my faith in America's greatness that these programs could be implemented without having to cut them back.

To illustrate the opinion of the American people that the domestic programs should be continued, I ask unanimous consent that the Harris poll in the Washington Post of Monday, February 7, 1966, indicating that 72 percent of the public are convinced that the domestic program should not be reduced, and that education programs be supported first of all, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE HARRIS SURVEY—PUBLIC GENERALLY SEES NO REASON YET TO CHOOSE BETWEEN GUNS AND BUTTER

(By Louis Harris)

Although the American people tend to think Congress should slow down from its 1965 pace, 72 percent of the public is equally convinced that President Johnson's domestic program should not be reduced in the face of mounting commitments in Vietnam. The popular conviction seems to be that a Nation so rich and prosperous need not yet choose between guns and butter.

Conservatives who backed Barry Goldwater in 1964, southerners who have consistently resented Federal incursions into their way of life, even high-income groups who suspect recent tax cuts may be short lived are included among the solid majority opposed to reducing expenditures for key programs of the Great Society.

When pressed to name those Government programs which in case of necessity ought to be cut first, two prime candidates emerged; the space program and aid to cities. The untouchables, in the judgment of most, would be aid to college education and health assistance.

A cross section of the public was asked: "In general, because of Vietnam, do you think President Johnson should reduce the size of his programs at home, such as education, poverty, and health, or do you feel these programs should not be reduced?"

[In percent]

	Reduce	Don't reduce	Not sure
Nationwide	22	72	6
By politics:			
Voted Goldwater in 1964	41	50	9
Voted Johnson in 1964	12	84	4
By region:			
East	16	81	3
Midwest	24	69	7
South	28	64	8
West	24	69	7
By income:			
Under $5,000	18	75	7
$5,000 to $9,999	21	74	5
$10,000 and over	30	65	5

Time and again, people come back to their central view that domestic programs are important and essential and are high on the list of what our young men are fighting for. But if reductions are to be made, further questioning made clear, people are prepared to draw up their own list of priorities—both for cutting and for keeping.

The cross-section was asked:

"Which one of the following programs would you cut first, if one Government program had to be reduced?" and "Which one of the following programs would you cut last, if one of the Government's programs had to be reduced?"

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

[In percent]

	1st cut	Last cut
Space program	28	15
Aid to cities	24	6
Poverty program	20	21
Aid to farmers	11	7
Aid to college education	6	33
Aid to health care	5	15
Not sure	6	3

It is possible, of course, that Mr. Johnson's already expressed aim of providing both guns and butter will be realized in 1966. This is the clear hope of a large majority. But if reductions do become necessary, the President's treasured consensus may prove to be more difficult to achieve.

AWARD TO SENATOR ROBERTSON, OF VIRGINIA, OF THE GOOD CITIZENSHIP MEDAL OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a few days ago our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Virginia, was given an award he richly deserves.

Senator ROBERTSON was presented with the Good Citizenship Medal of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, which is its highest award. The presentation was made through the Virginia branch, of which the Senator is a member.

The certificate accompanying the gold medal points out:

> The society is dedicated to the patriotic purpose of perpetuating and inspiring the active practice and demonstration of those high ideals and principles which influenced and strengthened the founders of this Republic and upon which the future of our Nation depends.

Mr. President, the great Woodrow Wilson, proud of the fact that he was born in Virginia, once said:

> A man's rootage is more important than his fruitage.

The rootage of Senator ROBERTSON goes back to the first permanent settlement of Jamestown, Dr. John Woodson, who came to Jamestown with Governor Yardley in 1619. Senator ROBERTSON is a member of the Jamestown Society, made up of those whose ancestors lived in the Jamestown area prior to 1700. He belongs to the Virginia chapter of the Society of the Cincinnati, limited to those who had an ancestor serving for 3 years in the Revolutionary War. He holds membership in the Sons of the American Revolution, which is a much larger organization of descendants of Revolutionary ancestors, and of the Sons of the Confederacy, being a grandson of a Confederate officer who was killed in the Civil War.

In fact, Senator ROBERTSON's ancestors were in every war this country ever fought, and he served in the Army in World War I.

With this "rootage" it is not surprising that he has been a champion of patriotic citizenship, and student and defender of the ideals and principles upon which our Republic was founded. He is indeed worthy of the tremendous heritage which is his as Senator from the State which has given to our country, Washington, Jefferson, George Mason, Patrick Henry, James Madison, James Monroe, and so many of her greatest and noblest sons.

Mr. President, the people of Virginia are most fortunate to be represented in the Senate by a man of the character, the ability, the courage, the vision, and the effective and inspiring leadership of WILLIS ROBERTSON. I join with them in congratulating him on the high honor bestowed upon him in being selected to receive the Good Citizenship Medal of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution.

PROPOSED ACQUISITION OF SPRINGFIELD, THE FORMER HOME OF PRESIDENT ZACHARY TAYLOR

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on February 16, 1966, the Kentucky House of Representatives passed a resolution memorializing the Congress to consider appropriate legislation to acquire Springfield, the former home of Gen. Zachary Taylor, the 12th President of the United States, and to acquire additional acreage for the expansion of the Zachary Taylor National Cemetery, both of which are located in my State of Kentucky.

The Honorable Troy B. Sturgill, chief clerk of the house of representatives, has forwarded me a copy of this resolution, and I ask unanimous consent that House Resolution No. 79, adopted by the Kentucky House of Representatives on February 16, 1966, be printed in the RECORD.

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

HOUSE RESOLUTION 79

Resolution memorializing Gen. Zachary Taylor

Whereas the remains of Gen. Zachary Taylor, the 12th President of the United States, and his beloved wife, Margaret, lie entombed in a beautiful marble mausoleum in the Zachary Taylor National Cemetery on the outskirts of Louisville, Jefferson County, Ky., surrounded by the graves of veterans from the Spanish American War to the wars of the present era; and

Whereas a small group of patriotic Kentuckians under the leadership of Mrs. C. D. Greer, of Louisville, as chairman of the Zachary Taylor Memorial Committee of the Outdoor Art League of Louisville, in 1921, undertook the task of beautifying the Zachary Taylor burial grounds, and to make of them a fitting resting place for this beloved soldier in the fall of 1922. The first step toward the development of the project was undertaken by the planting of pin oaks, and on March 10, 1924, the Kentucky legislature enacted a bill which was signed by Gov. William J. Fields, requiring the State of Kentucky to deed to Jefferson County that part of the Zachary Taylor burial grounds and road which had been deeded to the State in 1881 by Mr. George McCurdey, and on April 22, 1924, Jefferson County appropriated $10,000 for the building of a roadway leading to the burial grounds. In June of 1924, the Honorable Maurice Thatcher, Member of Congress from Louisville and Jefferson County, introduced a bill in the Congress calling for an annual appropriation for the maintenance of the grounds, the bill was enacted by the Congress and signed by President Calvin Coolidge on February 24, 1925.

Thus was established the Zachary Taylor National Shrine, and in 1926, the Kentucky Legislature enacted a bill which was signed by Gov. William J. Fields, appropriating funds for the purchase of 15 acres of ground surrounding the Zachary Taylor burial grounds, which was promptly purchased and deeded to the U.S. Government for the establishment of the Zachary Taylor National Cemetery, and was so dedicated on May 31, 1928. The dedicatory address was delivered by the Honorable Maurice Thatcher, Member of Congress from the Third Congressional District of Kentucky, who began his address with these glowing words:

"We are here today to dedicate this lovely mausoleum which shall hold through the indefinite future, all that remains of the sacred dust of that splendid Kentuckian, that great American, that splendid soldier and citizen, Zachary Taylor, the 12th President of the United States."; and

Whereas Gen. Zachary Taylor, affectionately called "Old Rough and Ready" by the officers and soldiers who served with him out of respect for his courageous and energetic leadership, was born on November 24, 1784, in Montebello, Orange County, Va., and a year later migrated with his family to Jefferson County, Ky., and thus truly became an early Kentucky pioneer. In 1806, Gen. Zachary Taylor volunteered for the Army which he served for 40 years. When the war with England broke out in 1812, Taylor, a major, was sent with 50 men to the defense of Fort Harrison on the Wabash River in Indiana, where on September 4, 1812, Indians led by Tecumseh furiously attacked and after 7 hours of hard fighting they were forced to flee in disorder. As a colonel, Taylor, in 1832 participated in the Black Hawk campaign, and for the defeat of the Seminoles in the Battle of Okeechobee in December 1837, he was brevetted brigadier general, and in 1840, General Taylor was promoted to command the southern division of the western department of the Army.

As commander of the Army of the Rio Grande, General Taylor, on March 6, 1846, was instructed to march to the Rio Grande, which was recognized by the United States as the southern boundary of Texas, but rejected by Mexico, and his first encounter with the Mexicans occurred on May 8, 1846, at Palo Alto, followed the next day by the battle of Resaca de la Paloma. General Taylor defeated the Mexicans in this and the war with Mexico was begun.

On September 21, 1846, General Taylor marched on Monterey, the chief stronghold in northern Mexico. General Ampudia, the Mexican commander, proposed surrender and terms were agreed on, then late in the autumn of 1846, General Santa Anna with a large army marched against General Taylor, who had taken a position near Buena Vista, on February 22, 1847.

General Santa Anna made a demand upon General Taylor for surrender, which was promptly refused and battle ensued, and just before the battle, General Taylor addressed his troops, "Soldiers, I intend to stand here not only so long as a man remains, but so long as a piece of a man is left." By nightfall the Mexicans were fleeing in confusion. With a force one-fourth the size of the enemy, General Taylor had won his greatest victory and won the Mexican War.

In 1848 General Taylor was elected President of the United States and was inaugurated on March 5, 1849. On July 4, 1850, President Taylor, while attending a ceremony connected with the building of the George Washington Monument, became ill and died July 9, 1850, and shortly thereafter he was brought to Kentucky and interred in the Taylor family burial ground, now the Zachary Taylor National Cemetery, neglected and almost forgotten by the Nation until the Outdoor Art League of Louisville in 1921

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

bigger States should have more authority if it comes to be decided in the House of Representatives, so that we also are fair and equitable to the big States by giving them more authority than they have now. We do not attempt to simply take power from one or the other but rather to equalize the power of both and to recognize that mere accident of geographical residence should give one American citizen more than 14 times as much significance, stature, and authority in the voting booth as another American citizen, and this is what occurs today.

We believe that the large States should have their proportionate power—no one is advocating taking away the 43 votes of New York—but we do believe that this power should be registered in the electoral college on the basis in which the people voted it. To do otherwise or, in other words, to continue the present system of general ticket voting, with its cumulative effect which produces 2d-, 3d-, and even 15th-class voting citizens, would be to give some individuals a greater voting power than they deserve.

The fact that this type of a result is clearly wrong, no matter how or where it is achieved, was pointed out by Chief Justice Warren in *Reynolds* v. *Sims* when he said:

"It would appear extraordinary to suggest that a State could be constitutionally permitted to enact a law providing that certain of the State's voters could vote 2, 5, or 10 times for their legislative representatives, while voters living elsewhere could vote only once. And it is inconceivable that a State law to the effect that, in counting votes for legislators, the votes of citizens in one part of the State would be multiplied by 2, 5, or 10, while the votes of persons in another area would be counted only at face value, could be constitutionally sustainable. Of course, the effect of State legislative districting schemes which give the same number of representatives to unequal numbers of constituents is identical. Overweighting and overvaluation of the votes of those living here has the certain effect of dilution and undervaluation of the votes of those living there. The resulting discrimination against those individual voters living in disfavored areas is easily demonstrable mathematically. Their right to vote is simply not the same right to vote as that of those living in a favored part of the State. Two, five, or ten of them must vote before the effect of their voting is equivalent to that of their favored neighbor. Weighting the votes of citizens differently, by any method or means, merely because of where they happen to reside, hardly seems justifiable. One must be ever aware that the Constitution forbids "sophisticated as well as simpleminded modes of discrimination."

We are all familiar with the fact that *Reynolds* v. *Sims* deals with legislative apportionment on the State level and was an attempt to give a more equal share of the voting strength to the urban areas but this does not detract from the basic premise that such weighting is wrong. It can be the other way around. The Chief Justice mentioned this in a footnote to his opinion when he pointed out that in the early 19th century the cities held the disproportionate representation and in the future the situation might be reversed again. The situation is reversed now as far as presidential elections are concerned and it should be rectified. As Warren said: "To the extent that a citizen's right to vote is debased, he is that much less a citizen. The fact that an individual lives here or there is not a legitimate reason for overweighting or diluting the efficacy of his vote. The complexions of societies and civilizations change, often with amazing rapidity. A nation once primarily rural in character becomes predominantly urban. Representation schemes once fair and equitable become archaic and outdated. But the basic principle of representative government remains, and must remain, unchanged—the weight of a citizen's vote cannot be made to depend on where he lives."

Before closing I would like to mention one additional and important point. Much has been said and written about minority Presidents. The major factor in such an occurrence is undoubtedly the general ticket—unit rules system. By breaking this up we would go a long way in eliminating such a possibility. It will not eliminate it entirely because as was pointed out in the memorandum prepared by the staff of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments following the hearings in 1961 two other factors contribute to such a possibility: (1) The minimum of three electoral votes for each State, and (2), the allocation of additional electors on the basis of population.

With one exception, no plan proposed in the past would eliminate completely the possibility of a minority President. That one exception is a direct national election. I have mentioned this not because I consider this a basic flaw in any other plan including Senate Joint Resolution 12 but because I think it should be made very clear why this possibility, so small it is almost infinitesimal once the general ticket system is broken up, must continue to exist.

As long as this Nation follows the principle of equality of States—the basis of federalism—it must exist. Under this system each State is allocated two electors corresponding to its Senators and a minimum allowance of at least one more regardless of the population of the State. To quote from the memorandum "Obviously, any system which preserves the Federal principle and its three-vote minimum allows for the possibility that a majority of the electoral vote may go to a condidate who receives fewer popular votes. Indeed, this was the original purpose of the electoral vote bonus for smaller States, so that the greater populations of the larger States could not dictate the selection of the President. It was part of the compromise which made the Constitution possible."

Mr. Chairman, the emphasis here is mine—although the quote is from this subcommittee's memorandum. I have included this because, as I have said, I feel that this is important. We should attempt to reduce the possibility of a minority President by doing away with that which contributes the most to such a possibility and is neither needed nor desired to preserve our Federal system but we should not become so obsessed with the idea of elimination that we destroy the principle of statehood imbedded in our Consitution. To do so we would, as the old saying goes, throw the baby out with the bathwater.

In summary Mr. Chairman, I would say this. Our system of electing a President has, generally speaking, served us well during the 177 years since our Republic was established. It has never failed to give us a President.

Through no fault of the Founding Fathers, it has, however, become distorted through the use of the general ticket system. Most of the framers of the Constitution, it should be pointed out, went on record favoring a district system for choosing electors, as the fairest method of expressing the popular will.

Senate Joint Resolution 12, is, in my opinion and the opinion of the many who support it, the only simple method by which each voter in every State will have the same voting weight in electing a President. It is the only one among the various electoral reform proposals which have been offered which will bring about a needed reform without a basic change in our constitutional system. It alone leaves control of the election machinery in the States, where it belongs.

It will bring about the balance so desperately needed in today's inequitable system. It was this imbalance that former President Truman addressed himself to in 1961 when he endorsed the district plan. At that time he said:

"The electoral college was first devised to protect the small States from dominance by the larger States, as for example, Delaware and Rhode Island from being dominated by Virginia and New York.

"The problem we face today is that of the emergence of the big cities into political overbalance, with the threat of imposing their choices on the rest of the country."

In the ensuing years since President Truman made that statement much has happened to increase the imbalance.

If you accept the thesis, which I do not, that two wrongs make a right, in 1961, the argument could be made that although large urban areas possessed a disproportionate influence in the selection of the President this was offset by a certain disproportionate representation in Congress on the part of rural areas. In effect then there was a counterbalance of interests. As has been previously pointed out this is no longer true. We have reformed and equalized the election process for the legislative branch. Now we must do likewise for the executive.

Simply put, in the past a wrong existed and logic demanded that it be rectified. Today that same wrong exists and both logic and justice demand that it be rectified.

VN

WORLD PEACE

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, in our struggle in Vietnam, "more than the freedom of the South Vietnamese is involved," declares the Columbia, S.C., State. It believes that world peace may be at stake:

But the United States can afford nothing less than firm adherence to principle and the search for the best answer—

The paper said on February 15.

Gen. Maxwell Taylor is quoted as saying:

I wonder if those concerned about war with China would say we should simply let the Communists take over in South Vietnam—

And it adds:

That effectively reiterates the position that the stand in Asia is, fundamentally and long range, one for the containment of communism.

The editorial gives a thoughtful summary of the issues before us and with the permission of my colleagues I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Feb. 15, 1966]

WEIGHING THE WAR

The questioning of our posture in southeast Asia boils down to the contention that we should modify our military efforts there in the light of our global commitments. Under this theory, all risks of the enlargements of the war in Vietnam should be abandoned.

The considerations in Congress of the American position will either shape the war into this modified, or holding, form, or will produce a reaffirmation of the broader offensive action now in force.

Whatever the citizen's view of these two positions, the fact that Congress is now attempting to play a hand in the war could turn out to be historic. Congressional participation in forging the policy for the future

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

holds the chance of error or offers the opportunity for wisdom.

In holding current procedures suspect, Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, retired, and ex-diplomat George F. Kennan have come close to the charge that fighting it our militarily is nonsense. They say the conflict tends to weaken, militarily, our world position and risks war with Red China.

