Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

Clearly, the job vacancy program is no substitute for effective private employment agencies and a strengthened public employment service; and it is no substitute for more long-range projections of manpower needs. In general, the vacancy program would complement other manpower programs. Perhaps it would displace the present area skill surveys which attempt to guide area planning and manpower retraining programs.

Witnesses indicated that job listings at the Employment Service and the NICB Index were not adequate substitutes for the survey and tabulation of job vacancy statistics. Job listings accounted for about 30 percent of all vacancies; however, the extent of listing varied substantially from area to area. The "Index of Help Wanted Advertising" does not have full coverage of occupations and areas, and there is some overlapping of advertisements for the same position in numerous newspapers. These indicators of job openings do not perform the task envisioned for the vacancy statistics.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

The subcommittee is gratified by the progress made in developing the concepts and procedures for the regular collection of job vacancy data. It is an example of research responding to a practical need. In addition to the extensive work connected with the pilot studies, specialists from government, the universities, private research institutions, and organized labor have contributed by way of a conference on The Measurement and Interpretation of Job Vacancies [1] held by the National Bureau of Economic Research, with support from the Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training. Additional research on Measuring Job Vacancies has been completed by the National Industrial Conference Board,[2] on a grant from the Ford Foundation.

After careful review and consideration, the subcommittee recommends that the program of regular collection of vacancy data proceed as rapidly as possible, and particularly that it be expanded to the 80 major labor areas as recommended by the Labor Department. Significant progress has been made on the difficult problems of definition and procedure, although there will undoubtedly be continuing clarification and improvement as experience is gained. It is time to expand the program further.

It is difficult to conceive of a more obvious way to improve the amount of useful information available to workers and employers in the labor market. Such information would promote efficiency and greater equality of economic opportunity. In addition, it would feed the needs of the Nation's new and growing manpower development programs.

[1] The Measurement and Interpretation of Job Vacancies, National Bureau of Economic Research (New York: Columbia University Press), 1966.

[2] John G. Myers and Daniel Creamer, Measuring Job Vacancies—A Report on a Feasibility Study in the Rochester (N.Y.) Area, National Industrial Conference Board (New York), 1966.

LIFE REPORTS WHAT PAUL DOUGLAS LEARNED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, no Senator can surpass the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in wisdom or in demonstrated devotion to this country.

At a time when speeches, especially commencement speeches are so frequently loaded with platitudes, the remarkable Senator from Illinois has given a fresh and inspiring insight from his unusually full and productive life in a commencement address recently delivered at Amherst College.

Life magazine was to impressed by this Douglas address that they wrote an editorial quoting from that speech as the lessons from PAUL DOUGLAS' life.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

WHAT SENATOR PAUL DOUGLAS LEARNED

The 1966 commencement season finds the usual number of distinguished, middle-aged orators seeking contact with the young—no doubt mostly in vain. But among all the forgettable remarks there are some serious attempts to convey a modicum of wisdom from one generation to another. And if any American is entitled to make that basic, old-fashioned kind of commencement address, it is Senator PAUL DOUGLAS of Illinois. At 74, he can look back on a long career as a public servant, as a distinguished economist and teacher, and as a soldier. He was 50 when he joined the Marines as a private; he emerged, badly wounded at Okinawa, as a lieutenant colonel. "What do you think life and history have really taught you?" asked DOUGLAS of himself before the Amherst class, some 20 of whose members later walked out on Secretary McNamara (*see p. 40*). "Are there any hints which you can offer us on the conduct of life?" The lessons of Paul Douglas' life are these:

"That what is most needed in the world is love—or energized good will—which, if given a chance and practiced with devotion, can in most cases melt antagonisms within a democratic society and reconcile opposites.

"That truth has at once a compulsive and healing power. We should not be afraid of truth, for if recognized and acted upon it is the rock upon which we can base our individual and collective lives.

"That in its larger aspects truth is not simple but subtle. Frequently, it requires a long process of discovery both by the probings of research and the sifting induced by dialogue.

"That in dealing with the winds of doctrine, in the words of Jefferson, 'We should not be afraid to tolerate error as long as reason be left free to combat it.'

"That when aggression stalks either a community or the world, resistance to it is both necessary and noble, lest it become all-pervasive. And it is well that it should be checked in its early days before it can acquire the cumulative momentum of success.

"That human courage in defense of an ideal is an ultimate virtue which we should not permit the pressures of conformity to diminish. The nation which minimizes courage is on the road to destruction.

"That the Athenians did well to make the owl and the olive tree their symbols to denote wisdom and peace. But freedom tempered with love is the only atmosphere in which true wisdom and peace can flourish. And to preserve and maintain all these virtues, a strong admixture of Spartan courage is needed. Thermopylae was necessary that Socrates might practice his dialectic."

U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM NOT AN INSUPERABLE OBSTACLE TO DISARMAMENT AGREEMENTS, SAY RUSSIANS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is gratifying to learn that despite the strong words used by Ambassador Roshchin at Geneva yesterday, the Soviet Union does not view the involvement of the United States in Vietnam as an insuperable obstacle to the successful negotiation of arms control and disarmament agreements.

An erroneous report carried on the wires yesterday indicated that Ambassador Roshchin had said that there can be no treaty to stop the spread of nuclear weapons as long as the United States continues its military operations in Vietnam. As I observed yesterday in commenting on this report, when I was at Geneva a month ago Russia made it quite clear that it did not consider Vietnam an insuperable obstacle to a nuclear disarmament understanding. If in fact the Russians had adopted the line attributed to them in the report, it would have been a most unfortunate change of mind.

It now appears on the basis of information supplied by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, supported by reports printed in this morning's New York Times and Washington Post, that despite their stronger language the Russians have not in fact altered their position, and are not insisting upon the removal of U.S. troops from Vietnam as a precondition to a treaty. The principal obstacle to a treaty to halt the spread of nuclear weapons continues to be what it has been all along—this country's shortsighted insistence on keeping open the option of cutting West Germany in on some nuclear sharing arrangement. If the State Department will permit our negotiators in Geneva to agree with the Russians to keep the West German finger off the nuclear trigger, I am convinced that a treaty to stop the spread of nuclear weapons remains a live possibility, and an immediate one, too.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the wire service story dated June 14, 1966, which was published in the Philadelphia Inquirer this morning under the headline, "Accord on Arms Barred by Soviet Over Vietnam." This is the erroneous report which I was given yesterday. The correct version is reported in a story in this morning's Washington Post under the headline, "Russian Blasts United States, at Reopened Talks on Disarmament," and in this morning's New York Times under the headline, "Arms Parley Resumes in Geneva." I also ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 15, 1966]

RUSSIAN BLASTS UNITED STATES AT REOPENED TALKS ON DISARMAMENT

Soviet delegate Alexei A. Roshchin made a virulent attack on U.S. policy in Vietnam at the reopening of the 17-nation disarmament conference in Geneva yesterday.

U.S. officials in Geneva and Washington denied that Roshchin made a U.S. troop withdrawal from Vietnam a condition for any progress on disarmament. United Press International and Associated Press interpreted Roshchin's remarks as making a U.S. withdrawal a prerequisite for new agreements to stop the spread of nuclear weapons and other disarmament goals.

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

The disarmament talks are held in closed session. Newsmen are given only summaries of the speeches.

Roshchin's speech was immediately denounced by U.S. delegate William C. Foster as a deeply regrettable propaganda blast. Some observers were pessimistic about the chances of progress on disarmament when the Soviets took such a strong line at the first session after a six-week recess.

Roshchin blamed lack of progress in the Geneva talks on the U.S. "aggressive war" in Veitnam, "continuous provocations against Cuba," the project of sharing nuclear weapons with West Germany, and other actions. He accused Washington of fomenting the arms race and trying to sabotage an agreement to stop underground nuclear explosions.

Before Roshchin spoke, Foster said the time had come for East and West to reconcile their differences and rivalries and work together for nuclear disarmament. He added that preoccupation with short-term objectives only impeded agreement of a non-proliferation treaty.

He warned that if the spread of nuclear weapons was not halted there would be perhaps 10 new nuclear powers in the world in 10 to 20 years.

Foster said the United States regarded as positive remarks by Roshchin, when the conference adjourned last month, that its work had not been completely useless.

The United States also shared hopes expressed then by Roshchin that new steps could be taken to break the deadlock in negotiations on a nonproliferation treaty, Foster added.

Negotiations on a nonproliferation treaty are deadlocked over NATO nuclear sharing. The Russians refuse to accept a U.S. draft treaty because they say it leaves the door open for NATO to give West Germeny access to nuclear weapons.