Another retired officer, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, supporting current policy, says: "I wonder if those concerned about war with China would say we should simply let the Communists take over in South Vietnam."

That effectively reiterates the position that the stand in Asia is, fundamentally and long range, one for the containment of communism.

The raising of the issue in Congress has momentously exposed varying views and healthily brought the problem before the American people. The differences cannot be brushed aside and the issue must now be threshed out.

Widespread desire, in and out of the Government, to end the war is understandable. But opinions coming out of the congressional investigation which say, in effect, the whole stand we are taking is a mistake could be hazardously misleading unless judiciously examined by the people.

The criticism takes us to the brink of withdrawal or at least defensive stagnation in southeast Asia, but nevertheless contains points having the ring of what may be a seductive logic.

More than the freedom of the South Vietnamese is involved. World peace may be at stake. But the United States can afford nothing less than firm adherence to principle and the search for the best answer.

CONTINUATION OF THE PUBLIC LAW 874 AID TO IMPACTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS PROGRAM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the 1967 fiscal year budget proposals contain a recommended cutback in the Public Law 874, aid to impacted school districts program. This cutback is calculated to save the U.S. Treasury some $233 million.

Many of my Rhode Island constituents—parents, teachers, school superintendents—have written to me urging that this program to continued at its present level. I am certain my colleagues are also very well aware of the severe financial impact the proposed reduction of this fine program will have on the participating communities. In Rhode Island alone, the present entitlement of $3,015,729 would be cut down to $1,546,501.

The purpose of the impacted aid program is to provide financial support for educational services in those school districts which must accommodate the children of Federal employees who live on and work on Federal property, and children residing with a parent who is employed on Federal property.

Now it is obvious that one of two results must flow from any reduction in the Public Law 874 program—school districts which receive this support must either eliminate some of the educational services they provide our schoolchildren or the school district must find other means to raise funds to continue its educational efforts. I strongly oppose reducing education services, and believe it is wholly inconsistent with the recent efforts of Congress to expand educational opportunities. I also consider it grossly unfair to impose on local communities an increased tax burden to support needed educational efforts, which are imposed as a result of Federal requirements. We must remember, and this is my overriding consideration, that it is children who will suffer the effects of any cutback—and I do not believe this would be in our national interest.

There is little question of our continuing need to maintain our Federal bases and establishments. In Rhode Island, our U.S. naval bases are of great importance to the maintenance of our military strength. Let us not forget that with the conflict in Vietnam, this need is even more apparent, and the number of personnel—and schoolchildren—will increase.

We cannot, Mr. President, take the short range view. The communities which must assimilate substantial numbers of Federal employees, need assistance in providing services to them. One of the most important services, is the education of their children. I see no useful purpose that is served by cutting back the aid to impacted school districts. The financial saving is more than offset by the hardships which will be carried by the local communities, and the resultant decline in the education of our youngsters.

This program must continue at its present level, and I intend to do all I possibly can to insure that it is.

I ask unanimous consent, that at this point in the RECORD, there be printed the breakdown of the impact on Rhode Island school districts should the budget proposal be accepted by the Congress.

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

Rhode Island	Congressional district	Present level	Proposed reduction
Newport school system, Newport	1	$553,102	$271,989
Town of Middletown School Committee, Newport	1	703,391	456,122
Town of Tiverton School Committee, Newport	1	42,015	24,466
Town of East Greenwich School Department, Kent	1	77,350	31,338
School Committee of the Town of Portsmouth, Newport	1	236,721	183,994
Town of Jamestown School Committee, Newport	1	42,661	22,631
Coventry School Department, Kent	1	105,869	41,635
Coventry School Department, Kent	1	0	0
Warwick School Committee, Kent	1	272,819	37,772
West Greenwich School Department, Kent	1	4,223	286
West Warwick School Department, Kent	1	71,798	28,902
Town of Smithfield Department of Public Schools, Providence	1	9,724	0
Bristol School Committee, Bristol	1	19,040	0
Foster School Department, Providence	1	4,065	0
Town of North Smithfield School Department, Providence	1	15,577	0
Foster Glocester Regional School Department, Providence	1	5,038	0
Congressional district total		2,263,483	1,101,538
Town of East Greenwich School Department, Kent	2	0	0
Town of North Kingstown School Department, Washington	2	683,185	428,653
Coventry School Department, Kent	2	0	0
Coventry School Department, Kent	2	0	0
Warwick School Committee, Kent	2	0	0
Town of Westerly School Committee, Washington	2	18,434	0
Town of Charlestown School Committee, Washington	2	4,527	0
Richmond School Committee, Washington	2	2,717	0
Town of Narragansett School Committee, Washington	2	18,967	4,864
West Greenwich School Department, Kent	2	0	0
West Warwick School Department, Kent	2	0	0
Town of Smithfield Department of Public Schools, Providence	2	0	0
Bristol School Committee, Bristol	2	0	0
Exeter School Department, Washington	2	10,250	4,435
South Kingstown School Committee, Washington	2	42,877	7,011
Foster School Department, Providence	2	0	0
Chariho Regional High School District, Washington	2	7,289	0
Town of North Smithfield School Department, Providence	2	0	0
Foster Glocester Regional School District, Providence	2	0	0
Congressional district total		788,246	444,963
Total, Rhode Island		3,051,729	1,545,501

UNDERSTANDING THE BACKGROUND OF THE VIETNAM CONFLICT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, a series of articles in the News-Journal papers of Wilmington, Del., has contributed a great deal to an understanding of the background of the Vietnam conflict.

They are written by William P. Frank, Deleware's best known newspaperman, and are illustrated by photographs taken by Bill Snead, a prize-winning photojournalist who is chief of the News-Journal photo department.

These two men spent 3 weeks in South Vietnam recently, talking to men from Delaware in particular but generally getting an overall impression of conditions in the country and the role Americans are playing.

I am impressed by the insight evident in the articles. They have added to my understanding of the situation. With the hope that they will also add to the understanding of others, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal, Feb. 23, 1966]

NO BITTERNESS—A JOB TO BE DONE ACCEPTS LIFE IN VIET

(NOTE.—This is the first of a series in which William P. Frank, who returned earlier this month from Vietnam, reports his impressions of that nation and its people.)

(By William P. Frank)

The greatest paradox in South Vietnam today is the average American fighting man

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

who really doesn't know why he's there but who is not complaining or bitter.

In the main his aim is to do a good job as soon as possible and go home.

GI Joe knows that, wherever he is in South Vietnam—Saigon, in some hamlet, or even in the security of a large military installation—there is danger.

He truly believes the Vietcong is a cruel, ruthless enemy. His willingness to trust Vietnamese is complicated by the fact he doesn't understand the Vietnamese mind.

The American fightng man accepts long hours of work and duty without griping. He is not disturbed too much by the antics of the demonstrating "Vietniks" back home. He does worry a great deal about the safety and welfare of his family and wishes they wouldn't worry about him.

Several soldiers told of narrow escapes they had experienced or of having been shot at by Vietcong and then added, "But don't mention that in your stories. The folks back home might get worried."

In general, the American soldier is careful about his life in Vietnam.

He takes his malaria pills with strict regularity once a week. He avoids drinkng water, except when he is positive it's safe.

He prefers American-type cooking to the strange dishes of the country.

While he admires and raves about the charm and beauty of the Vietnamese girls, he wouldn't want to take them home to meet mom or dad.

He has learned to bargain with street vendors and quite often beats them at their own game.

He keeps abreast of the news principally through the excellent Pacific edition of the Stars and Stripes, the Armed Forces Radio, and several American news magazines.

He has learned how to be extremely patient in air terminals when he has to spend hours waiting for a plane.

Many of the GI's have caught on to the spirit and philosophy of the civic action program of the United States and are willing to devote their off-duty hours to teaching Vietnamese children English or working in an orphanage or rescuing Vietnamese civilians in a battle zone.

But ask the average GI "Why are you here?" and he'll say, as if he had learned it by rote: "We're fighting to stop communism."

If the soldier has had no more than a high school education, he will not elaborate on that. If he is a college man, he will discuss the possibilities of communism's spreading to other parts of the Pacific and getting closer to his native country.

He hasn't too much to say about the Vietnamese soldier, first, because the average GI can't communicate with the natives and, next, because he doesn't come in contact with too many.

The average GI knows practically nothing about the history or ancient culture of Vietnam, except that he does know the French were there until recent years.

He has little or no respect for the Vietnamese police in Saigon and he knows that these police will not interfere with him. However, the soldier has a healthy respect for the U.S. military police who are always combing the bar districts in towns.

Of the several hundred American soldiers I've talked with in bars, restaurants, military installations, on planes and in bleak air terminals, none wanted to appear as a superpatriot.

The men, drafted or volunteers, don't want to wave the American flag and make fancy speeches about making South Vietnam safe for democracy.

The morale of the fighting man seems to increase the farther he gets from Saigon, the seedy, unkempt capital of South Vietnam. In faraway Da Nang or Chu Lai, men have told me that they have no hankering to get to Saigon.

The behavior of the American soldier in Saigon is not as bad as one would expect under the circumstances. Americans fill bars to capacity and are willing to spend lots of money buying "Saigon tea" for bar girls at the rate of about $1.25 or $1.30 a shot. But I saw very few American soldiers drunk on the streets.

Not all of these bar girls can be called prostitutes and when the curfew hour approaches, soldiers and girls come pouring out of the bars. Many girls are either picked up by their husbands or friends; the soldiers bunch up to hire taxis or pedicabs and make off for their billets.

Of course, a lot of them go off to parties but when the curfew time arrives, the streets of Saigon become as dead as Market Street in Wilmington at 4 in the morning.

The GI's have the greatest contempt for taxi drivers and pedicabbies who bedevil any American on the streets of Saigon. The taxi drivers and the pedicabbies will always try to overcharge and if the soldier knows his way around, he will pay what he thinks a trip was worth and just walk away from the squawking cabbies.

It is true, however, that some meaningful friendships have developed between the Americans and Vietnamese girls. In the better restaurants and in the officers' open mess in Saigon, it is not unusual to see soldiers and their Vietnamese dates, who are lovely in their native dress.

Oddly enough, even though prostitution is rampant in Saigon, there are very few streetwalkers. The streets are loaded with pimps approaching Americans to tell them where they can obtain "nice young girls."

When police do raid houses of prostitution, the girls are always held for court but "the foreigners" are always released. This is in keeping with the practice of the Vietnamese police to "interfere" with Americans as little as possible.

Technically, it is illegal for American soldiers to possess U.S. currency or "green" money. They get their money either in Vietnamese piasters or military currency.

Military money, which looks like the old American shinplasters, is adorned with the pictures of bobbed-haired American beauties and is used exclusively on military installations, at all post exchanges, in the USO, and officers' open messes.

The American soldiers travel around Vietnam chiefly on military planes on the basis of first come, first served at military passenger terminals.

Newsmen also travel that way and their press cards are accepted as "flight orders."

In Saigon, the Army operates buses to and from important points such as the Tan Son Nhut Airbase, or the major post exchange in Cholon, the Chinese section of Saigon.

For American servicemen who do not choose to wait for these buses, there are always the taxis and the pedicabs.

Army trucks and jeeps often will pick up servicemen, if there is room.

It is a common sight in Saigon, as throughout Vietnam where American forces are stationed, to see soldiers fully armed—rifles, submachineguns, revolvers in hip holsters or arm holsters. However, when entering PX's, the USO, or air terminals, the men are required to remove the clips from their guns.

The accommodations for the American fighting men range from comfortable billets in hotels that have been taken over by the United States to pup tents out in the field.

In the large installations, such as those for the marines near Da Nang or An Khe, the accommodations will range from tents with wooden floors and wooden sides to large tents erected right over the bare ground.

There is the widest variety in how the men in the military installations will try to spruce up and make the best of their tent cities. Some units have taken to planting native trees and even cultivated American corn for decorative and nostalgic purposes.

Some have built streets out of scrap lumber and what field stone they can find. Others have taken bits of the treads used for emergency air strips and used them as bridges over deep gutters.

The marines at a place called Chu Lai, on the South China Sea, have revealed a sense of humor. The area there is nothing but dark red sand dunes and scrub pines.

But in front of the small tent air terminal at Chu Lai, the sand has been raked clean and a sign put there, "Keep off the grass."

Hundreds of GI's have learned that they can buy expensive cameras very cheaply in the PX's—cameras that would sell for $350 back home, going for half that price.

A lot of them don't know how to use the cameras but they've got them.

At the main PX in Saigon, there's always a long waiting line of men trying to get into the camera, radio and tape recorder departments.

As souvenir buyers, no one can equal the American GI. He likes the Vietnamese doll in native attire, all kinds of luggage said to be made of elephant hides, imitation ivory chess sets, all kinds of imitation teakwood figures, lacquer boxes of many sizes and shapes. Now a few are going in for Vietnamese art, including very good oil paintings and wash drawings on silk.

The GI has learned how to evaluate anything. The best is "No. 1," the worst "No. 10."

In restaurants, he chiefly goes for Chinese food but has found the Vietnamese chop suey is nothing like it is back home. He tries to use chopsticks but gives them up when he attempts spaghetti.

In Saigon, when the GI gets tired of the exotic Far East, he finds refuge in the USO. There he gets a safe jumbo size milk shake for a quarter; a huge hamburger for 30 cents; good vegetable soup, ice cream, and free coffee—the best in Vietnam.

It also is in the USO that he can meet friends, read a varity of American newspapers, watch television, call home through a special telephone service of the USO, at the cost of $6 for 3 minutes, look at movies, and even play bingo.

The USO is the haven for the GI when he is weary of the hustle and bustle of Saigon and when he is not loaded with piastres.

It will take years before Vietnam gets over the impact of the American GI, and a long time before the native kids forget some of the Anglo-Saxon words they've learned.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal, Feb. 24, 1966]

VIETNAMESE A MYSTERY TO RANK-AND-FILE GI

(NOTE.—This is the second of a series in which William P. Frank, who returned earlier this month from Vietnam, reports his impressions of that nation and its people.)

(By William P. Frank)

GI Joe is ready to die in Vietnam, a country he knows little about.

Joe will go to great lengths to rescue civilians from combat zones, even at the risk of his life. He will contribute to their welfare and even get the folks at home to come across with gifts.

But he knows practically nothing about the 2,000-year history of the country, its folklore, customs, music or traditions.

However, some of the carefully selected wearers of the green beret, the elite Special Forces, are fully aware of the courage of Vietnamese junglefighters.

Air Force officers, who have trained with Vietnamese pilots, are impressed by the goals and standards of the Asians.

But the rank-and-file American soldier doesn't know, for example, that when his ancestors were in caves somewhere in Europe,

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

the forebears of present-day Vietnamese were living in a highly developed culture of literature, art and even science.

Nor is GI Joe aware that the Vietnamese have been fighting aggressors for more than 1,500 years or that the Mongolian cavalry of the great Kublai Khan, whose empire stretched from Vienna to Peiping, was defeated by Vietnamese guerrilla forces in the 13th century.

American soldiers are in Vietnam to fight the Vietcong and the Communists of North Vietnam, but the strange thing is that the average GI can't tell a friendly Vietnamese from an unfriendly one. The chances are he has never seen a living enemy up close.

A major problem between the Americans and the natives of the country is a lack of communication. The American soldier is either too busy in his camp or on a mission. When he is in town, he is more bent on pleasure than information. Also, not too many Vietnamese can speak English beyond the jargon of the marketplace or the smoke-filled bars.

If more American servicemen could speak French, there would be, perhaps, better communication since this is the second language for so many Vietnamese, including cabbies and hotel boys. This dates back to the era when Vietnam was part of the French colonial empire.

The American soldier is tremendously impressed by the immaculate dress of the Vietnamese girls in their native costumes of black or white pantaloons, tight bodices with high collars and flowing slit-sided tunics called "ai dai," pronounced "zow die." It is a mystery how these girls can look so lovely, clean, fresh, and dignified even as they emerge from the dark and filthy hovels where they live.

In Saigon, the GI usually encounters the sneaky pedicab driver or taxi driver who pesters him with suggestions of taking him to see young girls; crowds of shoeshine kids who want cigarettes or money; innumerable street vendors who start bargaining at mountain-high prices and eventually come down to a reasonable one.

Since more Americans have arrived, the Vietnamese have become adept at the free enterprise, profitmaking system—so much so that Communists in the north probably will never convince the South Vietnamese that collectivism is the best thing in life. Never has there been such prosperity in Saigon and near the large U.S. military installations—yet, abject poverty still prevails.

While the American soldier still may not have a deep admiration for the Vietnamese, he does respect the religion and religious structures of the people. It is amazing to see small Buddha shrines and burial places undesecrated in the midst of huge military camps.

During the many hours of waiting in U.S. air terminals, where American and Vietnamese soldiers have been together in a small area for hours, I saw little or no fraternization between the two. Again the chief stumbling block: lack of communication.

However, the one major religious folk custom of the Vietnamese that GI Joe has learned about is Tet, the lunar new year observed late in January amid an enormous and fantastic outburst of firecracks that gave many an American soldier battle jitters. Tet is a 3-day uncontrolled display of firecrackers in Saigon. For example, it left the pavements strewn with layers of red remnants of firecrackers, reminiscent of confetti after a big wedding.

The Vietnamese do have a long and notable history—dating back 20 centuries. The tiny nation's history is punctuated with innumerable wars for freedom and national identity against Chinese, French, and Japanese.