The West denies this and says it cannot subscribe to rival Soviet proposals that would weaken or undermine NATO defensive collaboration.

[From the New York Times, June 15, 1966]

ARMS PARLEY RESUMES IN GENEVA

GENEVA, June 14.—The United States and the Soviet Union agreed on the immediate goals when the disarmament conference resumed today after a five-week recess. However, the two powers were in complete disagreement on how to reach them. The resumption was marred by a sharply-worded Soviet attack on Washington's policies in Vietnam and on West Germany's alleged desire for nuclear weapons. It brought an equally sharp retort from the United States. William C. Foster of the United States and Aleksei A. Roshchin of the Soviet Union both gave priority to extending the present ban on nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in space and under water to underground explosions. They also called for a treaty soon to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. Mr. Foster, head of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, said at the 17-nation conference, which began in March, 1962, that Washington remained "strongly committed" to a ban on underground nuclear explosions.

The United States delegate acknowledged that science had made "substantial progress" in developing ways to detect such explosions from a distance. He added, however, that "hard evidence still points to the need for on-site inspection to verify a comprehensive test ban."

This was disputed by Mr. Roshchin. He asserted that the United States advanced "groundless demands" for international inspection in order, by preventing an accord, "to have a free hand for carrying on dangerous experiments with nuclear weapons."

When calling for a treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, Mr. Foster alluded to the Soviet Union's preoccupation with West Germany. He urged that the issue not be confused by becoming "obsessed with any one country."

The alternative to a treaty "is not a world with one or two new nuclear-weapon states in, say, five years, but rather a world with perhaps ten new nuclear-weapon states in 10 to 20 years," the United States official said.

But Mr. Roshchin asserted that the United States desired to draft a treaty that would leave open the possibility of satisfying West German ambitions through an allied nuclear-sharing arrangement. He said that desire was blocking in accord.

The Soviet delegate, who followed Mr. Foster, began his speech by accusing the United States of having increased world tension during the conference's recess by building up its forces in South Vietnam.

"Continuous provocations" against Cuba by Washington "also arouse serious concern," he said.

Mr. Foster replied by rebuking the Soviet delegate for beginning the new round of talks with a "propaganda blast." The Soviet Union, he said, would make a more useful contribution to negotiate.

Today's chairman, Antonio Gomez Robledo of Mexico, warned that if the conference had no progress to report to the United Nations General Assembly session opening in September another forum for negotiating arms-control questions might be sought.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, June 15, 1966]

ACCORD ON ARMS BARRED BY SOVIET OVER VIETNAM

GENEVA, June 14.—A virulent Soviet attack of U.S. policy in Vietnam marked the resumption of the 17-nation disarmament talks here Tuesday. The tirade broke a tacit understanding that Vietnam should not be allowed to disturb the Geneva negotiations.

Soviet chief delegate Alexei A. Roschin said at the meeting there can be no treaty to stop a spread of nuclear weapons as long as the United States continues its military operations in Vietnam. Such a treaty is the main issue before the conference.

PROPAGANDA BLAST

Roschin's speech—one of the most bitter yet delivered in the 4-year-old conference—was immediately denounced by U.S. chief negotiator William C. Foster as a deeply regrettable propaganda blast.

Roschin accused the United States of duplicity in sending more troops to Vietnam for what he called a merciless campaign against peace in Geneva. He said Washington thus increased the arms race and is responsible for prospects of no progress in Geneva.

Roschin's predecessor, Semyon K. Tsarapkin, had assured the conference earlier this year that the Vietnam conflict, though regrettable from his government's point of view, should not be allowed to disturb the negotiations in Geneva. Tsarapkin has since been appointed Ambassador to West Germany.

"UNFORTUNATE CHANGE"

Roschin's statement led Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, who recently returned from Geneva, to say in Washington: "I think this Russian position represents a most unfortunate change of mind. When I was at Geneva a month ago, Russia made it quite clear that it did not consider Vietnam an insuperable obstacle to a nuclear disarmament understanding."

When Roschin took over more than 2 months ago critical remarks about the U.S. role in Vietnam began cropping up in his statements and those of the delegates from Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Rumania here.

But these asides, though sometimes stinging, were short and mild compared to the Soviet delegate's long and bitter statement Tuesday. Western delegation officials said it sounded like a concentrated recapitulation of every main criticism the Soviet Union has voiced against Washington during the past 6 months.

SABOTAGE CHARGED

Roschin attacked the United States over Vietnam, the project of Atlantic nuclear weapons sharing with West Gerrmany, accused Washington of fomenting the arms race and trying to sabotage an agreement to stop underground nuclear explosions.

He also denounced what he called the "continuous military provocations against the Republic of Cuba" around the Guantanamo military base, a subject frequently raised by Communist speakers in the current international labor conference here.

OUR AMBASSADOR TO JAPAN, EDWIN O. REISCHAUER

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as everyone knows, the United States has over 100 Ambassadors working in the various capitals of the world. It is not surprising that no two of these Ambassadors are exactly alike, either in qualifications or in the manner in which they operate. Some are excellent. Some are very good. Some are good. Some are fair. Occasionally, one gets us into a lot of trouble.

Mr. President, I am not going to attempt to classify U.S. Ambassadors in other countries, but I do wish to point out that one of the highest grade Ambassadors we have in any country is our Ambassador to Japan, Edwin O. Reischauer.

Ambassador Reischauer has done a remarkable job in Japan. He has upheld the position of the United States ably and satisfactorily. He commands the respect of the Japanese people as well as the Japanese Government, and he has the respect of all Americans who know him.

I have been disturbed lately to hear rumors that Mr. Reischauer might be replaced.

Some of these rumors state that he wants to come home. I do not know whether that is true. Other rumors state that someone wants him to come home and get out of Japan so that his place can be taken by someone else.

I want to say that I most earnestly hope that Ambassador Reischauer does not want to come home and that no one is going to insist that he does come home, because if he should give up that post for any reason whatsoever, it would be an almost irreparable loss to the United States at this time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which was published in the Boston Sunday Globe of June 12, 1966, entitled "Our Man in Tokyo—Reischauer Doing Superb Job." It is an excellent article and I agree with the expressions which it carries.

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

OUR MAN IN TOKYO—REISCHAUER DOING SUPERB JOB

(By Richard Halloran)

TOKYO.—In the history of America's relations with Japan, the names of four famous Americans spring immediately to mind—the

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

5 nuclear powers, 20 nations by 1975 would have the capacity to explode atomic bombs. There is reason to fear that a nuclear war could be brought on by accident, or mischance, or by the erratic action of a trigger-happy officer, or a hothead, or drunk NATO ally. Also, we must protect mankind from radioactive contamination. We must halt the spread of nuclear weapons.

General Eisenhower in World War II showed bad judgment in preventing Generals Bradley and Patton from occupying Berlin, and in ordering them to pull back in favor of the Russians whose leaders were scheming to enter Berlin first. At that time he would have been well advised not to cater to the Soviet Union. Times have now changed. Twenty-one years following World War II, Communist Russia no longer seriously menaces the United States or the peace of the world. Were the Eisenhower viewpoint to prevail, it would no doubt cause the leaders of the Soviet Union to withdraw immediately from considering a proposed nonproliferation treaty.

General Eisenhower was wrong in 1945 in pulling back Generals Patton and Bradley. As a result of his orders, the Russian armed forces first entered Berlin. Were it not for General Eisenhower's command decision at that time, American armies led by Generals Bradley and Patton would have been the first with their tanks and thousands of GI's to march into practically undefended Berlin. Were it not for General Eisenhower's decision at that time, when he had been misled by the Russian leadership into believing that the objective of their armies was to destroy the German forces in the field and that their objective was not to be the first of the allies to enter Berlin, the history of our postwar dealings with Stalin and the Soviet Union might not have been so grim, and the Berlin wall might never have been built. He is dead wrong now, as he was then.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS DAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, this country has fought nine wars—including the war in Vietnam. Millions of Americans have answered the call to arms.

Most of these men have been citizen soldiers, sailors, and airmen—men like us, from farm, city, school, and college campus, men never basically dedicated to the profession of armed combat, men never primarily skilled in the art of war.

For the most part, they have been men whose native patriotism has exceeded their concern over the complexities of international intrigue—men who, in deep sense of duty, answered their country's call.

We thank God that the vast majority of them have been allowed to return physically unimpaired. But a million have given their lives, and more than 1½ million have suffered combat wounds.

Properly, we observe Veterans Day on November 11.

Appropriately, on Armed Forces Day, May 21, we paid tribute to the 3 million men and women now serving the Nation around the world in our military services.

Reverently, on Memorial Day, May 30, we paid homage to our war dead.

We owe an expression of the Nation's gratitude to our disabled American veterans, who will bear the combat scars of their patriotism throughout the rest of their lives.

I know of no better day to set aside for this high purpose than June 17, the 34th anniversary of the national charter granted to them as an organization by Congress.

It is appropriate that Congress observe DAV Day 3 days after Flag Day, and 3 weeks before Independence Day.

We honor the men whom the Nation can never repay for the lifetime disabilities inflicted upon them as they fought for our defense.

Great changes have occurred in the 190 years between 1776 and 1966. We are probably in the era of greatest change.

The one vital element in our national affairs that has not changed is the great American concept of constitutional government, the source of our liberty.

The disabled American veterans bear the scars of defending these principles.

Under their national charter, without Federal aid, they work for the single purpose of taking care of their own—the disabled war veterans, their dependents, and their widows and orphans.

As an organization, I congratulate the DAV and their commander, Claude L. Callegary, of Baltimore, on the 34th anniversary of their corporate being.

As individuals, each and every one of them has my salute of gratitude.

BACK PEDALING IN VIETNAM AND A NEW HOPE FOR ASIA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am disappointed today to have read that reliable sources in South Vietnam believe that the National Leadership Council, which is the expanded version of the military junta, will turn down the proposal of the South Vietnamese Electoral Commission to convert the Constituent Assembly into a legislative body. If this report is true, the repercussions could be unfortunate indeed.

I believe the South Vietnamese people really want a chance to freely express their own choices for a new civilian government. I further believe that the government of Saigon needs the legitimacy that only these elections and the speedy conversion of the Constituent Assembly to a civilian government can provide. I am convinced that the American people desire these elections and a civilian government in Saigon.

Should the military junta continue its confusing and delaying tactics regarding the above matters, I believe the result will be an increasing loss of confidence in Premier Ky both by the South Vietnamese themselves and the American people. I urge the President of the United States to make this fact perfectly clear.

While the situation in Vietnam remains unchanged, there is a very important hopeful sign regarding the larger Asian picture. A conference of nine Asian and Pacific States is presently meeting near Seoul, Korea. The participants at this conference are: South Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Malaysia, Nationalist China, South Vietnam, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, and Laos as an observer. Both white and Asian, the participants comprise a group with many common interests in maintaining peace in Asia.

I am particularly happy to see that the emphasis at this conference is more on the positive and peaceful side than it is military and ideological. This is an important first step for the countries in that area of the world—a step in the direction of regional responsibility.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD two articles concerning these matters which appeared in the New York Times of Wednesday, June 15.

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

JUNTA SAID TO BAR BUDDHIST DEMAND ON CHARTER GROUP—REGIME IN SAIGON REPORTED DECIDING TO LIMIT THE POWER OF ELECTED ASSEMBLY—NEW PROTEST FORESEEN—DEMONSTRATIONS CONTINUE—GOVERNMENT FORCES ROUND UP STUDENTS FOR DRAFT

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, June 14.—Highly reliable sources said today that the 20-man governing National Leadership Council had voted to limit the powers of the coming legislative assembly to writing a constitution.

The Leadership Council, which was recently enlarged by the addition of 10 civilians, decided that the assembly, to be elected in September, would be dissolved as soon as it wrote the constitution. That document is to be the basis of parliamentary elections next year.

It had been reoprted earlier that the committee drafting the laws for the September election suggested that the assembly be given limited legislative powers.

KEY ISSUE IN THE DISPUTE

The Buddhists have been demanding the legislative assembly act as a lawmaking body and take over from the military regime headed by Premier Nguyen Cao Ky.

The issue lies at the core of the Buddhist-Government dispute. The junta's decision was sure to bring violent protests from the Buddhists, observers said.

They said the action apparently reflected the generals' confidence that they would be able to overcome the Buddhists. Thus far they have.

However, Buddhist demonstrations continued in the capital and Thich Phap Minh, a militant leader, told thousands of cheering Buddhists that if Washington continued to support the Ky Government, "we can no longer accept the American presence."

"If the Americans want to impose colonialism on our heads, we will fight it," he said.

He asserted that the United States Ambassador, Henry Cabot Lodge, and other American officials "speak with the mouth of Buddha but from a snake's heart."

PARLEY IN SEOUL SHAPES NEW BLOC—NINE ASIAN-PACIFIC NATIONS WORK ON ORGANIZATION TO RESIST CHINA'S MARXISM

(By Robert Trumbull)

SEOUL, SOUTH KOREA, June 14.—Nine Asian and Pacific states, meeting in the riverside

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

resort of Walker Hill near the war-battered but frantically rebuilding city of Seoul, began today to plan an organization of non-Communist governments to resist the spread of Marxism in the area from its base in mainland China.

The new international grouping, as it took shape in the opening session of a three-day conference, will shun any military character and will play down the ideological context. The idea is to reduce tensions, not increase them.

"We do not contemplate" the construction of new barriers "to surround our peoples and isolate them from the rest of the world," said Thanat Khoman, the scholarly, multilingual Foreign Minister of Thailand and vice chairman of the conference.

THE OTHER PARTICIPANTS

The other countries attending as participants are South Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Malaysia, Nationalist China, South Vietnam, Australia and New Zealand. Laos, nominally a neutral country, is represented by an observer.

"We are not necessarily anti-Communist," the 52-year-old Thai Foreign Minister declared, but he went on to say that the "new form of colonialism" of the Communists was "the most frightful and odious scourge of our time."

Lee Tong Won, the 40-year-old Foreign Minister of South Korea and conference chairman, who conceived this meeting many months ago, suggested that the organization might begin merely as an agreement to meet annually in each of the member countries in turn.

Etsusaburo Shiina, the self-effacing Foreign Minister of Japan, proposed that the discussions be conducted "not from the standpoint of establishing in haste a new and rigid form of cooperation but of promoting gradual and realistic cooperation on a broad basis."

VIEWS LIKELY TO PREVAIL

The views of Mr. Shiina and Mr. Khoman seem likely to prevail.

At a reception given by the Koreans in the garden of a traditional temple-roofed Korean pleasure villa tonight, the Thai diplomat said that he favored an organization in which the next host country for the annual meeting would supply the secretariat while various standing committees of the member governments carried on continuing consultations in various fields of cooperation.

Narciso Ramos, the vigorous, experienced diplomat who recently became the Philippine Secretary of Foreign Affairs, and others look forward to a busily functioning association of non-Communist Asian and Pacific states with a commodities bank, customs union and other practical applications.

Australia and New Zealand, the only participating countries with a predominantly Western ethnic and cultural background in an area of mostly Eastern culture, shared the hard view of South Korean and Nationalist China on the Communist problem.

Paul Hasluck, the Australian Minister of External Affairs, referred to a statement by President Chung Hee Park of South Korea, in his welcoming address this morning, to the effect that it was sometimes necessary to fight for peace. Mr. Hasluck suggested that this could be the "keynote" of the conference.

"It is fitting that a meeting of this nature should be held in the Republic of Korea, for it was here that one of the critical turning points was reached in recent world history," the New Zealand Minister of Customs, Norman L. Shelton, said in a reference to the Korean war.

Tran Van Do, Foreign Minister of South Vietnam, noted that it was "remarkable" to have a gathering of non-Communist governments in a country where allied forces began fighting Communist North Korea 16 years ago this month.

NATO

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, NATO remains the linchpin of free world strength and unity of purpose. Despite the fact of French withdrawal from the integrated command structure of the alliance, the other 14 members desire to go forward.

In Chicago, on April 15, 1966, I delivered a speech outlining my thinking on the U.S. response to President de Gaulle's policy and to a number of problems presently facing NATO. My theme was that NATO must develop a political identity, going beyond a military alliance, in order to successfully survive the complexities and challenges of modern diplomacy. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a copy of my remarks.

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

NATO CAN ANSWER DE GAULLE'S CHALLENGE

(Remarks of Senator JACOB K. JAVITS prepared for delivery at a luncheon of the Executives' Club of Chicago, Pick-Congress Hotel, Chicago, Ill., noon, Friday, April 15, 1966)

NATO is not about to fall apart. Neither the conflict in Vietnam nor President de Gaulle's withdrawal from the integrated command structure will destroy the unity and effectiveness of the alliance. For, NATO remains the core of Free World security and strength. The United States commitment to it continues to be our most important foreign policy responsibility and should be absolutely unimpaired.