Despite invasions and the domination by intruders, the Vietnamese have managed to maintain their own identity. For example, they have not used Chinese writing for centuries but have adopted the Roman letter system, or "quoc ngu," given them by French and Portugese missionaries.

The women of all classes still cling to their native dress. This ranges from the wealthy women in public life to the humblest street vendor.

The men of the upper classes, however, have adopted western dress, but peasants still wear what Westerners would call pajamas.

Vietnamese food, by and large, is traditional—plenty of fish and a wide variety of it; also chicken, duck and pork; lots of rice and in more than recent years, blanched spaghetti, which they manipulate skillfully with chopsticks. Occasionally, the diet includes dried bat, regarded as a delicacy.

Markets are filled with vegetables, including enormous cucumbers, Chinese lettuce, plenty of watercress and mounds of sugarcane. This is sold as it is, or chopped into segments or squeezed into juice.

Butcher shops are adorned with red-glazed roasted duck, beef, yellow-glazed roasted chickens and strings of strangely shaped sausage.

Tea is the chief beverage. It's a good thing they don't drink too much water, for most homes do not have safe water or, for that matter, any kind of interior plumbing system. People must obtain water at common faucets in the street.

There is little drunkenness apparent anywhere in Vietnam. Soft drinks, particularly orange soda, have become extremely popular. Because the Vietnamese are a strong family people, it is common to see entire families squatting on pavements and/or in alleys around a common table. Food is eaten from common dishes with the ubiquitous and incredibly nimble chopsticks.

Restaurants are for the wealthy or the more prosperous Vietnamese. Streets are crowded with women and youngsters who prepare and sell food in huge pots on small charcoal burners.

Many Americans believe the ordinary people of Vietnam are unclean, so it is amazing to witness the great lengths to which they will go to wash themselves. In Saigon, the levee of the murky, garbage-filled Saigon River is usually jammed morning and afternoon with workers washing themselves. Or, it is not unusual to see pedicab drivers, even beggars, crowding around street faucets splashing themselves with water.

Everywhere in Saigon, one sees mothers combing and brushing the long hair of their daughters, and pecking around searching for lice.

The Vietnamese are a small, wiry people. The average man isn't more than 5 feet, 4 inches and weighs about 105 pounds. He appears much younger than he really is.

The women also are diminutive. A 20-year-old woman looks like a girl of 15. It is rare to see a corpulent Vietnamese.

American helicopter pilots have a rule: Their aircraft will accommodate five Americans, but eight or nine Vietnamese.

Vietnam is really a variety of peoples. Those in the lowlands are commonly called Vietnamese. In the highlands are the Montagnards, an independent group, distinct in habits and customs. There are also other minorities such as the Khmers who are actually Cambodians and the smallest minority known as Chams.

Most of the Vietnamese are Buddhists. Other religions are Confucianism, Taoism, Caodaism, and Christianity.

The Christians are mostly Catholic. The Catholic faith was strengthened with the coming of French colonialism in the late 19th century. The Catholic cathedral in the heart of Saigon is interesting because its architecture is Western and its stained glass windows have Western figures, with very little evidence of Far Eastern culture.

Cao Dai is a recent religion, made up of Christianity, Buddhism, and several other faiths. Its followers have their own pope and a strange assortment of saints, including Victor Hugo. This is a militant religious group, almost approaching the status of a political party.

The extent of education among the people is not known although many youngsters in Saigon say they go to school in the morning and work in the afternoon. Many schools are operated by Catholic nuns. Wealthy Vietnamese send their children abroad for schooling.

However, even the poorest street vendor or wizened and toothless cabbie is a financial wizard when calculating and establishing a ratio of U.S. money and Vietnamese piastres.

Saigon has far more book stores than one anticipates—chiefly selling paperback books in Vietnamese, French, and English. These do not cater exclusively to visitors or servicemen, but also to the people, with the books spread out on sidewalks.

When one gets to know the Vietnamese, he learns that, in the main, they are honest. Once an agreement has been reached about the price of something, they stick to it.

In South Vietnam at least, the people usually are gentle and speak in a high-pitched tonal language, using the same words for different meanings according to the tone of the voice.

Their folk songs are as sad as most of the people are—usually songs of unrequited love and longing for peaceful days in gardens with beautiful flowers.

Their festivals are marked with striking floral displays and potted trees. In Saigon, nothing is more gorgeous, more vivid in color than the flower market, which is patronized chiefly by the people.

The people's arts and crafts are anything but primitive. Several art exhibits in Saigon revealed a wonderful sensitivity, more often in the Western style and abstractionism than oriental.

Artists are fond of brush painting on silk, using native themes of farmers and boys riding water buffaloes.

In the crafts, nothing surpasses their lacquer boxes and lacquer panels, designed with exquisite delicacy.

The people patronize movies so often that most of the theaters have a reserved-seat system for French, Chinese, and American films. In Saigon, one can also go to the traditional theater, which is reminiscent of the Chinese stage, yet slightly different.

A casual Western observer may think that the Vietnamese are lazy because of the heat, the humidity, and the long afternoon siestas. He also will see many Vietnamese taking life easy as they squat on their haunches on curbs or against building walls.

But nothing is as hectic as the heavy Saigonese traffic with thousands of taxis, pedicabs, and the millions of bicycles—so many vehicles belching forth clouds of blue exhaust fumes. A pedestrian can't help wondering whether he faces asphyxiation during an afternoon stroll.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal, Feb. 25, 1966]

ILLNESS KILLS MORE SOUTH VIETS THAN BATTLES

(NOTE.—This is the third of a series in which William P. Frank, who returned earlier this month from Vietnam, reports his impressions of that nation and its people.)

(By William P. Frank)

Disease kills more people in South Vietnam than the enemy, the ruthless Vietcong.

The principal aim of the Vietcong is to destroy leaders of provinces or hamlets, schoolteachers, priests, community spokesmen—those who can influence the people against communism.

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

But disease in that sad country of southeast Asia is more "democratic." It lashes out at everyone.

According to the latest reliable figures, cited in a recent issue of the American Medical Association Journal, a little more than 46 percent of the deaths in South Vietnam occur among children up to 15 years of age.

In the United States, comparable statistics show the death rate for that age group is 9 percent.

The journal also reported that of all the children born in 1958—the last year of any reliable statistics—half were destined to die before their fifth birthday.

The maternal death rate in Vietnam is reported to be 25 times higher than that in the United States. Eight percent of babies born in Vietnamese hospitals never leave them alive.

According to Dr. John M. Levinson, of Wilmington, now in Vietnam for his third tour of volunteer service among the people, there's no reason to believe that the situation has improved since 1958.

"In fact," Levinson said, "the disease problem has increased. Except for what a few American doctors have been able to contribute on a volunteer basis, the medical problem has increased."

It is also reasonable to conclude that if the war is escalated, more civilians will be hurt.

American casualties are cared for in U.S. militray hospitals; Vietnamese military personnel have facilities, but the hapless civilian victims—the adults and children—must depend upon meager first-aid clinics and civilian hospitals already overcrowded, understaffed, and woefully short of supplies.

American doctors, not connected with the U.S. military effort but who are volunteering their skills among the people, have repeatedly told me that American guns may win the war, but it'll be up to American medical science to win the peace.

"That may sound like a tired cliche but it's the gospel truth," said Dr. George McInnes of Augusta, Ga., who heads an American medical team in a Da Nang civilian hospital. But medical help "is what the people see and understand—American compassion and concern for them. This is what is going to give them strength and confidence in America."

In a mountain village near Dalat is a small hospital operated by Dr. James Turpin. This hospital is called Project Concern, and is supported by contributions, many of which come from jaycee units in various parts of the United States.

Levinson has been working chiefly in a large maternity hospital in Saigon. One day recently 12 babies were delivered by midwives in one section of the hospital with a lone native doctor in attendance.

It is rare to see more than one or two Vietnamese doctors on duty in a civilian hospital. Most of them have been taken into the Vietnamese Army. It is estimated that there are not more than 200 Vietnamese civilian doctors for a nation with a population of 15 million. To make matters worse, most Vietnamese are extremely poor and they live in remote, rural areas.

At present, according to rough guesses, there are about 50 American doctors in South Vietnam. They are working in clinics and hospitals, treating every kind of imaginable case from war wounds to tuberculosis and cancer.

One of the major sources of disease in Vietnam is improper facilities for disposal and treatment of sewage and waste. Saigon, once hailed as the "Pearl of the Orient," has mounds of garbage on pavements and streets. It is uncollected for days at a time, making ideal breeding and nesting places for rats.

Supervision or control of food markets is virtually nonexistent; most restaurants are filthy. Untreated sewage is dumped into rivers; people live along these bodies of water and bathe in them.

Water is drawn from common taps in streets, and only the fact that the water is boiled for tea or soups, spares the people even greater disease.

Among the common maladies in the country are malaria, tuberculosis, various intestinal diseases, meningitis, typhoid, polio, and some leprosy.

According to one report, trachoma—a disease of the eyelids—is so common that at least four-fifths of the population has been infected with it at one time or another.

Levinson recently reported in an article in the American Medical Association Journal that it is not uncommon to see a leper sitting on the streets of Saigon begging for money or food.

Parasites of all kinds abound. According to Levinson, the peasant must face reinfection with parasitic diseases, since he must work barefooted in the flooded rice paddies where he is exposed again and again.

Residents of rural areas believe innumerable medical superstitions. These result from folklore from China. Only recently are these people beginning to accept Western medicines.

Peoples in villages that have been raked by the war, are known to carry their wounded on crude stretchers for miles to see the "bac si my," the American doctor.

Hospitals are so overcrowded, however, that it is meaningless to measure a hospital's capacity in bed space. Patients, small though the people are, live two and three in a bed. Sometimes, two cots are put together to accommodate four, maybe five patients.

Hospital attendants and hard-working nuns of nearby churches are unable to meet the demands of patients; so it is not unusual to see relatives of the sick on the wards, feeding, washing and given other attention to their ailing kin.

It is true that in many instances, American military doctors offer thier services and so do other military personnel, but all of this is on a when-and-if-time-is-available basis.

The arrival of an American doctor in a civilian hospital is quite an event. Word spreads swiftly through the wards.

Levinson, for example, had no specific hour for arriving on his first day at the large maternity hospital. When he showed up at 8, he learned a patient had been readied and Levinson was to operate. The woman had been kept under anesthesia for at least 40 minutes, waiting for the "bac si my."

The United States through what is now known as U.S. Agency for International Development does provide some facilities and equipment for civilian hospitals but it is the American doctor himself, big as life, always smiling, stumbling through basic Vietnamese with a sprinkling of French who represents to the people the heart of the Americans.

"Giving of one's self is the key to success here," a doctor in Da Nang told me.

"Assistance from the free world and from civilian volunteer agencies offers a challenge to American medicine to help defeat communism in southeast Asia," Levinson adds.

Mere equipment, stamped with the U.S. AID emblem, won't do the job alone.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal, Feb. 26, 1966]

OPEN POLLS HAZY IDEA TO SOUTH VIETS

(NOTE.—This is the fourth in a series in which William P. Frank, who returned earlier this month from South Vietnam, reports his impressions of the nation and its people.)

(By William P. Frank)

Nguyen, a floor boy at the Hotel Catinat in Saigon, tried to explain his idea of freedom.

In broken English sprinkled with a few French words, it amounted to this:

"Freedom means I can work where I want to work. I can change my job to make more money. I can live in peace—no bullets—no Vietcong."

But he couldn't describe the kind of government now operating in South Vietnam, nor did he seem to have any concept of the American form of representative government.

Although he can read and write Vietnamese, the theory that Nguyen could someday elect his own representatives in the nation's government was incomprehensible. It must be equally difficult to understand for the illiterate peasants who comprise the bulk of the 15 million people in that nation today.

What will the Nguyens, the millions of peasants and others in Vietnam do or say when a new constitution is offered to them this year? What will their reactions be when popular elections are held next year? It is impossible to predict.

The U.S. Army's "Area Handbook for Vietnam," prepared 4 years ago, makes this observation:

"The vast majority of the people (of South Vietnam) have little notion and less experience of representative government and democratic processes.

"An educated, Western-influenced urban minority, intellectually familiar with constitutional concepts and influenced by democratic ideals, is eager for a larger voice in national affairs and impatient with government restrictions and controls."

This was written in the days of Ngo Dinh Diem, the first President of South Vietnam, who was assassinated during a coup staged by the military in November 1963.

A few months earlier, a 123-member National Assembly was approved in a popular election. Candidates supported by Diem got 92 percent of the vote. This would make any American arch a quizzical brow.

It is important for Americans to understand that his concept of popular democratic government is something the average Vietnamese reads about in his newspaper or hears discussed on radio, but does not grasp.

Presidents, chiefs of state or Prime Ministers in South Vietnam represent a distant authority in Saigon to the majority of the people in the villages. What the majority of people in the country knows about government revolves around the province chiefs or hamlet leaders.

This is the way the people have been ruled for centuries—first under the mandarins of the royal government, then under French colonialism, then the Japanese, and down to the present day.

As recently as January 6, the Mansfield committeee of the U.S. Senate—which included U.S. Senator J. CALEB BOGGS, Republican, of Delaware—on its return from Vietnam wrote:

"The new leadership in (Vietnamese) Government which is drawn largely from military circles, is young and hopeful but with little knowledge of politics."

The United States has been in and around the South Vietnamese Government, officially and unofficially, since 1945. Sometimes Americans openly took part in promoting certain men for top office in Vietnam, notably in the case of Diem, who turned out as a failure. Lyndon B. Johnson, when he was Vice President, had acclaimed him as the "Winston Churchill of Vietnam."

American advisers are still active in many segments of the Vietnamese Government. For example, a former prison official of Montana has been chief adviser for the National Police of Vietnam for several years.

A number of high-ranking U.S. Army officers have been assigned for years to Vietnam to help train its army, including Gen. John (Iron Mike) O'Daniel, formerly of Newark, Del., now a resident of San Diego, Calif.

However, American advisers generally insist that they are just that, advisers, and try to keep out of the internal affairs.

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Col. Edward G. Lansdale, an expert in Philippine affairs, was, however, prominently involved in the administration of Diem.

The great problem in Vietnamese Government today is conceded to be the outlook of the villagers—whether they feel the South Vietnamese Government and the American forces are strong enough to protect them from the terrorism of the Vietcong.

The Mansfield report stated that some observers believe that no more than 25 percent of the country's villages under South Vietnam control will be free enough from Communist intimidation to take part openly in the election this year.

The Army's handbook on Vietnam also pointed out:

"It seems clear that the villager wants peace and security above all else. Confronted with the competing armed authority of the Government and of the Vietcong, he will accept what he must and respond slowly and cautiously to efforts to win his loyalty."

In effect, South Vietnam now has a military government called the Congress of Armed Forces.

But the country actually is run by what is known as the National Leadership Council, composed of top-ranking officers Maj. Gen. Nguyen Van Thieu has the title of Chief of State. Vice Air Marshall Nguyen Cao Ky is Prime Minister, and there are seven other generals on the council.

Sometimes Thieu speaks for the Government; sometimes Ky.

Several months ago, a copy of what passes for the present constitution of the nation was posted on the bulletin board of the press lounge in the Joint U.S. Public Affairs Office. It was one of the most-ignored items there.

The document has many fine-sounding phrases, such as this: "The rear (homefront) must be stable so that a solid foundation could be progressively laid and a tradition of liberty and democracy could be developed in an atmosphere of struggle an revolution.

On January 14, Ky addressed the Armed Forces Congress and admitted shortcomings since he became Prime Minister last June.

Indicating that some of the provisions of the "constitution" that had not yet been implemented, Ky said:

"We must also recognize that due to present circumstances, the Government still is unable to create a favorable political climate."

He then proceeded to talk about democracy suited for Vietnam and not for any other country.

He proposed seminars among the people in which they will be able to discuss the kind of government they want. He promised that a constitution will be proposed next October, a referendum held and the document promulgated in November.

He also promised that a civil government will replace the military government next year.

There is still no indication of what political parties will emerge or how much freedom they will have.

Much will depend on whether the religious factions will hold their temper, on whether the independent-thinking minority groups, such as the strange Montagnards of the highlands, will agree to come into the new Vietnam great society and, of course, on the progress of the war.

To date, there is no evidence of any strong opposition party in Vietnam except, of course, the National Liberation Front—the Communists. Even in the provinces, the terms of chiefs don't last long; they are either captured or killed by the Vietcong or are deposed by the Saigon government.

There are always subrosa stories of province chiefs with sticky fingers.

Only recently, 110 television sets were distributed by the United States, in one province, earmarked for the people.

The idea was that the people would be able to learn more about the outside world and get the democratic message via television, beamed from airplanes.

Just before the television programs began, an American official decided to check to see what happened to the sets.

He discovered that of 110, about 60 were in the homes of province officials or in police stations. Obviously, that's that not the use for which the television had been intended.

It is presumed they are now in public areas where the peasants can see television.

What is the future of Ky?

At present, the Ky government is trying to win the loyalty of the people by sending out teams into the villages to teach the people about democracy but the teams are still encountering the entrenched interests of the village chiefs.

The other day, in announcing reshuffling of cabinet officials, Ky said in effect, "I do not choose to run for public office."

But then other public figures have said the same thing and ended up in the saddle.

Historians and political scientists knowledgeable in Asian affairs are now advising caution in evaluating the political situation in South Vietnam. In the past two and a quarter years, there have been three coups, four attempted coups and at least 20 reshuffles in the government.

FURTHER TRIBUTE TO ALBERT THOMAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as a continuation of the tribute to the late Congressman Albert Thomas which I made on the floor of the Senate Friday, February 25, 1966, I would like to insert several matters pertaining to the final rites of this great Texan, which have been received by me subsequent to last Friday.

Although the tributes and descriptions of Albert Thomas will continue to call our attention to the outstanding nature of this remarkable individual for a long time, I think an account of the final rites should be printed for history in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Houston Post of Friday, February 18, 1966, entitled "Albert Thomas Laid To Rest With Military Ceremonies," the article from the Houston Chronicle of Saturday, February 19, 1966, entitled "The Saddest Bugle Call, Day Is Done for Thomas," the articles from the Houston Post of Saturday, February 19, 1966, entitled "Thomas Bade Farewell" and "High Officials Attend Rites," and the tribute which appeared in Maurine Parkhurst's column in the Thursday, February 24, 1966, Houston Chronicle be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Houston Chronicle, Feb. 18, 1966]

ALBERT THOMAS LAID TO REST WITH MILITARY CEREMONIES

U.S. Representative Albert Thomas, 67, was buried today in a military cemetery in Houston's North Side.

An eight-gun salute was fired. A bugler blew taps as the coffin was lowered into the grave.

A score of more of his colleagues from the House of Representatives in Washington, D.C., attended the military service.

ALLEN GIVES EULOGY

Earlier this afternoon, Dr. Charles L. Allen eulogized Thomas at a service in First Methodist Church.

Dr. Allen quoted President Johnson:

"Of the qualities that made Albert Thomas a remarkable man, devotion to the people he served and loyalty to his friends stand higher than all."

The church was filled with financiers, labor leaders, millionaires, and other friends.

"COURTEOUS, COURTLY"

And many followed the hearse to the Veterans' Administration cemetery on Airline-Steubner Road.

Albert Thomas has represented Houston in Congress for 30 years.

Dr. Allen summed up Thomas as "courteous, courtly, polite—he never forgot to be a gentleman."

Thomas died Tuesday of cancer in his Washington, D.C., home. His body was flown here in a Presidential fleet plane Wednesday night.

A steady flow of mourners came to the Settegast-Kopf Funeral Home chapel, 3300 Kirby, where the body of Thomas lay in state until the funeral.

The chapel's Colonial Room was filled with wreaths from many individuals and organizations. Thomas, known as a titan of Washington, was also known down to the lowest in the ranks of labor from whence he drew much of his Democratic strength.

His familiar greeting of "podnah" for all set him apart from most political leaders. His office door was always open to his constituents.

There was nothing of snobbery about him. He was shrewd, gregarious and yet quiet.

Thomas came to Houston in 1930 from Nacogdoches, one of the first Anglo-Saxon settlements in Texas. He had been county attorney there after graduating from Rice University and the University of Texas Law School, and attending Harvard Law School.

He became an assistant U.S. attorney in Houston and traveled the southern district of the Federal court for 6 years before running for Congress and winning in 1936. He took his seat in January 1937, in the 75th Congress. He had filed for a seat in the next Congress when he died.

Gov. John Connally, Attorney General Waggoner Carr, Secretary of State Crawford Martin, and U.S. Judge Homer Thornberry were flown here for the funeral.

They were joined at the South Main Church by a large congressional delegation, led by Texas two Senators, RALPH YARBOROUGH and JOHN TOWER, and U.S. Representative GEORGE MAHON of Lubbock, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, of which Thomas was the second ranking member.

Texas Members of the House who announced they would be in the funeral delegation include:

Representatives BOB POAGE, of Waco, O. C. FISHER, of San Angelo, CLARK THOMPSON, of Galveston, WALTER ROGERS of Pampa, JOHN DOWDY of Athens, JACK BROOKS of Beaumont, JIM WRIGHT of Fort Worth, JOHN YOUNG of Corpus Christi, BOB CASEY of Houston, HENRY GONZALEZ of San Antonio, GRAHAM PURCELL of Wichita Falls, RAY ROBERTS of McKinney, JAKE PICKLE of Austin, EARLE CABELL of Dallas, ELIGIO DE LA GARZA of Mission, and RICHARD C. WHITE of El Paso, all Democrats.

Also, the following members of the House Appropriations Committee: Representatives MIKE KIRWAN, Democrat, of Ohio, JAMIE WHITTEN, Democrat, of Mississippi, JOHN FOGARTY, Democrat, of Rhode Island, JOE EVINS, Democrat, of Tennessee, TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, FRANK BOW, Republican, of Ohio, EDWARD P. BOLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, WINFIELD K. DENTON, Democrat, of Indiana, WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, Republican, of Ohio, ROBERT N. GIAIMO, Demo-

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

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

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

"*Resolved*, That the clerk of the board of supervisors be and he hereby is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to Senator Stafford, Assemblyman Ingram, Congressman McEwen, Senator Javits, and Senator Kennedy."

On a motion by Mr. Storie, seconded by Mr. Miller, the resolution was unanimously adopted.

I, Charles V. Fox, clerk of the St. Lawrence County Board of Supervisors, do hereby certify that the above is a true copy of the resolution unanimously adopted by the St. Lawrence County Board of Supervisors on February 14, 1966.

Charles V. Fox,
Clerk, St. Lawrence County Board of Supervisors.

Resolution 29, 1966

Resolution objecting to sec. 53 of the conservation law, by Mr. Storie

"Whereas section 53 of the conservation law of the State of New York compels counties in the Adirondack preserve to pay one-half the cost of fighting forest fires; and

"Whereas the claims arise from expenses incurred by the State conservation department in fighting forest fires; and

"Whereas the State conservation department had complete control over the expenditures and do hire men and equipment, including an airplane and bulldozers; and

"Whereas some of this equipment is hired merely to stand by in case of need; and

"Whereas counties have no control or supervision over the expenditures; and

"Whereas the counties in the Adirondack preserve have no control over the closing of the woods during the drought season; and

"Whereas such a statute that compels the small counties in the Adirondack Forest Preserve to pay this expense is unjust and unfair to the taxpayers of these counties; and

"Whereas the users of the woods pay a license fee to the State of New York and the woods are used by residents from all over the State, as well as nonresidents fo the State; and

"Whereas this type of expenditure causes a terrific financial injustice to the taxpayers of the small counties in which the fires happen to occur: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Board of Supervisors of the county of St. Lawrence do hereby protest and do hereby object to this unfair law which is a statute; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the New York State Senate and Assembly hereby consider amending or changing the existing law so as to eliminate this expense of fighting forest fires to an individual county; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the said board of supervisors do hereby request the State senator and State assemblyman from this district to introduce legislation to change the law in relation to the counties bearing half of the cost of fighting forest fires in their respective counties."

On a motion by Mr. Storie, seconded by Mr. Dixson and Mr. Slate, the resolution was unanimously adopted.

I, Charles V. Fox, clerk of the St. Lawrence County Board of Supervisors, do hereby certify that the above is a true copy of the resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of St. Lawrence County on February 14, 1966.

Charles V. Fox,
Clerk, St. Lawrence County Board of Supervisors.

Steuben County Resolution

Resolution urging legislation in regard to purchase by municipalities of surplus or used equipment, upon the recommendation of the highway committee and the insurance and laws committee

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

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

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

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

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

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

Resolved, That the clerk of this board of supervisors is directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to Senator William T. Smith, to Assemblyman Charles D. Henderson, to Congressman Charles Goodell, to Senator Jacob Javits and to Senator Robert Kennedy.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR McNAMARA, OF MICHIGAN

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is with deep regret that I have heard of the pending retirement from the Senate of Senator Pat McNamara, of Michigan, on grounds of ill health.

I have never known a more honorable, candid, or forthright man. Senator McNamara speaks his mind without guile or craft and votes his convictions without fear or favor.

He is like the Rock of Gibraltar—a tower of integrity. He is also a brave and uncomplaining man. The Senate is the better for his service, and so is the country.

We shall miss him, and so will the Nation.

REDUCTION OF SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF THE VERMONT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution of the Vermont State Board of Education under date of February 23, 1966, in opposition to the reduction of the appropriation for the special school milk program for fiscal 1966 and the reduction in the President's budget for fiscal 1967 in the appropriation for the school lunch and special milk programs, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

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

Resolution of the Vermont State Board of Education

The Vermont State Board of Education at its regular meeting, February 11, 1966, unanimously voted the following resolution:

"Whereas the Federal Bureau of the Budget has reduced the appropriation for the special milk program for fiscal 1966; and

"Whereas the President's budget for fiscal 1967 proposes drastic cuts in the appropriations for school lunch and special milk programs, and

"Whereas the Vermont State Board of Education unanimously feels that both the school lunch and special milk programs are vital to the children of America and hence to the future of the Nation: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Vermont State Board of Education opposes any reduction in the appropriations for these programs; and

"That the Vermont State Board of Education believes that Federal appropriations for these programs should be increased, commensurate with the growth of both programs; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Vermont delegation in the Congress and the Office of the President of the United States."

Richard A. Gibboney,
Commissioner of Education and Secretary to the State Board of Education.

THE WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA CUTS THE GRANTS FOR LAND-GRANT COLLEGES SUCH AS THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a source of pride to all Alaskans is the University of Alaska located at College, Alaska, a few miles west of downtown Fairbanks. The university dates from 1915, when the U.S. Congress set aside land for the support of an agricultural college and school of mines. This land-grant college opened for instruction in 1922 under the presidency of Charles E. Bunnell, previously a Federal judge. It was a small school, and remained so in

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

the years before the war, but performed a unique task then, as it does today, for it is the only institution of higher learning in the United States that serves, within the scope of its resources, all of public educational needs, beyond high school, of an entire State. It became the University of Alaska in 1935 by action of the territorial legislature.

In number of students, as compared to other universities in the United States, the University of Alaska is a small but rapidly growing institution. Apart from the main campus, it operates six community colleges in cities throughout the State, and in four of those communities, it offers the only education programs above the high school level. In terms of activities in research and advanced study, it is burgeoning—its institute of arctic biology, its geophysical institute, the arctic research laboratory, are making valuable contributions to the advancement of knowledge of our planet.

The 1967 Federal budget, which purported to allow both guns and "the high priced spread" would sharply curtail these activities. The new budget would eliminate $39,276 in the Alaska Agriculture Experiment Station funds for research conducted jointly by the University and the Department of Agriculture. This cut, coupled with the budget's failure to provide funds for continued agriculture research in Alaska, amounting to $400,000 last year, will force the experiment station in Palmer to close. This station has developed a potato that can compete favorably with imported potatoes—those locally grown had a high water content attributed to the extensive hours of growth under the long daylight of northern latitudes. Also just announced by the Palmer station is a new variety of grass that will be of utmost importance to our dairy industry. It is vitally important that we in Alaska develop other products, for we are almost solely dependent upon air freight for the greater share of our fresh vegetables. Unless these funds are restored—if we are forced to close our research station, our harvest in many years to come will suffer, this is but another of the bitter fruits produced by the war in southeast Asia and nurtured by the ever-increasing escalation of our military efforts there.

Equally tragic is the drastic cutback in funds for instruction and facilities in land grant institutions. Here the University of Alaska is losing over $230,000. This means that if the average salary of an instructor in Alaska is $10,000, we will lose 23 instructors. Some programs will have to be eliminated. Others may of necessity be cut back or held at their present levels.

In a State that is noted for its richness in natural resources. Yet we consider our most important natural resource an educated populace. If we must sacrifice something to bear the burden of the wholly unnecessary undeclared war in Vietnam let the sacrifice be made in other areas that we can more readily afford—not in the education of our youth. They will be sacrificed both at home and abroad by the southeast Asian folly. These funds should be restored.

ELECTORAL COLLEGE—REFORM OR RETREAT?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, this morning the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary opened hearings on the question of reforming the electoral college. It was my privilege to present testimony today in behalf of my proposal, Senate Joint Resolution 12.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD my testimony before the committee in behalf of Senate Joint Resolution 12, which is cosponsored by Senators STROM THURMOND, Republican, of South Carolina; JOHN MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas; ROMAN HRUSKA, Republican, of Nebraska; THRUSTON MORTON, Republican, of Kentucky; PETER DOMINICK, Republican, of Colorado; HIRAM FONG, Republican, of Hawaii; J. CALEB BOGGS, Republican, of Delaware; JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi; and WINSTON PROUTY, Republican, of Vermont to provide for the election of presidential electors by the district system.

There being no objection, the testimony of Senator MUNDT was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to appear before this subcommittee on the question of electoral college reform. This is an issue with which I have been closely associated since 1953 when I joined with former Representative Frederic R. Coudert, of New York, in introducing legislation which would elect presidential electors from districts within a State rather than from a State as a whole.

Such a plan did not originate with us, although it has been popularly called the Mundt-Coudert plan, for it was in fact originally advocated by such early and mightier statesmen as James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, and John Quincy Adams.

I point this out to emphasize that the need for such a plan has always existed although it has never been formally adopted. At least it has never been adopted on a national basis which would be the only fair way of utilizing such a procedure. I believe that today the need is even greater than it has been in the past.

As the result of Supreme Court decisions in *Baker* v. *Carr*, and of particular significance to the question of electoral districts, *Wesberry* v. *Sanders*, a profound change has occurred in our system of representation—a change that has provided us with both the increased need for equalization within our presidential electoral process and the vehicle to achieve that equalization.

Mr. Chairman, at a later point I will go into this matter of *Wesberry* v. *Sanders* and the subsequent redistricting of congressional districts so that they will be as equal in population as practical in more detail. I will also cover the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 12; much of what I will say has been said before—the last time in 1961 before this same subcommittee. I note, however, that very few of the same members are present as the certainties of time and the uncertainties of elections have taken their toll.

For the present, let me say that I agree with James MacGregor Burns who has written: "Most Americans, regardless of party, are agreed on the failings of the electoral college. It is unfair, inaccurate, uncertain, and undemocratic. Unfair, because the presidential candidate losing a State by even a close margin forfeits all of that State's electoral votes. Inaccurate, because in most elections the winner's electoral votes are inflated grotesquely out of proportion to his popular vote. Uncertain, because presidential electors are not legally bound to vote for the candidate who carries the State. And undemocratic, because if no candidate wins a majority of the electoral college the verdict is rendered in the House of Representatives, where each State delegation, no matter how large, casts but a single vote in choosing among the three top candidates."

Senate Joint Resolution 12, in my estimation, is the only plan proposed which would correct these inequities without making basic changes in our constitutional system. It would correct the unfairness by eliminating the general ticket system. It would correct the inaccuracy because it would bring the electoral vote in line with the popular vote. It would correct the uncertainty because it would bind the presidential electors to the winning candidate. It would correct the undemocratic factors because it provides for a greater voice for the larger States should Congress be forced to name the President in the event no candidate wins a majority of the electoral college.

I stress this totality of correction for I believe that the amending process of the Constitution should never be used to confirm error; it should only be used to correct it and now that we have an opportunity to reexamine the electoral process for the President of the United States we should do a thorough job of it and get to the real root of the problem which is the general ticket system. This is not to say that I do not agree with some of the proposals advanced by President Johnson or that none of them are desirable. On the contrary, Senate Joint Resolution 12 includes some of them, and could be modified, I believe, to include others. The real problem, however, is not the fact that the electors are not bound to follow the will of the majority—a situation that has occurred only 8 out of a possible 14,554 times since 1820, or that certain gaps exist should the election be thrown into the House of Representatives—a situation that hasn't occurred since 1824 and has only happened twice in the history of our Nation. The real problem is the inequality of the voting power of the citizens of the various States—a situation which occurs every 4 years.

This is the main theme of my proposal and it can be summed up in one sentence:

I believe, and I hope you believe, and think you believe that every voter in this country as an individual, whether he lives in California, Delaware, New York, or South Dakota, ought to have equal voting power when it comes to electing the President of the United States.

This is the only important respect in which our electoral college system, so-called, has failed to function with fairness. It has stood the practical test of time since our country was established. It has carried us through 45 presidential elections, through peace and war, from George Washington to Lyndon B. Johnson. It was after the 4th presidential election that the 12th amendment was added to the Constitution to require presidential electors to vote specifically for President and Vice President, rather than, as the original provision provided, for two persons for President. Since then, 40 presidential elections have been held. It is obvious, therefore, that any system that has functioned so well for so long should not be changed lightly. Changes proposed or made should be the absolute minimum required to bring about the desired and necessary results.

Such minimum and wholly practical and necessary changes are proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 12, which I am sponsoring together with Senators THURMOND, MCCLELLAN, HRUSKA, MORTON, DOMINICK, FONG, BOGGS, STENNIS, and PROUTY. This is a

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Large diesel equipped cargo vessels recently launched

Name of ship	Yard No.	Owners	Builders	Tonnage deadweight	Machinery	B.H.P.	Speed knots
Cantuaria (cargo)	701B7	Comissao de Marinha Mercante	Verolme Estaleiros Reunis do Brasil	10,560/12,530	Verolme-M.A.N	8,400	18.4
Apj Ambika (cargo liner)	375	Apcejay Lines, Surrendra Overseas	Rheinstahl Nordseewerke	15,000	M.A.N	8,400	16.0
Oriental Queen (cargo liner)	809	Malaysia Marine Corp	Uraga Heavy Industries Co	12,500	Uraga-Sulzer	12,800	19.5

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

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

REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK BILL ENDORSED BY STATE GOVERNMENT OF CALIFORNIA AND BY PIONEER CONSERVATION GROUP, SAVE THE REDWOODS LEAGUE

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

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

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

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
February 24, 1966.

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

Confirmation of telegram sent yesterday.

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

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

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

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

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Governor of California.