NATO will survive the current French challenge. Indeed, the immediate effect of this challenge will be a greater NATO unity. This short-run effect was demonstrated unambiguously in the March 18th response of the remaining fourteen partners to President de Gaulle's note of French withdrawal. This joint note states that: "The North Atlantic Treaty and Organization established under it are both, alike, essential to the security of our countries," that "no system of bilateral arrangements can be a substitute," and that the whole apparatus still meets "a common political need."

But the confidence of today, the widely recognized conviction that NATO is still the key to Free World strength should not obscure the problems of tomorrow. Unless these are solved, NATO will become a mere shadow of itself in the future.

NATO's problems, however, run much deeper than a logistics relocation operation. Its purpose is being questioned because of the relaxation of Soviet pressure in Europe; its strength is being undermined by the short-sighted nationalism of the French President; its intentions are being challenged by artifically inspired West German demands for a nuclear voice; and its goals are being blurred by a lack of strong and consistent leadership from the United States.

Above all, NATO faces the challenge of transforming itself from a military alliance to a political community, to a true form of regionalism in the North Atlantic area. A military alliance is a negative form of unity. It exists only as long as the common threat is perceived by the partners in the same way. A political community derives its meaning from positive sources, by what it is for, by what it is trying to achieve, by the institutions and ideals upon which it rests.

NATO must establish bonds that hold, independent of a common danger. It cannot depend upon threats from the Soviet Union for its unity. Furthermore, no realistic NATO nuclear sharing arrangement to meet that threat can materialize unless is a genuine single political means to control it.

NATO must develop a political identity. How can this be done?

There must be a decision at the top to go forward. A Summit Conference of the Heads of State of the NATO countries is needed to set up a common political institutions; only a command decision at the top can set the machinery in motion.

For, left to their own devices, nations will go their separate ways, uniting only when it suits individual purposes. It is up to the United States to provide the leadership to weave together the diverse threads of the Western World. As a nation with preponderant economic and military strength, the United States must have the courage to go first and set the example. Our partners have accused us often and justly of trying to force arrangements on them which we would never accept ourselves.

The thrust of the Summit meeting should be an effort to unify the great number and variety of decision-making units in the Western world. As of today there are several dozen Western inter-governmental groups, with no consistent membership pattern, trying to promote cooperation in matters of trade, finance, monetary affairs, politics, technology, refugees, defense, and social life. Coordination among these groups is often ad hoc and limited.

The way to end this debilitating fragmentation is by the rule of substitution. Where there are several inter-governmental groups dealing with the same or similar problems, one group should be substituted for all—or, at least, one group ought to act as an executive coordinating body for the others.

The two groups-in-being that should take the lead in this unifying process are NATO and OECD. NATO could act as the focal point for political and military cooperation, thus superseding the Western European Union and a number of bilateral arrangements. OECD is the natural body to tie in North America with the Common Market and EFTA. To effect these ends, the North Atlantic Council—policy-making body of NATO—and the Secretary General of NATO should be delegated broader and more effective powers as provided for under Article 2 of the NATO Treaty. OECD, in turn, should be given a mandate to oversee all economic and trade negotiations.

In order to underpin these efforts, an Atlantic Consultative Assembly must be established. Only such a parliamentary body can nurture habits of cooperation and feelings of common loyalty. This Assembly should be composed of delegates selected by the parliaments of the 15 NATO nations—which is the composition of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, now in its twelfth year—but with two major changes: (1) The Assembly should be empowered to discuss all Atlantic matters, economic and political alike; and (2) the five European nations that are members of OECD but not of NATO—Austria, Spain, Ireland, Sweden, and Switzerland—should be entitled to membership.

Finally, an Atlantic High Court of Justice is needed to round out the institutional picture. This Court should be empowered to decide specified legal controversies which may arise under Atlantic Community treaties.

It is essential that this "operation nucleus" start now. The decision to move in this direction is long overdue. It will take many long years of hard and pragmatic bargaining to establish the reality of an Atlantic Community and an appropriate infrastructure.

In the meantime, NATO is being buffeted by a whole range of problems that require immediate attention and decision. Our long range objective of an Atlantic Community should not obscure them. But the decisions of today must be made in the light of and in accordance with the ultimate goals.

There are six key problems facing NATO today.

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

(1) Since World War II, we have urged the United Kingdom to reorder its foreign policy priorities and merge itself with Western Europe. The Commonwealth is not the British Empire, and a close Anglo-American tie is no substitute for an intimate British-European connection. Western Europe needs the United Kingdom and the United Kingdom can be greatly stimulated by Western Europe. A permanent British presence in the Common Market can assure the Benelux countries and Italy that they will not become pawns in a Franco-German struggle for ascendancy. It is also necessary for London to open up the Common Market door for the other countries of the European Free Trade Association.

(2) West Germany wants more status and influence within the alliance. Specifically, the Bonn Government wants to share in the control and use of nuclear weapons. I can sympathize with Bonn's desire for influence commensurate with its contributions, but I do not believe that nuclear weapons is the proper area for this new role. A German finger on the nuclear trigger will create two major difficulties: (a) it will be resented and feared by all European powers who still do not have complete confidence in German stability; and (b) it will undercut the U.S. drive for a non-proliferation treaty. A non-proliferation treaty must take precedence over any sort of NATO nuclear force. Just as our own government created the German demand for a nuclear voice by the MLF proposal of 1962, so we must now help the Germans to forego it.

(3) The French withdrawal from the integrated command structure of NATO and their request for NATO to leave French territory unless placed under direct French control, raises another set of difficulties. But these are not insuperable. It must be clearly understood that France has not withdrawn from the alliance as such. She still recognizes the need for the common defense. Unfortunately, France under de Gaulle is too preoccupied with the principle of nationalism and so is overly sensitive about any formal kind of cooperation. Also, while the French continue to pursue this line, NATO must take care not to be punitive to French interests to try to isolate France.

Every effort must be made to reserve France's rightful place in the alliance organization and to leave in tact as much of the military structures as France will allow on her soil. For, we have a right to expect France to return fully to NATO when President de Gaulle leaves the French presidency—at least, the chances are good enough to warrant such planning.

During this transition period, the U.S. should reaffirm its commitments to the alliance and take the necessary steps in conjunction with the other members to relocate troops and supplies and keep the alliance operating.

(4) There is still an unsettled debate about strategic doctrine. Our European partners oppose the U.S. doctrine of flexible and controlled response. The Europeans fear that such a doctrine will lessen the credibility of our nuclear deterrent. We believe that credibility is a matter of meeting force with appropriate levels of counter-force. Such a debate can never be solved in the abstract, and we hope it will never be resolved in reality. The only reasonable response to the debate is to maintain the strength of NATO on all levels—conventional, tactical and nuclear.

(5) There is a feeling in some quarters that the Soviet Union no longer represents a threat to the security of Europe, that Moscow's motives have changed. But we cannot base policy on unknowable intentions and motives; we have to base it on capability. A divided Berlin and a divide Germany still present a constant source of danger and temptation.

(6) NATO is in the throes of a globalization debate. The U.S. wants NATO to take a more active role in conflicts and problems outside the Atlantic area. Our partners are reluctant to do so. In time, we hope our partners will realize that the security of the Western world is dependent on the struggles in the underdeveloped world. In time and with insistence, we hope they will undertake their proper share of this burden, as for example in Vietnam.

What should be the course of our own policy during this period? United States policy should be steady but not slow, purposeful but not pressureful, and unambiguous but not unsophisticated. Diplomacy is a dedious and intricate art, but it is an unfruitful process unless given clear direction from the top. Current crises and problems should not make us panic. They should make us realize that the time has come to set NATO on a new footing, not as a new military alliance, but as the nucleus for an effective Atlantic community.

CHINA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this has been a year of important resurgence regarding the discussion of Communist China in the United States. For many years, there were few constructive proposals on how we should deal with the China problem. Many people have now come forward with sound and analytical statements on what should be done.

In my home State of New York I recently delivered two speeches on United States-Communist China relations. The theme of the first, "China and the Peace of Asia," was that in the long run we must find some way to get along with Communist China, because without such a longrun understanding there can be no peace in Asia. The second speech, "Communist China and Nuclear Disarmament," is an attempt to enlarge on the theme of the first speech. I present the thesis that both the United States and Communist China must learn to negotiate what is negotiable and to talk in some areas while we dispute in others. I also make a proposal to invite Communist China to the Geneva Disarmament Conference provided that they first sign the nuclear partial test ban treaty.

Both speeches emphasize the fact that China's aggressive objectives and tactics have not changed, and that they are unlikely to respond positively to any proposals from us at this time. Nevertheless, I believe certain carefully posed contacts that do not endanger our security or undercut our diplomatic position should be made. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have these two speeches inserted in the RECORD.