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

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

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

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.
February 24, 1966.

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

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

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

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

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

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

A RECORD OF MISJUDGMENT

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

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

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

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

Furthermore, at this same committee hearing when questioned regarding the then civilian Prime Minister of the Saigon government, Quat, he stated he was certain this government was stable and would not be overthrown by a coup. Evidently, General Taylor's guess was fantastically wrong, or if based on information furnished by our CIA, his intelligence was bad. The committee records show his answers. The facts are that within the following 48 hours, before General Taylor left the United States for Vietnam, 10 generals operating one of those frequent Saigon coups, overturned the civilian Prime Minister and shortly thereafter the present Prime Minister, Ky, was installed by these generals.

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

The chairman in South Vietnam of the National Liberation Front, so-called, is Nguyen Huu Tho, a Saigon lawyer, who, it is stated, is not a Communist. This National Liberation Front was formed years ago. It is said the Vietcong military units come under its direction. Also, it has representatives at Hanoi and at the capitals of other Asiatic, African, and European nations. Of course, if

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

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

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

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

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

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

Builders	Name of ship	Type	Owner	Tonnage deadweight	Engine-builders and design	Engine data	B.H.P.	Service speed knots
			UNITED KINGDOM					
Charles Connell & Co. (Shipbuilders).	Beuledi	Cargo liner	Ben Line Steamers	13,000	Barclay, Curle-Sulzer	9RD90	20,700	21.0
Austin & Pickersgill	Exning	Cargo	Atlantic Shipping & Trading Co.	16,000	Clark-Sulzer	6RD76	9,600	17.0
	Inishowen Head	Cargo liner	Head Line	10,050	do	6RD76	9,600	17.0
	Australia Star	do	Blue Star Line	11,600	Vickers-Sulzer	8RD90	17,600	19.0
Burntisland Shipbuilding Co.	Tenbury	Cargo	Alexander Shipping Co	11,620	Brown-Sulzer	6RD76	9,600	16.0
Wm. Doxford & Sons (Shipbuilders).	Aliki Livanos	do	Monrovia Tramp Shipping Co.	16,520	Doxford	67PT6	9,000	15.8
John Readhead & Sons	Sharistan	Cargo liner	Strick Line	12,100	do	67PT6	10,000	17.0
	Floristan	do	do	12,100	do	67PT6	10,000	17.0
Swan, Hunter & Wigham Richardson.	Southhampton Castle.	do	British & Commonwealth Shipping Co.	11,120	Wallsend-Sulzer	8RD90	2X17,600	22.5
	Good Hope Castle	do	do	11,120	do	8RD90	2X17,600	22.5
			BRAZIL					
Ishikawagima do Brasil	Puebla	Cargo	Comissao de Marinha Mercante.	13,000	Ishibras-Sulzer	7RD68	7,700	15.3
	Presidente Kennedy	do	do	13,000	do	7RD68	7,700	15.3
			DENMARK					
Nakskov Shipyard	Ancona	Cargo liner	East Asiatic Co	9,390/12,770	B. & W	1074VT 2BF160.	15,000	20.8
			FRANCE					
At. et Ch. de la Seine Maritime	Ville de Lyon	do	Nouvelle Cie. Harvraise Peninsulaire.	12,000	Antlantique B. & W	874VT 2BF160.	12,000	19.0
			GERMANY					
Blohm & Voss	Hammonia	do	Hamburg-America Line	12,544	M.A.N	K9Z86/160	18,900	21.0
	Alemannia	do	do	12,544	M.A.N	K9Z86/160	18,900	21.0
	Borussia	do	do		M.A.N	K9Z86/160	18,900	21.0
Deutsche Werft	Tabora	Cargo	Deutsche Afrika Linien	13,500	M.A.N	K6Z78/155	9,600	18.2
	Talana	do	do	10,400	M.A.N	K6Z78/155	9,600	19.0
H. C. Stülcken Sohn	Republica del Equador.	Cargo liner	Flota Mercante Gran Colombiana.	12,450	Sulzer	9RD76	14,400	19.0
			HOLLAND					
Rotterdam Dockyard Co	Moerdijk	do	Holland-American Line	12,500	Stork	SW6x85/170B	14,000	18.5
			JAPAN					
Hitachi Shipbuilding & Engineering Co.	Straat Futami	do	Royal Interocean Lines	12,068	Hitachi-B & W	684VT2 BF180.	13,500	19.0
	Straat Fushimi	do	do	11,878	do	684VT2 BF180.	13,500	19.0
Kawasaki Dockyard	Tennessee Maru	Cargo	Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha	11,550	Kawasaki-M.A.N	K9Z70/120C	11,250	17.3
	Denmark Maru	do	do	10,600	do	K8Z70/120C	10,000	17.5
	Holland Maru	do	do	10,500	do	K8Z70/120C	10,000	17.5
Mitsubishi H.I	Ise Maru	Cargo liner	Nippon Yusen Kaisha	12,500	Mitsubishi-Sulzer	6RD90	15,000	15.0
	Yamagata Maru	do	do	12,800	Mitsubishi		13,000	19.5
Namura Shipbuilding Co	Rio de Janeiro Maru	do	Mitsui O.S.K. Lines	11,470	Mitsubishi-Sulzer	6RD68	7,200	15.4
	Iyo Maru	do	Nippon Yusen K.K	12,500	Yokohama-M.A.N	K6Z78/140D	10,000	18.2
Nippon Kokan K.K	Ibargi Maru	Cargo	Nippon Yusen Kaisha	12,500	Mitsubishi-M.A.N	K6Z78/140D	10,000	18.2
			SWEDEN					
Uddevallavarvet A/B	London Citizen	do	London & Overseas Freighters.	15,120	Uddevalla-Götaverken.	760/1500 VGS8U.	10,000	17.5
			YUGOSLAVIA					
Brodogradiliste Uljanik	Dmitri Gulia	do	U.S.S.R	12,000	Uljanik-B & W	874VT2 BF160.	12,000	18.4
	Nazim Khikmet	do	U.S.S.R	12,000	do	874VT2 BF160.	12,000	18.4
	Alexandr Grin	do	U.S.S.R	12,000	do	874VT2 BF160.	12,000	18.4
	Arkadij Gaidar	do	U.S.S.R	12,000	do	874VT2 BF160.	12,000	18.4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

there are negotiations to bring about peace, it would be futile to give in to the demands of Air Marshal Ky of the Saigon government and bar representatives of the Vietcong. There can be no cease-fire or armistice secured at the conference table unless representatives of the Vietcong are present as delegates independent of the delegates of the Hanoi and Saigon governments.

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

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

A LONG RECORD OF MISJUDGMENT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY REFORM

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

He said that the "really important issue" for the longer term in keeping international payments system functioning smoothly was "whether arrangements can be made to insure that the maintenance of a balance in the U.S. international accounts will not have harmful effects on the world economy."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

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

PERILS OF RESTRAINTS

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

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

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

TWO-THIRDS APPROVAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The United States has had a long succession of large and, until last year, growing surpluses on current account. Its overall payments imbalance has been caused principally by large outflows of public funds and increased outflows of private capital, stemming in part from the dominant position that the United States holds in the world's capital markets. These outflows have been of great benefit to all the recipient countries—especially to the developing countries—and the need has been to achieve

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

in support of programs designed to overcome any racial imbalance in the public schools: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio.

Authority of February 21, 1966:

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

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

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

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

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

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

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

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

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

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. SCOTT:

Article entitled "National AME Church Sets 150th Celebration of Anniversary," published in the Philadelphia Independent of February 11.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Speech entitled "Marketing the Northwest," delivered by Reed O. Hunt, chairman of the board, Crown Zellerbach Corp., delivered on February 15, 1966.

Essay entitled "Autobiography of a Bill," written by Marianne Williams.

Article entitled "Puget Sound: What It Is," written by Don Page, and published in a recent edition of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer.

By Mr. COOPER:

Editorial entitled "A Resolution of Patriotic Reminder," dealing with the proposed designation of February as American history month.

Articles dealing with the appointment of Miss Molly Clowes as editorial page editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal.

Articles dealing with the award of Freedom Leadership Medal to Dr. James Turpin.

SENTIMENT ABOUT VIETNAM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

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

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

Last week, at the University of Missouri in Columbia, it was announced that 50 persons were expected to take part in protesting our policies in Vietnam. I am told, however, that not more than 10 actually participated at any one time.

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

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

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

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

VIETNAM PETITION

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

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

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

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

SIGNERS

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

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

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

Mike Smith, Michael Watkins, Ellen M. Kane, Dianne A. Taus, C. T. South, Anne T. Clark, Liz Manson, Alice A. Templeton, Robert F. Striken, Thomas S. Patten, Jennie Myers, Judith E. Turner, David W. Gardner, Ellen Sue Zigel, Frances E. Wilson, Mary J. Hagan, Carolyn M. Kaiser, Michael L. Villain, Richard Fredman, James V. Schwent, Thomas Lee Siffin, Paul Andrews, Toni Rewick, Loran, Maloney, William Gordon Culver.

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

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

William Gerry Brumfield, Thomas B. Allen, Donald C. Gerhardt, Kenneth R. Ray, James Edward Turner, Robert Eugene Heater, John M. Glanino, David Radunsky, Edward M. Wheat, Ronald N. Lingo, Mike Walters, Tom Haynes, Roger S. Mixtar, Mike Gibbons, Irving W. Kurtz, Lawrence R. Lemer, Mike Kuppel,

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

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

License they mean when they cry liberty.

As summed up by one religious periodical:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We have come to expect periodic outbursts from the American public at the Supreme Court's decisions dealing with obscenity. The people are rightly concerned. Our society is in the middle of an anti-Puritan revolution in morals. Any writer who manages to shock is automatically entitled to respect as a worthy rebel. William Phillips, editor of the Partisan Review, has labeled the heroes of today's avant-garde as "the new immoralists." He adds: "To embrace what is assumed to be beyond the pale is taken as a sign of true sophistication. And this is not simply a change in sensibility; it amounts to sensibility of chaos."

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

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

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

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

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

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

PROMOTION OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 489

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

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

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

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

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON THE DESK FOR COSPONSORS

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

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

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONORS OF BILL AND RESOLUTION

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

Authority of February 16, 1966:

S. 2928. A bill to amend title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to authorize the Commissioner of Education to provide technical assistance and grants to school boards

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Derrell Andrews, Robert Lee Hill, Edwin W. Joem, Gary Stitt, Stephen J. Levitch, Neal D. Warren, Roy G. Cappell, Robert T. Eppelson.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ronald W. James, Burt E. Deacock, Arthur H. William, Michael Woods, Thomas Wayne Mitchell, Wm. H. McKnight, Jr., Robert Pile, Bruce Lordfather, Charles Ervin, Karen Kay

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Thomson, Ronald R. Reagan, Barbara Crevello, Michelle C. Wilson, Robert N. Gould, Beverly D. Fields, Jerry L. Davenport, Ron Farley, Joan Powell, Tahy Stein, Mike Woodall, Henry Blair, Bill McBride, Virginia Mooney, Karen Mitchell, Bill Hynes.

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

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

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

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

Michael E. Engel, John Wedleston, Mary Ellen Kirberg, Douglas Jones, Mike Alexander, Billy C. Dunehew, Terry G. Hayden, Michael Tellman, Perry Mudd, Jerry Fillmore, Kay Lang, Delmar Heinke, David Brown, U.S. MCR, Richard K. Lucy, Sid A. Trojahen, Richard John Ohanesian, Glenn Germann, Sandra Lante, Frank G. Mays, II, Dick Newman, Gary W. Flick, John L. Walker, Ted Warmbold, Bruce Downey.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I noticed in the Baltimore Sun of this morning the following headline: "U.S. Paratrooper Company Beaten Decisively." Now there are a great many young Americans in South Vietnam. Those I have talked to were glad to be there. Perhaps a few were not. But none of them are primarily responsible for being there, and I would hope the Senate would do everything in its power to in turn do its part by sending everything needed to help these young Americans as they wage this war in South Vietnam.

EXPANSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

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

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

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

The Commission should not, to my mind, devote itself only to new recommendations but could very well evaluate those recommendations of the former

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

has in proportion to its population, 360,000 Americans would have been wiped out in 3 years.

That fact explains more than just why the Vietcong went to such great lengths Tuesday to assassinate the chief of Le My, a showcase village in the U.S. marines' pacification program. It also sheds light on why the Vietnamese conflict in such a long, hard, dirty war.

It helps explain, for instance, why the Vietcong is so tenacious. In a complex society such as that of the United States where no man is indispensable, there can be a smooth transition from one administration to the next such as the one that took place after the assassination of President Kennedy. In a simple society such as Vietnam, however, where experienced administrators are at a premium and decisionmaking must consequently be more centralized, the loss of just one public official can be much more disruptive.

It helps explain why U.S. bombing attacks haven't been as effective as was hoped, at least not so far. The Vietcong likely feels that as long as it can decapitate South Vietnam's social structure by assassinating public officials, it can lose a score of troops for every administrator it murders and still be ahead of the game.

It helps explain why the United States has refused to include the Vietcong in any peace negotiations. Among other reasons, there is an understandable reluctance on the part of representatives of a nation with a strict code of military conduct to sit at the same table with men whose hands are stained with the blood of innocent civilians.

It also helps explain why the United States is having so much trouble winning the war. To us, life is not cheap and we would never think of stooping to assassination just as we have refrained from bombing civilian targets in North Vietnam.

Does this mean the United States is fighting a war it cannot win?

Not necessarily. Atrocities are nothing new in the history of human conflict, and as the Nuremberg trials and the more recent fate of Adolf Eichmann demonstrate, sooner or later there comes a day of reckoning for war criminals.

Moreover, during the 1948–60 guerrilla war in Malaya, 2,473 civilians were slaughtered compared to 1,865 casualties among the security forces. But such tactics did not prevent the British and Malayans from defeating the Communists.

COMMENDATION OF VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY

(Mr. KING of Utah (at the request of Mr. WHITE of Texas) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, President Lyndon B. Johnson is a most unusual man, using the term in its complimentary sense. A decision recently made by him is particularly worthy of commendation, the decision to make Vice President HUMPHREY, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Director of the AID Program, and other high Government officials available to the Members of Congress to give them an in-depth briefing on their Vietnamese visits.

The most unusual feature of this operation is the fact that the Vice President has been so completely available and so completely forthright. Every Congressman who has so desired, has had a chance to talk to him. Every question asked has been answered.

The atmosphere on Capitol Hill during the past week has been one of complete candor. I for one feel that this has created a most healthy situation. I congratulate President Johnson on his newest diplomatic tour de force, and reassure the Nation that on Capitol Hill no effort is being spared to get the facts.

NOTICE TO HOUSE MEMBERS ON REPRINTING OF UKRAINIAN DAY PROGRAM

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the 48th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence, a private order is being submitted for reprint publication of all statements and other insertions made by House Members prior to, during, and after the January 22, 1966, event, which was observed in the House on January 25, 1966.

If there is no objection from any such Member, his or her statement or insertion will be incorporated in the reprint brochure, which has been requested by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

U.S. AIRPOWER SHOULD NOT HAVE CLIPPED WINGS

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida (at the request of Mr. WHITE of Texas) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, U.S. ground forces in South Vietnam are operating under difficult circumstances, yet our ground troops are under orders to fight to the finish.

Ironically, where the United States has definite superiority, in the air over North Vietnam, U.S. airpower has its wings clipped. American airmen are subject to careful review of air targets prior to bombing missions, and many targets are spared even though they may have definite military importance to North Vietnam.

If U.S. ground troops are told to fight to win, similar standards should be applied to the use of U.S. airpower over North Vietnam.

The President has stated that the United States will honor its commitment to defeat communism in Vietnam. Let our commitment allow no room for sanctuary in North Vietnam, but be carried out with the same resolution in the air that our military forces now use on the ground.

PROTECTION TO DESERT LAND ENTRIES

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

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which is designed to protect the claims of those who had rights to desert land entries before the Secretary of Interior ruled last year that there was not sufficient water from the Colorado River to allow the desert land entries to be cultivated.

Desert land laws permit an individual to obtain title to as much as 320 acres of publicly owned land if certain conditions are met. One important condition is that a water supply be available in an amount sufficient to make the lands agriculturally productive.

Under the law at least $3 per acre must be spent on reclamation by the landpower within 3 years after the entry is filed. By the end of 4 years at least one-eighth of the land must be under cultivation.

Under the Maggie Havens ruling in 1923 the Department of Interior suspended the time limits prescribed by desert land laws on certain lands until water for irrigation becomes available.

The Secretary of the Interior on December 2, 1965, determined that insufficiency of water in the Colorado River to meet all the demands of the basin users required him to take action to terminate some 250 desert land entries principally in Imperial Valley, Calif.

Whatever the gravity of the Colorado River water supply, I believe the pioneers and their descendants who have sought to develop these desert land entries since the early decade of this century should be protected in their opportunity to hold their land when water does become available.

As a participant in the Interior Committee hearings on the lower Colorado River, I am well aware of the needs of protecting and augmenting our very valuable water supply. That is why I have urged immediate studies on the possibilities of importing water from the Northwest to replenish the supply of the Colorado River since California's use of Colorado River water for agriculture today approximates the allotment under the seven-party agreement.

The action of the Secretary last December has brought home in the starkest possible way the grim necessity of enacting Colorado River legislation which will augment the Lower Colorado River Basin supply.