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

CHINA AND THE PEACE OF ASIA

(Excerpts of the remarks of Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, prepared for delivery before the Annual Masonic Dedication Service and Breakfasts, Waldorf and Astor Hotels, New York City at 10 a.m., Sunday, March 20, 1966)

The struggle in Vietnam is really a struggle to create and preserve peace and stability in Southeast Asia and in Asia as a whole. Because Vietnam is not an isolated conflict, because it does have the greater meaning of war or peace in Asia, it has led us to a search for causes and roots. The search has led back to Communist China.

Since 1949, United States policy toward Communist China has been static and largely negative. We have done and must continue to do what we must, that is, contain Red China militarily. But we should now begin as well, in a measured and careful manner, the process of trying to bring Communist China into the community of nations.

I believe that over the long term, we must find some way to get along with Communist China. Without such an understanding there can be no peace in Asia. Without it, Vietnam could be a beginning, not an end.

Those of us who are convinced that the so-called "wars of national liberation" are actually wars of aggression instigated and supported by Communist China, are also convinced that such wars must be frustrated. Our overriding reason is the future role of the Peking regime in the issue of war and peace in Asia. Viewed in this light, the struggle in Vietnam is one element in our policy toward Communist China. If we are successful in demonstrating our will to resist aggression, it can be a most fruitful national effort, it can lead to peace. If the results of the struggle are inconclusive, we will still be faced with the possibility of war.

I believe that we must ultimately come to some sort of agreement with Communist China. I do not believe in the wisdom or inevitability of preventive war, nor do I see any sense in a unilateral U.S. withdrawal from the Asian mainland. I am convinced that in the course of the long effort to find some way to get along, we had to show steel. Because of this, I support our limited military commitments and limited political objectives in Vietnam. But I consider what we are doing in Vietnam as part of a greater whole. It gives us a basis for making policy with respect to Communist China which could get us away from the static condition in which we now find ourselves, i.e. being against recognition, against any kind of trade, against admission to the United Nations, and against policies of other nations with respect to Communist China which differ from our own.

There is no question about the need for finding a way to deal with Communist China in respect to any Vietnam settlement. It is a fact that Communist China is the main supporter and stimulator of the North Vietnamese and ideologically the principle barrier to bringing North Vietnam to the peace table.

Whatever settlement may result on Vietnam will require some international action, such as supervision of free elections probably by the United Nations, and will require Communist Chinese participation. To make such participation practicable in a settlement it would be necessary to have Communist China as a member of the community of nations, making the settlement. Accordingly, just as I have concurred with the President that in peace negotiations regarding Vietnam there should be unconditional discussions, so I believe that in connection with such peace negotiations there should be "unconditional discussions" with Communist China.

This is only a step and the meaning of this step must be celarly understood. It is important to consider what we are not doing under such circumstances. We are not recognizing Communist China or agreeing to trade with it or to cease opposing its admission to the UN. We are saying only that we are willing to discuss all questions and to abide by the results of an agreed-upon treaty or agreement.

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

We are not turning our back on the Chinese Nationalist government on Taiwan which as a state and as a member of the UN must be assured that its national integrity is being fully respected.

We are not in any way lessening our determination to resist—with military means or otherwise—the change of governments by force, subversion and aggresssion, whether or not called a war of national liberation, and that we propose to stand by our military commitments to resist subversion or aggression in the future.

We are not in any way retreating from our purpose or our determination in Vietnam—that its people should be in an atmosphere of peace freely decide their own governmental future.

We are not seeking the approval or agreement of Communist China, nor are we in fear of Communist Chinese rejection. We are continuing our peace offensive on a broader and more inclusive scale, facing realistically the real problem—Communist China—and confident that other nations will realize that it is never embarrassing to face reality, especially when speaking and acting from a situation of strength.

I have no illusions about Peking's reaction to such a proposal or to any other peace overtures—at this time. Mao Tse-tung and the other old revolutionaries, locked as they are in the prison of their own dogma, will respond with hate and invective in the negative. On March 3, Jenmin Jih Pao, a Communist party newspaper, commented that the U.S. Senate debate on Vietnam was a "camouflage to hoodwink the people," and that both the "hawks" and the "doves" are "fools." On March 14, Vice President HUMPHREY was treated with the same sort of disdain by the Communist Chinese leaders. The day after he hinted that Washington may be prepared to adopt a policy of containment without isolation, the Chinese Communist leaders called his suggestion the "kiss of Judas".

As of now, the Red leaders are completely preoccupied with maintaining their doctrinal purity. They shun any formal contact with the "American imperialists." They believe that their appeal in the developing nations rests on an uncompromising ideology and on implacable hostility to the West. They are dead wrong in this belief. Recent events in Cuba, where Castro has turned his lengthy diatribes against Peking, in Africa where the overthrow of governments which had become too much under Chinese communist influence was greeted with immense African approval, and in Indonesia where the overwhelming number of Indonesians have risen up in support of the Army's efforts to prevent a communist takeover—all these events are testimony to the blindness of Peking's doctrine.

Our problem is to bring Peking to the realization that not only has its dogmatism failed, but that its refusal to recognize this failure will be dangerous—to everyone concerned. As long as the Peking leaders remain entrapped by their own propaganda, every conflict runs the risk of escalation. As long as their ideology provides no room for peaceful coexistence, every small dispute China has with another nation can become a full-blown confrontation. This is not only true of Peking's relations with the West, but within the Communist world as well.

How can we bring Communist China into the international community of nations for the purpose of making peace in Vietnam without selling out other peoples or our own ideals and commitments?

The answer to this question must revolve around a general policy of strength and sensibility, containment but not isolation of the Chinese people.

We can have peace in Vietnam only if the priorities of Peking are reordered. To do this, we must maintain our strength while showing our willingness to negotiate unconditionally with Communist China, as well as with North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front.

COMMUNIST CHINA AND NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

(Excerpts of the remarks of Senator JACOB K. JAVITS prepared for delivery at the Sixth Annual Banquet of the Iona College Alumni Association, Commodore Hotel, New York City, 7:30 p.m., Thursday, June 9, 1966)

Will Communist China join the community of nations?

This, in the 1960's, is the most crucial question in respect of the future peace and stability of the world.

The United States, the most powerful nation on the face of the earth, must play a leading role in assuring that the answer to that question is a positive one. In my opinion, we can help to bring about a positive answer by our strength—moral as well as physical—not our weakness; by our patience, not our haste; and by our reasonableness, not our inflexibility, and not by unilateral concessions.

It will take time; there will be frustrations, set-backs and even dangers, but the process of building bridges between Communist China and the world community must be pursued.

Until now, however, I feel we have been mesmerized by the dream of some magical event—some mystical world conference—in which all major disputes between China and the remainder of the world may be eliminated at one stroke. But the history of international relations demonstrates that the process of accommodation in relative peacetime between hostile nations is a piecemeal one. It rarely happens at one stroke. Package deals are illusory, and complex diplomatic problems must be treated separately and on their individual merits. With respect to U.S. relations with the Peking regime, this means that both nations must learn to negotiate what is negotiable and we must learn to talk in some areas while we may dispute in others.

I have hoped—and continue to hope—that a breakthrough might come in Vietnam. To this end, I have repeatedly proposed that the United States state its willingness to engage in "unconditional discussions" with Communist China with respect to Vietnam. Unhappily, the Peking leaders, as well as those in Hanoi, show no signs of compromise. The only hopeful signs in Vietnam come not from Peking or Hanoi, but from the prospect of genuinely free elections in South Vietnam. If these free elections are held as scheduled and if the South Vietnamese are able to submerge their differences enough to form a reasonably representative civilian and constitutional government, the cause of peace and freedom will be greatly strengthened.

But the fact that the aggressors in Vietnam are not willing to come to their senses does not require that the rest of our diplomatic machinery come to a halt. Indeed, our government is quite frequently engaged in talks with Communist China at the Ambassadorial level in Warsaw. This contact is a vital one, but it is only one link. In the nuclear age neither the Chinese nor the rest of the world should allow it to be the only link.

I therefore, propose another link. I propose that Communist China be invited to the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva, if it will sign the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

Over 110 nations have already signed the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, and it seems to me that Communist China should first assume these same treaty obligations, as so many others have, before discussions can be fruitful.