In the meantime I am introducing this bill to preserve the desert land entrymens right to perfect their entries when sufficient water becomes available.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KEE (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for February 24, 1966, on account of official business in his district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON), for 40 minutes, on March 1; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

critics of our policy, both in and out of Congress, are saying. A president can be right and the entire country disagree with him. Or he may be wrong and still enjoy mass approbation.

We have an obligation to answer these arguments. On one side some advocate at worst, complete surrender—that we get out right away. At best, they guise this defeatism in an enclave theory which would effectively give the bulk of the country over to the Communists and leave us isolated.

Others advocate mass bombing. They want us to take the war to the Chinese mainland. Their intension is honorable. The result would be devastation, but not victory. And their proposals might unleash a world war.

Disparate as these critics are in the solutions they propose, they are similar in their eagerness to be relieved of the burdens of world leadership. They both want us to get the whole thing over with. Both views smack of the sentiments of Prime Minister Chamberlain. Mr. Chamberlain once spoke to the British nation and I quote: "Of a quarrel in a far-away country between people of whom we know nothing—why should we get involved?"

This was appeasement. The result was 6 years of the bloodiest war in the history of mankind. That appeasement would work was a myth then—it remains a myth now.

These critics despair too soon. We have been in South Vietnam in force for a scant 6 months. Only now is our presence being felt. Six months ago, village after village was being surrounded and overcome, and the government forces had retreated to the town squares and to the city of Saigon itself. Today, many of the villages have been retaken and pacified. More than that, the people know that we are there. They know that we intend to stay as long as necessary. The impact is one of enormous significance.

Just over a month ago I was in Vietnam. I went there to see for myself. I saw the condition of the country. I saw the magnitude of the job. I saw that we were doing that job.

I was impressed by the will of the Vietnamese people. But I must pause to tell you about our magnificent men. Our forces are extremely able, alert, and intelligent. Most of the men in our Armed Forces today are high school graduates. Most of our officers are college graduates. Most of them are trained in government, in economics and political systems. And most of them, thank God, understand the philosophical and political threat of communism so that they know what the war is all about. The morale of our men is tremendous. Inspiring is the only word for it. They know why we are there. They know what we must do. And they have the ability and will to do it.

What then are the prospects for immediate victory? Victory in this instance is not like that of a conventional war, in that it must mean the containment of communism, and this will undoubtedly take time and effort and sacrifice. But the stakes are enormous.

I recall as vividly as any experience of my life, the days of the Cuban crisis. You may remember that Congerss had just adjourned and President Kennedy summoned all of the congressional leaders back to Washington. There in the Cabinet Room of the White House he outlined in detail the Russian missile threat to the United States. For one terrible week the Nation looked down the nuclear barrel. On the Monday after the Sunday morning that Khrushchev wrote his letter to the President indicating withdrawal of the missiles, President Kennedy said, at his final briefing: "The military threat of Russia is receding. Now the threat will come from Communist China as it develops the hydrogen bomb."

Two years later, almost to the day, gathered in the same room, with almost the same people, with the exception of President Kennedy, President Johnson briefed us on the explosion of the first nuclear device in China. There were many questions directed at Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara. One prevailed above all the others What threat does this pose to the free world? The answer came back, candid and brief: Very little as of now, but a major and dangerous one 10 years from now, baring no change in the aggresive government now dominant in China.

And as I talked with our leaders in Vietnam and Saigon, these meetings kept recurring in my mind.

So this is the ultimate challenge of Vietnam. Whether we turn back the threat now or whether we repeat the events of other days and ultimately face a China infinitely stronger than it is today and determined to conquer the rest of mankind.

This is the challenge, but what of the future? Our objectives are clear. We intend to contain communism in Vietnam. We do not believe that the Communists will stop unless we stand firm. Thus, we are erecting a wall. Not a wall of brick and stone and barbed wire, but a wall of will and resolution.

Yet, at the same time, I want to assure you that President Johnson is doing everything possible to get the Vietnam conflict to the conference table where we can achieve a just and honorable settlement. Our emissaries range the world for peace. Now we take our search for peace into a new forum at the United Nations.

We will stay in Vietnam no longer than is necessary. We seek no territory or bases. We support free elections in South Vietnam if they can be conducted in peace and without Communist intimidation.

The problem is, as the most recent pronouncements from Hanoi so graphically reveal, that the Communists do not yet want peace. They still think they can win.

Our enemies hope that we are a callow Nation. They confuse our reluctance to accept our destiny of world leadership with lack of resolve and thus call us a paper tiger. They hope that we will be unwilling to bear the weight of world leadership when the mantle grows heavy. They dream that the mightiest Nation in the world, with a gross national product of nearly three-quarters of a trillion dollars, will fall for the spurious aternative of guns or butter. They hope that the Democratic Party, fearful of being characterized as a war party, will hesitate to conduct our Vietnam policy with vigor. They cling to the vain expectation that our national determination will crumble.

In conclusion, let me quote from the address made by President Johnson at the Johns Hopkins University in April 1965:

"We fight because we must fight if we are to live in a world where every country can shape its own destiny. And only in such a world will our own freedom be finally secure.

"The first reality is that North Vietnam has attacked the independent nation of South Vietnam. Its object is total conquest.

"Over this war, and all Asia, is another reality: The deepening shadow of Communist China. The rulers in Hanoi are urged on by Peiping. This is a regime which has destroyed freedom in Tibet, attacked India, and been condemned by the United Nations for aggression in Korea. It is a nation which is helping the forces of violence in almost every continent.

"Why are we in South Vietnam?

"We are there because we have a promise to keep. Since 1954 every American President has offered support to the people of South Vietnam. We have helped to build, and we have helped to defend. Thus, over the years, we have made a national pledge to help South Vietnam defend its independence. And I intend to keep that promise.

"We are also there to strengthen world order. To leave Vietnam to its fate would shake the confidence of all these people in the value of American commitment, the value of America's word. The result would be increased unrest and instability, and even wider war.

"We are there because there are great stakes in the balance. Let no one think for a moment that retreat from Vietnam would bring an end to the conflict. The battle would be renewed in one country and then another. The central lesson of our time is that the appetite of aggression is never satisfied.

"There are those who wonder why we have a responsibility there. We have it for the same reason we have a responsibility for the defense of the freedom of Europe. World War II was fought in both Europe and Asia and when it ended, we found ourselves with continued responsibility for the defense of freedom.

"Our objective is the independence of South Vietnam, and its freedom from attack. We want nothing for ourselves, only that the people of South Vietnam be allowed to guide their own country in their own way.

"It should also be clear that the only path for reasonable men is the path of peaceful settlement.

"Such peace demands an independent South Vietnam securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationships to all others, free from outside interference, tied to no alliance, a military base for no other country."

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

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

ATROCITIES NOTED

(Mr. KING of Utah (at the request of Mr. WHITE of Texas) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly impressed by some figures I read recently in the Salt Lake City Deseret News. It pointed out:

If the United States had as many mayors, police chiefs, and other government administrators assassinated as South Vietnam has in proportion to its population, 360,000 Americans would have been wiped out in 3 years.

The paper states that this throws light "on why the Vietnamese conflict is such a long, hard, dirty war."

Atrocities are nothing new in the history of human conflict, the paper continues. It adds:

Such tactics did not prevent the British and Malayans from defeating the Communists.

I suggest that this article is worth study, and I include it in the RECORD:

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Deseret News, Feb. 16, 1966]

CAN WE WIN IN VIETNAM?

If the United States had as many mayors, police chiefs, and other governmental administrators assassinated as South Vietnam

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

come principally in the area of schooling. The emphasis has been derived largely from the almost universal disdain of top officials in the Office of Economic Opportunity for the present American educational system.

The antipoverty program's most ambitious new educational method is the Job Corps, which itself amounts to a new and experimental, coexistent high school system. It has been discussed in earlier articles in this series.

Outside the Job Corps, the teaching methods employed in antipoverty projects have not been especially inventive or distinctive, least of all in vocational training. But the OEO is putting a premium on innovation in considering applications for grants, and some new fervor may be seeping into the schools. If there has not been much of acclaim in past performance, there is considerable future promise.

The 25 boys in Project Re-Entry in Syracuse spend 5 mornings a week in class and 5 afternoons at make-work jobs. Their goal is to get back into high school or to acquire an "equivalency certificate." Without either, their job chances are dismal.

These 25 boys are hard-core dropouts. For them, life both in school and out has been a "poor scene." Ralph Mingolelli and William Beard, two former schoolteachers who preside over Re-Entry, were asked how many of their scholars have had brushes with the police. Mingolelli replied, "Put the question the other way," and held up one finger.

Teaching these dropouts is different. The point of departure for morning class discussion may well be one student's claims about his amours the night before. The teacher's day may end at midnight in the police station, rescuing a pupil from whatever mess he has gotten into. Says Mingolelli: "When you want to change the action, become a part of it."

Since Project Re-Entry began last fall, only two have quit the program. Most of the rest will learn to read (passably), to do arithmetic (primitively), and to embrace a life of work (decently).

NEW IDEAS FOR OLD

3. The OEO stakes a great deal on the hope that its new techniques and, of course, its basic approach will prove massively contagious; that new ideas will impinge on old institutions: the schools, the welfare agencies, the hospitals, the community services. In this area, the Washington Post inquirers brought back a mixed verdict.

Some reporters saw a real feedback in the schools, where a premium was being put on original and imaginative programs as a basis for future OEO grants. They noted the number of teachers and school administrators who are as disillusioned with old methods as the OEO officials, and who chafe impatiently to introduce changes.

Others saw remarkable originality and an eagerness to shift gears in church groups, notably Catholic institutions, which are reshaping themselves and their methods of extending service to the poor who surround them.

But some reporters felt that the old guard in schools and welfare services resisted change and plodded along as always, inert and untouched by the novel, strident sound of the voice of the poor.

Some attitudes change hard, or not at all. Annie, a Negro woman in Atlanta who works when she can and goes on relief when she can't, was convinced by her neighborhood aid to look into the opportunities at her nearby center.

On arrival, she was greeted by the same welfare worker, now employed by the center, whom she had dealt with under the old system.

Said the worker: "Well, Annie, here you are, back again."

Annie uttered a terse suggestion, turned on her heel and left.

The reporters believed it likely, however, that the drive behind massive participation would some day force cities' public services, such as the school, health and welfare systems, to accept representatives of the poor as members of their directing boards. And they noted that once new ideas and methods are accepted at the top, they would find their way into effective action below, regardless of the traditionalist attitudes within the agencies.

THE IDEA CATCHES FIRE

4. By far the most important innovation of the war on poverty is its insistence on the involvement of the poor, not merely as hired hands but as planners, originators, coadministrators and critics of the programs.

The number of the participating poor is still in the thousands, but the idea has caught fire. The unanimous view of the Washington Post's team is that its results cannot fail to be enormous: things will never be the same. Their forecast was highly optimistic and usually couched in excited terms.

They believe that enough people have been involved already who will not let go lightly of new found hope, a remarkable resurgence of dignity and, to be frank, a natural inflation of the ego that comes with being a member of this board or an officer of that.

More tangibly, they saw representatives of the poor taking the first timid—and, paradoxically, enormous—steps at telling off members of the power structure, at declaiming their needs, speaking their pieces, and discovering, to their own surprise, growing confidence in their strength.

Above all, the reporters were impressed with the potential of the neighborhood or community action centers organized under citywide "umbrella agencies" in several hundred localities. They forecast that community centers may become one of the great urban institutions of the next generation.

Already they have forced both the poor and the powerful to look much harder at the services the city and welfare agencies offer. They have intensified concern with the schools in particular. Although it was not anticipated, the centers have focused on urban renewal and inadequate, remote, and callous medical services as objects of particular outrage. The community action centers have been innovative in bringing free legal services to the poor. The programs are sensationally popular—and may produce sensational changes.

Community action programs have had especially heartening results in the South, where involvement of the poor means, in practice, involvement of the Negro. Southern moderates—and others who would now like to get off the segregation hook—can find in such programs a quiet way to begin constructive action, working on specific welfare projects side by side with Negroes.

What direction the community action neighborhood centers will take remains to be seen. Civil rights groups are believed to be lurking in the wings, wondering what their role should be. More radical groups must be contemplating their potential.

A new institution has been born—inherent with great promise.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 13, 1966]

PROGRESS IN POVERTY

The administration's well-advertised war against poverty is, on its first year's showing, a remarkable success. Its achievements already justify a forceful and steady expansion of its reach. The series of articles in this newspaper by Alfred Friendly and his colleagues have examined in some detail the nature of these achievements. And they also have shown the very important conditions of success in this enlightened campaign.

It has not worked equally well in every circumstance. The war on poverty is most effective where it involves urban Negroes. It is least effectve where it is dealing with white populations. The Economic Opportunity Act, and all of the reforms that it has set in train, are the direct consequence of the long struggle over civil rights. The people who best comprehend the war against poverty are those who, at least vicariously and emotionally, took part in the civil rights marches and demonstrations.

But among the 30 million Americans defined as impoverished, three-quarters are white. The impact of the Opportunity Act is very largely concentrated upon the most desperately deprived, embittered, and volatile slums. They happen to be heavily Negro. Clearly the Office of Economic Opportunity made the right choice. But it is necessary to understand that a choice was made. It was a choice forced by the limitations of the appropriations and lack of time for organization. But it was a choice that has excluded most of the people termed poor.

The poverty programs offer very little to the elderly, although the elderly comprise nearly a third of the poor families in this country. The great weight of the resources have been thrown into the programs for children and young families. Again, a choice was made.

The poverty programs are fully effective only where mayor and school superintendents welcome them. The cities with big, vigorous community action programs are those in which mayors are urgently attempting to work out a new style of city politics. They are the cities where the old ward organizations are collapsing, and mayors are looking for new lines of communication into the slums and particularly the Negro slums. While the slums want a hearing at city hall, it turns out that the more alert city halls want to hear from the slums. In cities like Detroit and Pittsburgh, the community action organizations are serving this double purpose. Where mayors are indifferent or hostile, as in Chicago or Los Angeles, community action is a meager and hobbled affair. Philadelphia demonstrates the point nicely. Its city hall neither understands nor likes the idea of community action, and Philadelphia's community action programs are hobbled by a lack of leadership and competent staff. But the same city's new school board, elected last fall on a tide of votes for reform, has seized the Opportunity Act and is exploiting it forcefully.

The Economic Opportunity Act has set loose the powerful concept of the participation of the poor, as a bloc, in the affairs of the community. The poor used to have at least the advantage of numbers, but now they are the minority in a hugely middle-class nation. The Opportunity Act has not only provided the professional direction and staffing that this inarticulate bloc must have. It has also set off a great process of soul-searching and reorganization among numberless school systems, welfare agencies, colleges, hospitals, government offices, and political parties. In the long run, these indirect effects may be the most telling.

The war on poverty has generated confidence and aspiration where there was none. To carry it forward will require sturdier support than the President's budget offers. To cut it back now, in this moment of hope, would be a severe misfortune for the whole country.

VN

VIETNAM

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

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues to an editorial appearing in the Washington Post on February 25 con-

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

portunity's phase of the war on poverty will be a ridiculous boutonniere in the lapel of disaster, spurs on a jockey whose horse has dropped dead.

But, assuming a continued high level of the American economy, a team of 8 Washington Post reporters who studied the war on poverty over a 3-week period in more than 20 communities throughout the country is convinced that it can do what it is supposed to do.

Only here and there can it be measured by what it has accomplished so far; but its promise can be measured. It looks enormous.

"CONTROL" BY POOR?

If it is to be realized, however, a handful of formidable problems must be solved:

1. A miasma of confusion still lingers over the famous command that the program be carried out with the "maximum feasible participation" of the poor. These are the most powerful words in the war on poverty; they are also the most plaguing.

To the extent that they are read to mean "control" of the programs by the poor, and to the extent that the purposes of the phrase are conceived of as an end rather than a means, to that extent the program will raise false hopes and kindle crippling fears.

In and out of OEO a kind of mystique has been built up around the conception, an inflation of a magnificent potential into a monster. The real potential is that with "maximum participation" the poor can define their needs and spotlight the inequities that beset them; by organizing their strength they can help themselves carry through remedial projects; by acting politically, in the broad sense of the word, they can induce corrective and helpful action from the powers that be.

DREAM VERSION

The dream version—the pipe dream version—is that the poor can weld themselves into a strident, monolithic political force that can hammer city hall and the establishment into submission, intimidate them by demonstrations, picketing, and more violent measures, and mayhap, take them over.

In a somewhat less extravagant piece of fantasy, some of OEO's theoreticians and many of the poor themselves have taken the phrase to mean that the poor must constitute the majority on the directing boards of each locality's antipoverty program.

The naivete of the first conception, of massive political conquest, needs little demonstration. The evidence is the most solid antagonism that the war on poverty first encountered on this score among the Nation's mayors. It now is happily abated.

COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP

But the practical problems of the second conception, inherent even when the poor are not in the majority but where their participation is too consuming, are almost as fatal. OEO has still to reckon with them effectively.

An antipoverty program in any community cannot be successful unless it is directed by the leadership forces in the community, along with the poor. Usually this means the mayor; it must include the superintendent of schools; it should include other top city department officials, the leaders of the dominant religious organizations, and representatives of the Community Chest agencies; it is lost without delegates from the establishment, i.e., the most influential political and nonpolitical personages in town.

Even at lower levels, where individual antipoverty projects are being conducted—in the schools, the neighborhood centers, the shops, and welfare and counseling offices—the direction of professionals responsible to the citywide agency and the guidance of trained technicians on the staff are indispensable.

2. A second dismaying problem is the prospective reduction in OEO appropriations, and its consequences on the momentum of the war on poverty.

On paper, the requested $1,750 million for OEO next year is larger than its current $1,500 million. In rate of spending, however, it will almost certainly be considerably smaller.

FUNDS SPREAD OUT

The financial details are intricate, but the essence is that the rate at which OEO will be funding projects this spring is far higher than the rate it can maintain throughout fiscal year 1967.

If, after all the ballyhoo and glowing expectations, the tempo of the program is reduced, the psychological impact will be severe and could be ugly, even disastrous. If the muscle is cut, its regeneration is unlikely.

3. OEO has yet to face up squarely and publicly to the curious fact that its program is deplorably fractional and that it appears to have no plans for making it complete. Indeed, OEO seems almost indifferent to the inequity.

ONLY SHOWING GOALS

At best, in a couple of its national programs like Headstart and Neighborhood Youth Corps, it will serve over a year-round period something like 20 percent of those who stand in need of the program. Other ventures, like Job Corps and individual projects in the cities' community action programs, will touch only from 3 to 10 percent of their particular "universes of need."

In a sense, then, the war on poverty is something like a demonstration program, showing that various goals can be achieved but not trying to achieve them in a volume even approaching totality.

It cannot remain indefinitely in that posture, which is completely alien to the American tradition of fairness. A city, strapped for funds, does not give hot school lunches to only half the children that need them, but gives half-adequate lunches to all.

Where will the correction of OEO's all for 10 percent, none for 90 come from?

In theory, if a demonstration or 10 percent sample project proves itself successful in Dubuque, the city fathers of Dubuque will take it over, expand it by 10 and serve the totality of its needy.

But in view of the present state of finances of the average American city, and its nonexistent prospects for much more revenue, nothing could be more unlikely.

FEDERAL FUNDS?

Must the job then be done by Federal funds, expanded 5 to 10 times above the present OEO appropriations? Presumably. But OEO is silent on even whether it will ask Congress for that kind of money in the future. At present, it obviously has no chance.

So the war on poverty functions only in part, like a hospital where the doctors treat only every 10th or 20th patient.

There are many other faults of the war on poverty—maladministration, too hasty and too diffuse operations, corruption, delay, some silly projects, some excess Madison Avenueism. There have been many failures.

All of these are the sort that present irresistible invitations for roaring (and transparently gleeful) complaint by every shrill critic from Congress down to the poverty wards. These categories of criticism have been highly publicized.

What is important about them, however, is that they are correctable, not inherently unsolvable. Which means they are really not important to a total assessment of the potential of the war on poverty.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 13, 1966]

STRONG WEAPONS IN POVERTY WAR

(By Alfred Friendly)

The major claim that the war on poverty directors make for their program is that it is innovative and that the innovations work. If it is not that, it is nothing.

Its newness and usefulness, they assert, lie in its techniques, methods, and general philosophic approach.

A team of Washington Post reporters set out to assess the war on poverty in terms of those claims. Their consensus, very largely positive, follows.

POOR HELP THE POOR

1. The principal new technique that the war on poverty set out to demonstrate was that the poor themselves could operate many of the own welfare projects, thus performing a great portion of the tasks necessary to improve their environment and position. More generally, the concept is that the poor can do a host of jobs hitherto thought to be within the competence only of professionals or well-trained craftsmen—teachers, organizers, office workers, technical assistants.

In Rochester, Herbert M. Greenberg started a demonstration project using neighborhood women—all of them poor, none with much more than grade school education—to teach preschoolers.

The first stage of the project is now underway in the cheerful basement of a church in the Negro area of town. Doing the work are a half dozen of these neighborhood teachers' aids and only two professionally trained child care specialists for 30—soon to be 70—children.

One of the professionals, a singularly pretty young woman named Nancy Lyke, bubbles with enthusiasm. "It's astonishing," she says; "it's the most thrilling thing I've ever done. These girls (the teachers' aids) can do so much more for the children than we could ever do."

"First of all, they can get to the homes and bring the kids in here; second, they can get the mothers involved. Mainly, it is they—and not any middle-class person—who can put across the truly important idea, the project's main purpose going to school is a good thing and school isn't merely another manifestation of that hostile society that the kids' families fear."

Mrs. Lyke referred to the forthcoming employment in the preschool center of a cook, a general manager, clerk-typists, health workers, a bookkeeper, and maintenance workers—all of them without prior training in the skills of their new jobs.

"The use of neighborhood people is just as valuable and feasible in other areas as it is with teacher's aids. They have warmth and understanding, an ease that is utterly lacking among the outsiders. They are our arms into a community where social workers from the red feather agencies failed."

There is little doubt that the war on poverty has proved the point, and it is an important one; workers can be recruited from the ranks of the poor and quickly made competent. In the task ahead—not merely conquering poverty but making the quality of life better for all Americans—there are simply not enough professionals and technicians to go around; "subprofessionals" will be needed by the millions.

However, the Washington Post's team was unanimous and emphatic on one caution: The poor alone, the subprofessionals, are lost in almost every job without the shoulder-to-shoulder cooperation of experts. The ratio need not be high, but one or two "pros" are indispensible. A Nancy Lyke is needed at the top.

STARTING WITH SCHOOL

2. The war on poverty's experiments with new methods in services to the poor have

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

cerning the President's speech upon receiving the National Freedom Award Wednesday evening.

The President in his speech once again clearly and definitely stated the position of the United States regarding the struggle for liberty by the people in South Vietnam. He has once again pointed out the pitfalls of indecision. He has taken a bold step to shatter any possible illusion of a wavering policy the Communists may have received from recent criticisms of our present course.

The President's statement is to be commended as evidence that he is a deserving recipient of the National Freedom Award.

Under unanimous consent, I include this editorial in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 25, 1966]

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

The President made a powerful and persuasive defense of his policies in Vietnam in his address at the National Freedom Award ceremonies in New York Wednesday.

He disposed of the allegation that our objectives are unlimited with a flat "no." He dealt with the repeated expressions of anxiety about deliberate escalation of the war by voicing his own opposition to mindless escalation. He dealt with the hawks who have complained that not enough has been sent to General Westmoreland. He responded to the criticism that we fight alone by citing our allies. He made it plain we will not deliberately widen the war. He again emphasized the pacification program in which social and economic aids will parallel military efforts. He made it clear that we will not impose a coalition government—or any government on the South Vietnamese. He vigorously defended the peace offensive. He wisely put no time limit on American support to South Vietnam. He reviewed again the long train of commitments that brought us to South Vietnam. He closed with the stirring words of President Kennedy: "We shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

It was time that the President restated our ends and reaffirmed our determination. It is not to reproach the critics but only to state a fact of life to say that the on-going debate over policies in South Vietnam has created an impression of irresolution and indecision. Whether it has given any aid to the enemy or not, it probably has given them some comfort. And it has helped confirm the favorite illusion of the Vietcong—that the United States is another broken and bankrupt France that can be driven out of South Vietnam by the collapse of morale at home.

It will not be sufficient to attack this illusion with occasional reassertions of purpose. By act and word we must make it plain, again and again, that we are ready for a long and hard struggle to preserve the right of the South Vietnamese people to determine their own government. The peace offensive and the internal debate no doubt have revived North Vietnam's hopes of imminent American default. It must be made clear to Hanoi that these hopes are false hopes.

WATER POLLUTION

(Mr. FALLON (at the request of Mr. WHITE of Texas) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will carry forth one of the most important programs that this Congress has ever enacted—the cleaning up of our Nation's lakes, streams, rivers, and harbors. This is the greatest single domestic problem that our Nation is facing today. The time is now for a national concerted attack on this problem. The bill which has just been placed in the hopper of this House will carry forth this attack on a wide scale and will continue a program that I have been consistently advocating since the inception of the first Federal program dealing with water pollution several years ago. I was proud at that time to be one of the coauthors of the initial legislation which first began this great program to preserve our Nation's waters. That bill was reported from the Committee on Public Works a number of years ago and eventually became Public Law 660 of the 84th Congress. Since that time, the Committee on Public Works has made several forward-looking changes in the initial legislation and the proposal that I am presenting to the Congress today carries forth the spirit of that program.

It is a tragedy in this day and age to see the waste and spoilage of our Nation's waters. We are all guilty whether we be private or public entities or whether we be a part of the Federal, State, or local governments.

Last year the Water Quality Act of 1965, of which I was a cosponsor and upon which hearings were held before the Committee on Public Works and which is now on the statute books of our Nation, brought into the program the further development of the cooperation we hope to create between Federal, State, and local governments, industry and private citizens to solve this problem. This bill will guide us down that road.

For the information of the Members, there is included a rather brief summary of the four major titles of the bill:

Title I provides a new approach to the water pollution problem. It is aimed at cleaning up entire river basins through the development of comprehensive pollution control and abatement plans for selected river basins, and through grants to assist in financing the development costs of waste treatment works in accordance with the plan. The plan itself will include water-quality standards established under the criteria of the Water Quality Act of 1965, adequate provisions for enforcing those standards, a permanent local or interstate organization to carry out the plan, and adequate local financial programs to assure the maintenance of water quality and future expansion of treatment works.

Title II provides for an attack on the pollution problem on a statewide basis. It authorizes the Secretary to waive the dollar ceilings under the present grant program for waste treatment works, and makes more of the funds available under that program for matching grants. The State, in turn, must agree to match the Federal grants and adopt statewide water-quality standards. The grantee must adopt an adequate financial program to assure maintenance of water quality and a financial program to cover future expansion of treatment works.

Title III amends the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, in three principal ways, as recommended by the President: (a) it doubles the appropriation authorization for grants to State and interstate agencies to formulate, carry out, and enforce water-quality standards meeting the criteria of the Water Quality Act of 1965; (b) it removes the present dollar limitation on pollution control research; and (c) it strengthens the enforcement provisions of the act.

Title IV of the bill enables private citizens to bring suits in Federal courts to obtain relief from pollution in interstate or navigable waters, requires the Secretary of the Interior to consider whether the deposit of refuse matter in navigable waters of the United States is, in each case, consistent with the purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and transfers from the Secretary of the Army to this Department the authority to administer the Oil Pollution Act, 1924.

MARYLAND DAY ADDRESS AT VALLEY FORGE

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

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 13, the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin, mayor of Baltimore, had the honor of representing Governor Tawes at the Maryland State Sunday Service at Valley Forge, Pa. During Mayor McKeldin's 8 years as Governor of Maryland, it was his privilege to speak at these Maryland Day services, and, therefore, he was delighted to return, once again, to this historic shrine to deliver the address of the day.

I hope many Americans, including Members of Congress, read Mayor McKeldin's eloquent address:

ADDRESS OF THEODORE R. MCKELDIN, MAYOR OF BALTIMORE, MARYLAND STATE SUNDAY AT VALLEY FORGE, FEBRUARY 13, 1966

A hundred and eighty-eight years have passed since Washington and his Army underwent the ordeal that has made the name of this place famous in American annals. It is a long time—a hundred and eighty-eight years—but not long enough to dim the glory of their achievement; nor has it diminished, but, rather, increased our amazement at what they were able to endure.

For what they exhibited in the highest degree is the basic military virtue, the foundation on which all the others rest. That virtue is endurance. Without it, the most brilliant tactics, the most desperate courage, the most furious assault, can never win a great war and only partial and transient success in a small one. Valley Forge proved that the force commanded by Washington had the one quality without which no army can become a really great one.

This place was not the scene of any of the brilliant feats of arms that are the subject of legend and song. Not here "the embattled farmers stood and fired the shot heard round the world." It was not here that Sergeant Jasper leaped over the parapet and retrieved the fallen flag. Not here did Washington give the British King the Christmas gift of a shattered mercenary army. Not here did Nathaniel Greene, our American Fabius, slowly wear out an army too strong for him in pitched battle. Nothing happened here except the stoic suffering that proved our men had the highest military virtue of all, the ability to imagine death, but not defeat.

It is appropriate, then, that nearly two centuries later we are still gathering here to celebrate what was demonstrated here, not

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

exultantly with thunder of guns and fanfare of trumpets, but with joy and thankfulness that the men of old were such men, and with a profound resolve that their stout hearts shall not be disgraced by a wavering and quickly discouraged posterity.

For if ability to endure frustration and disappointment, and hope deferred that "maketh the heart sick" meant the salvation of the Nation in 1778, it means the salvation of the world in 1966. If they had failed, the United States of America would never have been born. If we fail, a despairing next generation may well believe that it might as well not have been born, since it lacked the element of survival and therefore raised hopes only to dash them. So it is not unreasonable to say that failure on our part would be worse than if they had failed.

From the physical standpoint, of course, there is no comparison of our ordeal with theirs. We are not leaving bloody footprints in the snow, our comrades are not dying without doctors or medicines, few of us are suffering constant hunger, constant pain, endless back-breaking labor. From that standpoint, we are indeed the fortunate ones.

But if we view it from the mental and spiritual, not the physical angle, I am not so sure of our advantage. The men of 1778 knew what they had to do. They had to win that war. No doubt they knew that in time other problems would arise, but until the war was won it was useless to think about anything else.

We, too, have a war on our hands, but it is a comparatively small war, and there are a hundred other problems that will not wait for peace. On only a few of these is there any general agreement on what we ought to do, while on some there is strong, almost violent disagreement among Americans of equal honesty and intelligence. That is to say, we suffer from distractions that the men of Washington's army escaped. Our ordeal is more mental than physical, but if we can't stand it we are certainly as complete failures as men who break down under physical torture.

So if we come to Valley Forge filled with admiration and gratitude, which we certainly ought to do, I submit that we ought also to come in a spirit of deep humility. We are better off than the men who suffered here, but not as much better off as complacent Americans tend to believe. It was their responsibility to deliver the country from the tyranny of a foreign prince. But it is ours to deliver it from tyrants far worse, and much harder to defeat, than George III. We have to defend it from the tyranny of prejudice, ignorance, hatred, and stupidity; and our failure would be more disastrous because it would affect not one country only but all the world.

To strengthen our spirits surely we can do no better than resort to this shrine of patriotism; for from this source, if from any, we should be able to draw new resolution and stouter courage. It was here that our forefathers met the supreme test of their time and passed it to the admiration of the world. So from this place their descendants should go out steeled to resist the failures, follies, and misfortunes of our time. If the fair reward of political freedom was the ideal that nerved them for the ordeal, do we lack the promise of an even fairer reward?

I think not. I think, on the contrary, that the reward offered us is as much greater than the one that inspired their courage and devotion, as the terrestrial globe is greater than the United States. It is the promise that, not by conquest, not by coercion of any kind, but simply by a practical demonstration of the ancient truth that "righteousness exalteth a nation" we may persuade men of diverse races and many tongues to accept, not the institutions, but the principles of government that our ancestors formulated and expressed in the Declaration of American Independence.

But for the very reason that this is a process of moral suasion, not of compulsion, it cannot be rapid; and to be compelled to "make haste slowly" is one of the severest tests to which an American can be put. We have always been precipitate. We rushed to the Pacific in just 40 percent of the time that Jefferson—himself a fast mover as the Louisiana Purchase showed—thought we would need. We built a gigantic railroad system with incredible speed. We invented the telegraph and the telephone and the aeroplane. It was said of Theodore Roosevelt, but it might be said of the typical American that "his natural gait is running away."

Then to call on such a nation to stop and consider, to wait for the auspicious moment, to apply pressure slightly, but steadily and for a long, long time—that puts a hasty nation to a very hard test indeed. We want results now, or by next week at the latest. We are builders, rather than cultivators, and to ask us to stand patiently while the seasons follow their leisurely round is hard on us. Consider, for example, the United Nations. It is now 21 years old and it hasn't reconstructed the world yet. So there are voices constantly demanding that the thing be abandoned. But the reconstruction of the world would be wonderfully swift if it were done in three generations, that is, in a single century.

This explains why I contend that February 1966, is as definitely "the winter of our discontent" as February 1778, was. It is different, certainly. The present ordeal is psychological, rather than physical, but never doubt that it is an ordeal, and never doubt that if we fail the present test the result will be as disastrous as failure would have been in the 18th century.

But at Valley Forge the Americans did not fail—and we, too, are Americans. Part of our inheritance is the grim determination, the dogged refusal even to imagine defeat that brought the men of old at last to Yorktown to accept the surrender of a beaten foe. The British Army band on that occasion played a tune called, "The World Turned Upside Down," but it was their final bad guess. It was in fact the day when this part of the world at last was set rightside up.

So if we are now enduring a spiritual Valley Forge, shall we not regard it as the prelude to a spiritual Yorktown that is bound to come? We are nto fighting Redcoats now. Such military foes as we have may be curiously described as yellow Reds. But by far the heavier, tougher battle is against the invisible foes I named a few minutes ago. Nor are they foreign, for prejuice, ignorance, hatred, and stupidity have no nationality; they are universal, and their presence among us is more to be feared than their invasion from abroad.

By the same token, we may expect victory in this war to be longer delayed than it was in the 7 years of the Revolution, for the issues are greater and more widespread. Yet victory in this struggle will be even more glorious; for while the men of old won us freedom as a nation, if we can match their courage, their endurance, and their faith, we may emerge, not merely as a free nation, but as a leader of all free nations in the search for that wisdom whose "ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace."

WATER POLLUTION

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

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, when this country was first discovered, the supply of clean water seemed unlimited. The great bodies of water were more than adequate for fish and wildlife, and they were used for irrigation, for the production of power, and as inland highways for agriculture and industry.

But these waterways also were used as dumps for waste products without thought to the consequences for future generations.