The Geneva Disarmament Conference is making important but slow progress in several areas. The issues in dispute between the U.S. and the Soviet Union in regard to the nuclear non-proliferation problem are now clearly focused. The major obstacle to the completion of this vital treaty is the question of nuclear sharing within NATO. We want to find some way to satisfy the interests of our allies, and the Soviet Union wants to guard against a West German finger on the nuclear trigger. If NATO can agree to some internal arrangement based on the principle of consultation on nuclear matters rather than joint ownership, there is a good chance that the non-proliferation treaty could become a reality, probably when the acute Vietnam crisis is behind us. On the problem of extending the partial test ban provisions to cover underground tests, there are also some positive signs. Significant advances have been made in the technology of detecting underground nuclear explosions. The key stumbling block, however, remains Moscow's refusal to accept the necessity for any inspections whatever of "suspicious explosions," that is, explosions that are difficult to distinguish from earthquakes.

Communist China should not be allowed to make a propaganda circus of the Geneva discussion if it joins them. The best way to guard against this is to give the Peking leaders some stake in the success of the talks. Signing the Partial Test Ban Treaty would be a step in that direction. Permitting Communist China to introduce other issues for discussion, such as their own proclaimed interest in a "no first strike" nuclear agreement, would be another step. Our own government, in fact, has already indicated a willingness to discuss this "no strike" issue if the Chinese would agree to stop its atomic testing in the atmosphere.

Inviting Communist China to the Geneva Conference as a way of adding to its links with the world would also have the advantage of not prejudicing the recognition problem. The disarmament meetings in Geneva are independent of the United Nations. Communist China's membership would not commit our own government in any way to recognizing this regime or to giving it membership in the U.N. Moreover, it would not be difficult to extend the invitation. The U.S. and the Soviet Union, as co-chairmen of the conference, could make the offer. Of course, some provision must also be made at that time to keep the proper balance at the conference between Warsaw Pact, NATO, and neutralist powers.

I have no illusions about the likelihood of Communist China's response to the invitation. It will probably say "No" to the offer, and will continue to instigate its so-called "wars of national liberation." But I also have no doubt that the U.S. should attempt to bring the People's Republic of China into a genuine dialogue on disarmament and other security matters. Peking has recently exploded its third nuclear device, and the radioactive fallout from this explosion was dangerously high. Whether we like it or not, Communist China is fast becoming a nuclear power.

On April 16, Secretary of State Rusk laid down the principle of our policy toward Communist China. He said: "We must take care to do nothing which encourages Peking—or anyone else—to believe that it can reap gains from its aggressive actions and designs. But, at the same time, we must continue to make it plain that, if Peking abandons its belief that force is the best way to resolve disputes and gives up its violent strategy of world revolution, we would welcome an era of good relations." I subscribe to this principle, and my proposal of today is made in this spirit.

VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on June 12, 1966, I delivered the commencement address at Hofstra College. This address

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

represents my thinking on the situation in Vietnam.

In this address, I deal with the two most pressing problems in Vietnam: First, elections; and second, escalation. Fair, open, and free elections and a speedy conversion to a caretaker civilian government are needed to give the government of South Vietnam the legitimacy the government needs and the people of South Vietnam want. In regard to bringing peace to Vietnam, positive and constructive proposals should be made to bring the conflict to the conference table. My address contains proposals for a military freeze.

I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the RECORD.

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

THE NEED TO PREVENT ESCALATION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

In such a setting as this, it is appropriate that we think of our life purpose, both as individuals and as Americans. As individuals I am sure this purpose is on every mind and heart and I would contribute only little within this context to your individual thoughts.

But on our purpose as a nation I can perhaps be helpful. Because of our productive power, traditions and geographic location, we are a nation that has fallen heir to world responsibility. Our people have accepted and carried out this role as being vital to our security and to our ideals—but we still feel uncomfortable with this responsibility. Yet, we are probably the first of the world powers in history that can sincerely demonstrate that we want nothing but peace and freedom for all and the broadest possible opportunity for all people.

By now it is also quite true that we have no doctrinaire preconceptions about social and economic systems and are perfectly willing to live in peaceful co-existence even with Communist states, provided they do not practice aggression or subversion upon others.

Within this context, it is proper to ask why Vietnam has become such an overriding issue in our country. We have faced military challenges before, as for example, in the Berlin Blockade, the Korean War, and the Cuban missile crisis—but these seemed easier to explain.

In Berlin, we had the full support of the Western world, and we were defending unequivocal rights of access to this city. In Korea, the North Korean attack across the 17th parallel was a clear case of aggression, and we acted as the major part of a United Nations Police Force to repel the aggression. The Cuban missile crisis was close to home, it was a clear attempt by the Soviet Union to alter the balance of power, and our allies came to our support immediately.

Vienam is more difficult to explain. As the threat becomes more subtle and the area more distant from our traditional concerns, it is harder to understand—but it is no less a threat. We have allies in Vietnam—in fact, those nations in the area, among others, which also feel their security is at stake—but their number and capacity are limited.

The point that troubles so many Americans is the unusual amount of disapproval in the free world for the position we have taken and the way we are carrying it on. All the more reason why our policy in Vietnam needs to be spelled out and be clearly understood by every American if possible—so grave is the issue, so critical are its implications.

In reflecting on the first catastrophic year of World War I, Winston Churchill wrote that "events passed very largely outside the scope of conscious choice. Governments and individuals conformed to the rhythm of the tragedy, and swayed and staggered forward in helpless violence, slaughtering and squandering on ever-increasing scales . . ." Reflecting on war in general, Karl von Clausewitz, the dean of military historians, warned that all military conflicts tend to outstrip political objectives and develop a logic of their own.

Vietnam must not become a case in point.

My own thinking on Vietnam has been governed always by four principles:

First, that our cause of helping the South Vietnamese people to defend themselves is a just one, and that our objective of allowing the people freely to determine their own future should be pursued by limited military means. The objective would make little sense if it led to the devastation of South Vietnam and a wider Asian land war.

Second, that the conflict should end in some kind of negotiated settelment, and that we must do all we can to bring all relevant parties, including Communist China, North Vietnam, and the National Liberation Front, to the baragining table. This requires that our objectives be reasonable and our means measured; it does not mean unilateral concessions by the U.S.

Third, that we should focus our energies on means to develop a freely elected, representative, and workable government in Saigon. Only such a civilian government can gain legitimacy and acceptance from the Vietnamese.

Fourth, that if there is to be no stable Saigon Government because the leaders of the various factions will not submerge their personal power drives for the common effort against a communist takeover, the U.S., notwithstanding its determination to see the struggle through, cannot remain in Vietnam. I feel the American people are flatly opposed to U.S. forces fighting alone—or to a U.S. takeover of South Vietnam.

As I see the situation, then, we must pursue peace through strength and reasonableness in order to prevent the further escalation of the conflict, and we must help to stabilize and legitimize the Saigon Government in order to achieve our purpose—the social and economic reconstruction of Vietnam under self-determination.

PURSUING THE PEACE

In order to prevent the fighting from developing a logic of its own and in order to avoid a condition where military decisions determine political choices, the escalation of the conflict must be ended.

There must be a military freeze before there can be hope for peace discussion to begin.

I think it is important to distinguish between a military freeze and a cease fire. A freeze simply means to fix a ceiling on the present magnitude of battle, particularly in respect to the introduction of new troops. At this stage of the Vietnam conflict, there is probably little hope for a prolonged or extended cease fire. More likely, as in the Korean War, fighting will occur during the negotiations themselves. The establishment of a cease fire agreement and the details of policing it will also be the business of the eventual peace conference.

To the end of bringing about discussions through a military freeze, I would make the following proposals:

1. That, subject to international verification, the United States agree to stop sending additional troops into South Vietnam in return for a North Vietnamese pledge to halt the infiltration of their soldiers into South Vietnam.

North Vietnamese infiltration is now exceeding 6,000 per month. U.S. troop introductions during the next twelve month period are likely to average 10,000 per month. At this rate, the already high casualties will double in a year's time.

2. That the United States agree to cease bombing in North Vietnam in return for a North Vietnam and NLF pledge to come to the conference table and negotiate for peace.

The cessation of bombing in the North should provide Hanoi with some face-saving reason for agreeing to talk. It could also create a calmer atmosphere for the talks.

3. That the Geneva Conference of 1954 be reconvened in order to conduct the negotiations, and that the NLF be allowed to sit at the conference as an "independent party."

I suggest the Geneva Conference rather than the United Nations because of the fact that neither North Vietnam nor Communist China are members of the U.N. and would, therefore, object to a U.N. framework. Moreover, the Geneva Conference, unlike other possible international bodies, is composed of nations that have a direct and intimate stake in Southeast Asian Affairs. That is not the time to go looking for a new international body—only to argue about composition and procedure all over again.