Nationally, the problem of water supply has grown into one of major significance. We are making enormous demands on our water supplies—and it is estimated that at the current rate our requirements will greatly exceed supplies within the short period of 15 years. This means that we must hasten the cleanup of our fouled waters and adapt means to reuse water wherever possible.

This effort will tax our technical skills, our innovating ability, and our capital resources, both public and private, and at all levels of society.

On the east coast of the United States, the severe drought conditions which have plagued some areas, such as New York City, are previews of things to come for all of us unless we face the problem of managing water resources.

Because this is a national problem, there are naturally a number of legislative measures which have been enacted by the Congress or which will be voted upon in the near future. The Water Quality Act of 1965 was enacted to amend the basic Water Pollution Control and Abatement Act of 1961. The Water Quality Act provided means for additional pollution research and development, increased grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, and authorized establishment of water quality standards on interstate waterways.

Over the next 10 years, we could achieve very dramatic gains in the appearance and quality of our rivers and waterways. It does not take too long for streams to cleanse themselves, if there is a fast current flow, and if the flow of pollution into them stops. But to stop the inflow of pollution is going to require a massive investment in order to build the great number of sewage treatment plants needed.

The magnitude of the effort is indicated in a report made recently by the Senate Committee on Public Works. Although, State, Federal, and local officials, as well as representatives of industry were found to be overwhelmingly in favor of the present program of sewage treatment construction grants, they all agreed that current authorization for $150 million annually is entirely inadequate to keep pace with the problem—and even this authorization is scheduled to expire on June 30 of next year.

Right now, for example, 367 new sewage treatment centers are needed just in the largest cities of the United States at a total cost of over $1,300 million. The Federal share of 30 percent of this comes to $397 million.

There is a current need in Baltimore for three sewage treatment centers at a cost of $6 million, and by 1972 there will

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 112 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1966 No. 35

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend W. G. Henson Jacobs, rector, St. Augustine's Episcopal Church, Brooklyn, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me.

Let us pray.

Almighty God, who provideth for Thy people by Thy power, and rulest over them in love: We commend to Thy good providence, Thy servant, our President, and all those who with him take counsel for the peace of this Nation, and the world. Especially do we commend to the guidance of Thy Holy Spirit, the Representatives of Thy people, gathered together in this House, under the leadership of Thy servant, the Speaker. Let Thy wisdom be their guide: Let Thine arm strengthen them: let truth and justice, holiness and righteousness, peace and charity, abound in their days.

Finally, we commend the soul of Thy servant, the late beloved Chaplain, into Thy hands, thanking Thee for his life of devoted service, and we seek Thy favor in the words which Thou didst Thyself teach us to pray saying: *Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil; for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever.* Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 24, 1966, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

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

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

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

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

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 6845) entitled "An act to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. FONG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE TIME FOR TALKING IS OVER

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, there continues to be probing of our reason for being in Vietnam and a search for some happy solution to the war itself. Most of this is wasted energy. It is a time for united action and a drive for victory. I am more and more strongly convinced that the uncertainty regarding the Vietnamese war which weighs upon the American people would in large measure be dispersed if the President were to call repeatedly for patriotic support for our fighting men from all levels on the home front. The time for talking is over; it is time for action. We are in a war; argument and dissension will not win it. These provide only comfort to the enemy. The American people have always responded to crisis and to emergency. Now is the time to remind them of this Nation's great mission and of the essentiality of victory. Regardless of the reason we are in Vietnam, we are there and we must win.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

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

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

There was no objection.

CAPE LOOKOUT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 251) to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment to the House amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment to the House amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 23, of the House engrossed amendment, after "Banks." insert: "Land donated by the State of North Carolina pursuant to this subsection shall constitute consideration for the transfer by the United States of 1.5 acres of land that is to be used as a site for a public health facility in the village of Hatteras, Dare County, North Carolina."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment to the House amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the amendment which the Senate has adopted to the House amendment to the Cape Lookout bill, S. 251, is acceptable to the supporters of the legislation and the members of the House committee. All this amendment does is to make clear that the transfer of the 16,000 acres of land to the United States which the State of North Carolina is making will stand as consideration for the 1½ acres which the United States last year transferred to the State of North Carolina under another act of Congress.

The two figures—16,000 and 1½—are out of all proportion to each other, but as long as the State is willing to accept 1½ acres in return for 16,000, I am in favor of it. More specifically, as I understand it, the language of the Senate amendment was developed in order to overcome certain qualms which developed when the Cape Hatteras bill, the 1½-acre bill, was under consideration in that body. Some thought that donating these 1½ acres to the State might be labeled as a "giveaway," and it was agreed that the Cape Lookout bill would contain some such language as that of the Senate amendment which is now before us. This got the doubters over their hurdle.

I recommend that the House concur in the amendment to its amendment.

SP4C. DANIEL FERNANDEZ

(Mr. WALKER of New Mexico asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness but with much pride that I ask to address this body today.

The name of another young man from my State of New Mexico has been added to the list of those killed in the Vietnam struggle. But this young man has shown that he is to be counted among the heroes who have died for our country.

This young man is Sp4c. Daniel Fernandez, 21-year-old son of Mr. and Mrs. Jose I. Fernandez, of Los Lunas, N. Mex.

One Purple Heart for wounds received in his first tour of duty was not enough for Daniel. He realized the tremendous struggle taking place for a free people in Vietnam, and volunteered to go back for a second time. This second time cost him his life, but saved the lives of his buddies serving with him.

This young man has been nominated to receive this country's highest decoration for bravery, the Medal of Honor, for giving his life to save his buddies. I am hopeful that speedy action will be taken to make this posthumous award which will acknowledge our country's gratitude to this gallant man who died a hero's death.

Daniel Fernandez died Friday, February 18, in a fierce battle with the Vietcong about 25 miles west of Saigon.

At the height of the battle, a grenade was tossed into the midst of Daniel's unit. Without hesitation, he threw himself on the grenade as it exploded, shielding his buddies from the blast. Knowing what was about to take place as he covered the live grenade with his body, he shouted:

> Move out, you people.

Friends of Daniel say that he was truly an unselfish person who always got along well with others. He had a consuming passion for horses, and at one time before entering the Army was a bronc buster. He participated in amateur rodeos and took an active interest in all life had to offer.

Daniel was an outstanding athlete in cross-country track and took part in football.

This young man grew up in the pleasant little ranching and farming community of Los Lunas, a town of about 1,500 people, on the Rio Grande, 10 miles south of Albuquerque.

Even as a child Daniel showed his desire to help other people. He helped out with the March of Dimes drives, took part in school programs sponsored by the 4-H Club, and volunteered for the school patrol in order to be of help to other students.

His officers in Vietnam have the highest praise for Daniel. Lt. Joseph D'Orso, a member of Danny's platoon, echoed the words of all his friends:

> He was always volunteering. He was ready to do anything.

His platoon buddies have given the highest praise to this young hero. Even after the fatal incident, just before being flown away in a medical evacuation helicopter, Daniel turned to his sergeant, of Nashville, Tenn., and said:

> Who's going to take care of you now?

Sergeant Perkins said that he had been working with Daniel since he joined the unit:

> He called me Sergeant Rock and I called him Old Dan. He was real young, but real grown up in his attitude.

Daniel was first wounded in Vietnam in March of 1965 after volunteering to go there. He was awarded the Air Medal and the Purple Heart and was sent home on furlough before being transferred to Hawaii.

In January of this year he volunteered to return to Vietnam. On February 18 he died a hero's death.

VN

ESCALATION IN VIETNAM

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permision to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will debate and vote on the supplemental defense authorization. The authorization involves a crucial policy decision about what kind of war we are fighting in Vietnam.

On February 26, the New York Times carried an article from Saigon written by Seymour Topping. It describes the new war strategy being mapped out in Saigon. It is a strategy of escalation, which is expected to last for 3 to 7 years. According to Topping:

> During periods of maximum combat effort, it is expected that American casualties each month will average about 400 to 500 dead and about 1,500 wounded.

Thus, an escalated war can be expected to produce a minimum of 50,000 casualties.

This is what tomorrow's vote is all about. I hope that every Member of this body will read Mr. Topping's account before voting tomorrow.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 26, 1966]

UNITED STATES AND VIETNAM DRAW WAR PLANS FOR 3 TO 7 YEARS—OFFICIALS IN SAIGON CHART STRATEGY FOR INVADING OF ENEMY STRONGHOLDS—HOPE FOR TALK IS DIM—PLANNERS ARE APPREHENSIVE OVER REACTION TO EXPECTED HEAVY GI CASUALTIES

(By Seymour Topping)

SAIGON, February 25.—Senior United States and South Vietnamese officials are showing a new sense of purpose and direction in the war against the Vietcong.

"We have nothing to cheer about except that we have at last defined our problem and we have the go-ahead on a program," one of them explained.

The officials estimate, in their planning, that the war will last from 3 to 7 years. At the moment they are more concerned about the possible adverse reaction of American public opinion to a costly, prolonged struggle than about any of the specific military or political problems within Vietnam.

MORE TROOPS TO ARRIVE

Under the new plans, the level of offensive operations is to be raised as the support capability of U.S. forces is expanded through the improvement of port facilities at Saigon and other harbors extending north to Da Nang.

Additional troops are to be brought to Vietnam so that the military commanders will have sufficient forces to strike hard at Vietcong base areas.

Air strikes at communication lines in North Vietnam and infiltration routes through Laos are to be continued. U.S. troops will be permitted to enter Cambodia in pursuit of Vietcong forces and North Vietnamese units that are reported to be based there.

A decision has been postponed on the deployment of U.S. troops in Laos to cut the Ho Chi Minh trail, although senior military officers in Vietnam tend to favor such an operation.

OFFICERS DIVIDED ON PLAN

The administration has decided against such a move for the present because of the opposition of the Laotian Government and disagreement within the U.S. military leadership over the feasibility of such an operation.

It is within this strategic framework that Gen. William C. Westmoreland, the U.S. commander in Vietnam, is planning his operations. The general intends to employ U.S. troops, which now number more than 200,000, in a series of sweeps directed at destroying, defeating or neutralizing the Vietcong's main-force units, which are estimated to total 80,000 men.

Despite private assurances from President Johnson that the administration will prosecute the war as is required, officials in Saigon are wondering whether the American people will tolerate the casualties that are foreseen in the projected military operations.

During periods of maximum combat effort it is expected that American casualties each month will average about 400 to 500 dead and about 1,500 wounded.

There are no startlingly new features to the war program. The essential difference is that since the Honolulu Conference the key U.S. officials here, Ambassador Henry Cabot

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4

Lodge, who has overall responsibility for the American field effort; his Deputy Ambassador, William Porter, who is the coordinator in support of the village pacification campaign, and General Westmoreland have been given a clearer mandate to put the program into effect.

NEGOTIATIONS BELIEVED UNLIKELY

A number of policy options have been discarded or pigeonholed by President Johnson.

Official planning in Saigon no longer takes account of any possibility of peace negotiations with the Vietcong. It is felt that the President's "peace offensive" was undertaken to demonstrate that the Communists are not interested in negotiations and to assuage public opinion. The President is said now to be bent on action to break the back of the Communist-led insurgency.

Officials here did not weigh seriously the issues raised in the exchanges between President Johnson and Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, over his proposals on the role of the Vietcong. Air Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky, the South Vietnamese Premier, is planning to hold elections late next year, but the 10-member governing Military Directory says it has no intention of allowing the Vietcong to vote or to put up candidates.

LANDING IN NORTH DISCARDED

In military policy, two options on action to seal off the South Vietnam battlefield by impeding or discouraging infiltration from North Vietnam have been discarded. One of these was a proposal for an amphibious landing in North Vietnam, near the Vinh region to block the approaches to the infiltration corridor through Laos.

A decision also has been taken against bombing the population centers at Hanoi and Haiphong, although the mining of the channel to the port of Haiphong and the destruction of jet airfields near Hanoi are still under consideration.

General Westmoreland believes that it will take several years to break the Vietcong main force units. Since the Pleime campaign, which began late in October, about 17,000 Vietcong soldiers have been killed, according to official American estimates. Vietcong forces have been provoked into major engagements by U.S. troops penetrating for the first time into some of their base areas.

VIETCONG REPLACING LOSSES

Vietcong losses, in killed and wounded, are being made up by the infiltration of troops from North Vietnam, now estimated to total 4,500 a month, and the drafting of men in South Vietnam.

Under the U.S. military umbrella, the South Vietnamese armed forces, totaling 570,000 men, are to have the principal mission of destroying or dispersing the approximately 110,000 Vietcong guerrillas operating outside the main units.

Once reasonable security is restored to any area, the pacification and rural reconstruction programs are to be instituted. Teams of Vietnamese revolutionary development cadres would cooperate with security forces in rooting out 40,000 Vietcong political and military command and control cadres in the villages.

A modest beginning described by one American official as a "small, bite-sized deal," is to be made this year in a pacification program in four selected areas where security conditions are fairly good. At the end of the year a total of 40,000 revolutionary development cadres are scheduled to be in the field, and the pacification areas will be slowly expanded.

REFORM MEASURES PLEDGED

Along with the pacification program, the Ky government is pledged to a program of political democratization and economic reform which is to be announced soon, to check inflation. Premier Ky has assured U.S. officials that he will introduce a constitution in November well before the elections.

At no stage in the political and military program do American or Vietnamese officials in Saigon foresee an opening of negotiations with the Vietcong toward a peace settlement. The more optimistic of them predict that Hanoi, confronted by a determined military campaign and a successful pacification program, will halt the infiltration to the south and that the Vietcong will gradually disperse in 4 to 5 years.

However, even the most optimistic officials are uneasy about returning to Honolulu next June to meet President Johnson's demand for a demonstration of how many coonskins have been nailed to the wall.

Apart from the results that may be expected in the next months from emergency measures to slow down inflation, no responsible United States or Vietnamese official in Saigon expects to record spectacular gains by as early as next June. One South Vietnamese official wryly said he might have to skin his stuffed tiger to have something to show to the President in Honolulu.

GENERAL RIDGWAY SUPPORTS GENERAL GAVIN

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1 month ago, I inserted in the RECORD a letter from Gen. James Gavin to Harper's magazine. In that letter General Gavin advocated a policy of stabilization rather than escalation in Vietnam. His letter has since become the center of a nationwide debate over military strategy.

In the March issue of Harper's, General Gavin's position is supported by Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, former Army Chief of Staff. The text of General Ridgway's letter follows:

MEDAL FOR A GENERAL

I read with absorbing interest Gen. James M. Gavin's "Easy Chair" ("A Communication on Vietnam," February) and my own views accord completely with his.

General Gavin's penetrating analyses of our major military problems and policies, which he has made over the past decade and a half, have been conspicuous for fertile and creative thinking and far-ranging vision in the military field. It was his advocacy of the concept of "Sky Cavalry," as he termed it, a concept based on sound fundamentals of the military art, which resulted in our having a new type of Army combat division in our troop list today—the 1st Cavalry Division. Its battlefield performance in Vietnam has so far amply vindicated General Gavin's originality of thinking and brought further luster to this brilliant combat leader and politicomilitary planner.

GEN. M. B. RIDGWAY.

PITTSBURGH, PA.

ELIMINATING UNLIMITED TREASURY BACK-DOOR BORROWING AUTHORITY OF FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

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

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today (H.R. 13102) a bill to limit and provide for the gradual reduction and elimination of the authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association to borrow from the Treasury in carrying out its "management and liquidating" functions.

Mr. Speaker, this unlimited Treasury backdoor borrowing authority came into existence 2 years ago. It was a Senate provision in the 1964 Housing Act authorizing FNMA to sell beneficial interests or participations in respect to mortgages or interests therein held by Government agencies. No similar provision was considered by nor included in the Housing bill as it passed the House. It was adopted by the committee of conference and thus became a part of the Housing Act of 1964.

In connection with sale of the participations, FNMA, under its "management and liquidating" functions was authorized to guarantee payment of principal and interest on such participations. This guarantee in turn was supported by the grant of unlimited authority for FNMA to borrow funds from the U.S. Treasury for this purpose. Such unlimited backdoor borrowing authority was achieved by excluding this activity from a provision elsewhere in the FNMA charter act effectively limiting the access of FNMA to Treasury borrowing authority for its other "management and liquidating" functions.

Mr. Speaker, the basic purpose of FNMA; namely, a Government secondary mortgage market facility, is being subverted. FNMA rapidly is becoming a mechanism to finance other agency lending programs on an unlimited basis. It is becoming a Federal hockshop.

The Appropriations Committees might as well close shop as far as control of Federal lending programs is concerned if this unlimited backdoor Treasury borrowing authority is allowed to go unchecked.

Already, FNMA has sold $1.2 billion of participation certificates in a pool of FHA and VA mortgages and sale of another $410 million of such certificates is scheduled on or about March 16. The 1967 budget contemplates sale by FNMA of $1.55 billion of participation certificates for the Farmers Home Administration, Office of Education, and the Small Business Administration as well as an additional $1.68 billion of certificates for the VA and Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. Speaker, this program is getting out of hand. It is the unlimited pipeline to the Treasury that makes this program tick. My bill, upon enactment, will bring it to a halt because it will plug this unlimited pipeline to the Treasury. I anticipate my proposal will be of interest to the Appropriations Committees in particular as well as all Members of Congress interested in preventing abuses in backdoor financing.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, at the time of rollcall No. 24 last Thursday, February 24, 1966, covering the supplementary appropriation bill for our aid program in Vietnam, the Dominican Republic and elsewhere, I was obliged to be absent from the floor.

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400030001-4