These are my proposals, yet even as I make them, I am not sanguine about the possibilities of negotiations at this time. Peking, Hanoi, and the NLF show no signs of willingness to end the struggle. Their preconditions for negotiations are "immediate, complete, unconditional withdrawal of U.S. troops," and "the recognition of the NLF as the only legitimate voice" of South Vietnam. These are not negotiating points, they are ultimatums. The main responsibility for preventing a peace conference lies squarely on the communists' shoulders.

The U.S. has repeatedly stated its readiness to discuss "anything with anyone", and no preconditions have been attached. If the communists do not believe the sincerity of this offer, they have but to test us to find out.

But the fact that we have made this open offer to talk does not mean that we are relieved of further responsibility. The President has an obligation to continually restate and clarify our objectives, and to explain these in positive and realistic terms to the American people and the world. In recent weeks, the U.S. people's "consensus" behind the President's policy in Vietnam has diminished. I believe this is, in large measure, due to a sense of drift regarding the President's conduct of the conflict and due to the frustration generated by the internecine quarrels among the South Vietnamese leaders.

Specifically, it is my impression that the American people feel that the President has not been forceful enough in presenting U.S. interests in the current South Vietnamese power struggle. I believe that the American people are losing patience with intramural power plays in Vietnam by local military, political and religious groups, and that they want the President to make this perfectly clear to the South Vietnamese. I am not implying that our own people want the President to dictate a solution or support any particular faction or man in South Vietnam. What I am saying is that I believe the American people want the President to state that unless these internal differences are settled, we cannot remain in South Vietnam.

I also believe that the American people are unhappy about the fact that the President has apparently accomplished little in bringing the negotiating position of the Saigon Government on peace in Vietnam into line with our own. Premier Ky has often stated that he will not discuss any matter with the NLF under any circumstances. We cannot become tied to such an unbending position.

The thrust of what I am saying is that neither we nor the Vietnamese can afford the luxury of taking positions that contribute only to the escalation of the conflict and not to peace.

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

ELECTIONS AND LEGITIMACY

Free elections are the single most important elements in the future stability of South Vietnam. If the communist leaders continue to foreclose the possibility of negotiations, free elections may be the only way for the Saigon Government to establish the legitimacy it needs and the people of South Vietnam ought to have.

If every step of this electoral process, from campaigning to the installation of a new government, is not conducted with the openness and fairness it deserves, hope for bringing peace to Vietnam will seriously recede.

The various South Vietnamese factions seem to be fighting primarily over power, and not over purposes. The over-whelming majority of these same people do not want to be ruled by a communist dictatorship any more than a military one.

The South Vietnamese leaders must learn that their quarrels only defeat their ends. I was pleased to learn last week that there are some hopeful signs in this regard.

The Electoral Commission of South Vietnam has properly recommended that the Constituent Assembly to be elected next September should "also have legislative power" and could transform itself into a full-fleged parliamentary body if the proposed constitution so provides. It would be very unwise for the military junta to prolong unduly their own military form of government; the transition to a caretaker civilian government should be made as quickly as possible.

The Electoral Commission also recommended that the Saigon Government request U.N. observation of the elections. This is an important sign of good faith, and I hope that the U.N., notwithstanding the opposition of the Soviet Union and France, will assume this responsibility. Some outside international supervision of the elections is most desirable.

It would be appropriate, in addition, to call for a cease fire during the period of the elections. If need be, this cease fire should be unilaterlly declared. All bombing should stop, and U.S. and ARVN troops should be ordered to fire only in self-defense.

While I am pleased that the Electoral Commission has asked the Saigon Government for a speedy transition to civilian rule and for international supervision of the elections, I am concerned by another of the Commission's proposals.

The Commission proposed that "those who directly or indirectly are involved in any activity favoring communism and neutralism . . . should not be permitted to stand as candidates."

It is a dangerous practice to allow local officials to determine who are included in an abstract definition of "communists and neutralists."

Also, the election must be open to all—universal suffrage by secret ballot should be the basis of participation in the September elections, otherwise the results of the election might not be truly representative of all the South Vietnamese people.

As a practical matter, however, we must realize that there are certain areas of South Vietnam in which it may be impossible to have free elections. All those who observe these elections—the U.S., the U.N., and other international bodies, and the whole world—will be able to judge whether areas so excluded by the Saigon Government invalidate the essential fairness of the election. The Saigon Government must, therefore, be careful not to exclude areas in an arbitrary manner—and I hope our Government will make this clear, too.

Should the people of South Vietnam decide in these elections that they no longer desire U.S. assistance, we should withdraw. It is my belief, however, that the people of South Vietnam will freely choose to retain our help in the joint effort to bring about peace and freedom and the social and economic construction of South Vietnam for which its people have sacrificed so much.

Peace is an elusive condition in human affairs. The history of man is dotted endlessly by needless conflicts.

Abraham Lincoln, in his Second Inaugural Address, has given us the criterion; we have but to follow it: "Let us strive to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations."

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CHARTERING OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this is a memorable date for the 38 million Americans who have been or are now associated with one of the greatest youth organizations in world history, the Boy Scouts of America. It is likewise a date of great significance to our beloved President pro tempore, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

It was 50 years ago, on June 15, 1916, that President Woodrow Wilson signed into law the bill authorizing a congressional charter for the Boy Scouts of America. Today is the golden anniversary of that event.

CARL HAYDEN is the one Member of the 89th Congress who was also a Member of the 64th Congress, which approved this bill 50 years ago. He voted for it as a Member of the House, representing the State of Arizona.

His vote on that occasion was but one of innumerable instances of CARL HAYDEN's lifelong concern for American youth.

The bill chartering the Boy Scouts was introduced in the House as H.R. 755, and passed that body on March 6, 1916. On May 31 of that year, it was approved by the Senate. The bill was duly signed by the then Speaker of the House, the Honorable Champ Clark, of Missouri, and the Honorable John H. Bankhead, Sr., of Alabama, then Acting President pro tempore of the Senate. The key section of that act read as follows:

> The purpose of this corporation shall be to promote through organization, and cooperation with other agencies, the ability of boys to do things for themselves and others, to train them in Scoutcraft, and to teach them patriotism, courage, self-reliance, and kindred virtues, using the methods which are now in common use by the Boy Scouts.

Congress has every reason to be proud of the action it took in 1916 in providing a Federal charter for the Boy Scouts of America. As Senator HAYDEN himself has written:

> Judged by its outstanding accomplishments, no organization has proved to be more worthy of a Federal charter.

By 1955, on the 45th anniversary of the founding of the American Scout movement, there remained only four Members in Congress who had served in the 64th Congress, and who had voted in 1916 to charter the Boy Scouts of America. These four men, all of whom had made historic contributions to our Nation's progress, together issued a proclamation on February 8, 1955, celebrating the 45th birthday of the Boy Scouts of America, and reminding the Scouts that the purpose for which their charter was created by the Congress "continues as your vital service to our beloved America." The four signers of that proclamation wer Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Carl Vinson, chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, Alben W. Barkley, former Vice President of the United States and Senator from Kentucky, and our dear colleague, CARL HAYDEN.

In commendation of CARL HAYDEN's leadership in the Scout movement, the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America, on June 14, 1962, awarded him Scouting's highest award, the Silver Buffalo, for "distinguished service to boyhood."

On January 14 of this year, Senator HAYDEN offered a resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 68, which I had the honor to cosponsor, expressing the sense of Congress on the 50th anniversary of the chartering of the Boy Scouts of America. The resolution was ordered reported to the Senate from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on Jan-10, and was approved by the House on February 21. May I remind the Senate that in adopting that resolution we resolved:

> That the Congress hereby pays tribute to the Boy Scouts of America on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the granting by Act of Congress of the Charter of the Boy Scouts of America, and expresses its recognition of and appreciation for the public service performed by this organization through its contributions to the lives of the nation's youth.

Mr. President, it is indeed deserving and fitting that the Boy Scouts of America be so recognized on this auspicious occasion for them, for the Congress, and for the Nation. I am proud to have had a part in the resolution making this occasion possible and to have this opportunity to add my words of personal appreciation and gratitude to the Boy Scouts for all they have done through the years for our Nation's youth. I salute our Boy Scouts of America on the 50th anniversary of their chartering by Congress and say to them as emphatically as I can, "Continue with the same energy and vigor that in the past you have so magnificently displayed to instill in the hearts and the minds of our Nation's youth, at a time when it is so vitally necessary, the noble and lofty ideals of patriotism, courage, self-reliance, and kindred virtues on which you were founded."

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 502 OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1164, S. 2858.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

above reproach by a U.S. senator, is placed under surveillance during a trip abroad; private detectives look for damaging evidence in the personal life of a lawyer who criticizes automotive safety; a spy is planted in a drug firm by a company specializing in industrial undercover work.

Big Brother, the all-knowing ruler of the year 1984, is not watching. Not yet, anyway. But a lot of little brothers are and as they do they raise questions that defenders of the individual have constantly struggled to answer. The late Justice Brandeis, dissenting from a 1928 Supreme Court ruling that wiretapping was not an unreasonable search and seizure, went back to the framers of the Constitution to argue . . . "They sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions and their sensations. They conferred, as against the government, the right to be let alone."

Dr. William Beaney, Cromwell professor of law at Princeton, agreed in testimony before a House subcommittee investigating the invasion of privacy. Dr. Beaney, aware that a final definition of privacy is elusive, did, nonetheless, call for an inventory of activities that raise the issue of privacy and dignity.

Dr. Beaney's suggestion has generally gone unheeded. Some intrusions may have been justifiable; others could have been pernicious, while still others could best be categorized as absurd. But if such practices are to go unchecked, they could result in a society of living in fear of Big Brother.

THE REAL REASONS FOR OUR PRESENCE IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the real reasons for America's presence in South Vietnam are set forth quite realistically, I think, in a column Howard K. Smith wrote for the Evening Star. Smith asks if the United States is pleading its case in Vietnam on the wrong grounds by emphasizing legal and moral reasons for our presence. And he prefers, as I do, to argue the case for our presence in Vietnam on the basis of political realities.

The "real and relevant" explanation for our presence in Vietnam, he says, "is that this is a power struggle the loss of which would bring consequences awful to contemplate." Mr. Smith states the consequences in this column, Mr. President, and they are indeed awful to contemplate. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

IS UNITED STATES PLEADING VIET CASE ON WRONG GROUNDS?

(By Howard K. Smith)

Every successive opinion poll shows that our appetite for resisting in Viet Nam is declining, and that President Johnson's stock with the voters is going the same way.

One cannot help thinking that the administration is not putting its case to the American people in proper terms. Of several faults, one is outstanding: The President and Secretary of State Dean Rusk and their colleagues almost always justify our effort in Southeast Asia on legal or moral grounds. The fact is that the struggle there is essentially and overwhelmingly a power struggle which we would probably have to undertake regardless of law or morality.

This is not to agree with the host of guilt-ridden critics who believe our moral case is bad. Compared with our foe's case, it is downright good. Ho Chi Minh has never dared submit his regime to a free election such as we are pressing for under U.N. inspection in the south.

His instrument of power has been terrorism. His "reforms" left the average North Vietnamese peasant considerably worse off that the average South Vietnamese peasant—until Ho made life in the south impossible by the murder of nearly all local officials and the systematic intimidation of the rest. It is an eloquent fact that though war-weary South Vietnamese dissent or riot or desert the forces, none go over to the Viet Cong.

But the real and relevant explanation of why we are fighting is that this is a power struggle the loss of which would bring consequences awful to contemplate.

To make the point, consider what would happen, first if they, then if we, prevail.

A Communist success, following an American withdrawal, would be an "open-ended" result. It would sharpen their appetite and desperately weaken the resistance of neighbors waiting to be consumed. It would justify the basic motivation of their ideology which is blind faith in a world interpretation that promises universal dominion at the end of the road.

The "domino" theory is much discredited in conversation. But the facts of life are these: Laos and Cambodia are shot through with guerrilla forces trained where those now in South Viet Nam were trained. Our AID officials in Thailand are watching a guerrilla minority, trained in the same place beginning to accumulate power by methods of pure terror in northeast Thailand.

China has made public the intention of adding Thailand to her bloc, and her actions over many years make clear her ultimate design of forcing the disintegration of India, the only possible counter-force to China south of Japan.

In short, a Communist success would be a destabilizing event; it would be bound to lead to further and worse conflicts.

A success for our side, on the other hand, would be a stabilizing result. As in Europe, we seek no territorial gain. Our aim is to find a line and establish the principle that we will not cross it to their detriment if they will not cross it either.

In the age of nuclear weapons it is a paramount mission to establish this principle that borders may not be changed by force in Asia—just as we established it in Europe. With China rapidly becoming a nuclear power, we dare not relinquish the effort now by curtailing our force or withdrawing it.

In his recent history of our times, Prof. Carroll Quigley makes the point that Germany, Italy and Japan gained immensely more by losing to us in World War II than they could have possibly have gained by winning. Had they won, their governments, filled with the seeds of their own degeneration, would have been stimulated to infinite acquisition, with consequent national impoverishment and eventual annihilation by the United States. As it is, they have stabilized, become progressive, democratic and prosperous societies.

Very much the same can be said about the Communist nations of Asia. If they win in Viet Nam, they will move on indefinitely to extend their sway. At some point the United States would be forced to intervene again, this time with the support of the opinion polls of a frightened public that at last would see the real nature of the struggle. A much bloodier war would result.

South Viet Nam is the right place and this is the right time to make a stand.

KANSAS DETERMINED TO REBUILD AFTER KILLER TORNADOES

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, last Wednesday, June 8, a series of killer tornadoes struck Kansas. Approximately 15 tornadoes were sighted and several of them touched down and left paths of violent destruction. A good number of communities and farm sites were affected. All together 17 persons were killed. Over 500 were injured with almost 100 of these requiring hospitalization. Preliminary surveys supplied to me by the Red Cross show that 818 homes were destroyed, 938 with major damage, and 1,116 with minor damage. In addition almost 100 house trailers were destroyed or received major damage. All together a total of approximately 3,300 families suffered losses.

In the city of Manhattan approximately 75 homes in a newly developed section of Manhattan were either destroyed or received extensive damage. At Kansas State University all but two of the married student housing apartment buildings received such major damage that they have had to be evacuated.

The greatest destruction, however, was concentrated in Topeka, the State's capital. Here 16 persons were killed and approximately 2,000 homes destroyed or damaged. Several apartment buildings were also hit, leaving a total of 3,000 families homeless. Approximately 200 business firms were destroyed or received major damage. One automobile dealer lost 275 automobiles through the storm.

The city's Washburn University was especially hard hit. President John W. Henderson states that the losses to the university are probably "the largest damage ever to any institution of higher learning."

Preliminary estimates placed the loss for Topeka at $150 million. However, several building experts believe that final estimates may well show damages of at least $300 million.

Mr. President, an article in this morning's, June 15, Wall Street Journal describes the death and destruction which was visited on Topeka a week ago. It also reports on the tough determination of Topekans to rebuild their devastated city. While I visited Topeka last Friday, I was impressed by the manner in which all the city's citizens were working together to clean up the debris and to make their city operational and livable as soon as possible. Topeka Mayor Charles W. Wright, and Topeka Water Commissioner C. Frank Mannspeaker, are today here in Washington seeking assistance in planning and funding rehabilitation of the city, which suffered what some believe is the worst damage ever sustained by a metropolitan area from a tornado. Housing, mass transit, education—all suffered heavily from the twister. The Wall Street Journal article describes this mood of determination and cooperation very effectively and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my comments.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, it is encouraging to report that all the regular natural disaster programs and agencies are being effectively used to help Kansans recover as rapidly as possible from this disaster. However, as I stated last Thursday upon introducing a special disaster relief bill, I believe that ad-

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

ditional programs beyond those by present law are needed in order to provide reasonable and necessary relief. President Johnson has declared Kansas to be a national disaster area, indicating that this was a disaster of truly major proportions.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 15, 1966]

TORNADO AFTERMATH: TOPEKA DEMONSTRATES HOW CITY CAN REBOUND IN WAKE OF A DISASTER—DEVASTATED AUTO DEALERSHIP RENTS FAIRGROUND FACILITY; COLLEGE USES HIGH SCHOOL—THE ENORMITY OF REBUILDING

(By James C. Tanner)

TOPEKA, KANS.—Parts of the roof and walls are missing from Cyrus Guthrie's corner grocery store. Canned goods and packages of detergents are strewn in front. Electricity is still off. Homes of most of the store's customers are heaps of debris. But groceryman Guthrie is open for business—almost as usual.

The Guthrie store, a concrete building in northeast Topeka, was wrecked by a tornado that killed 17 persons and left a $150 million scar across this state capital city of 130,000 last Wednesday evening. When the warning sirens sounded, Mr. Guthrie closed his store and headed for cover. Later he returned to the area to help haul out the injured and to spend a weary night at his battered store giving away flashlights from his stock to dazed and homeless neighbors.

By dawn the next day, Mr. Guthrie was out rounding up carpenters and scrambling for materials to patch up the store. Like most Topekans with property in the path of the storm, he had insurance, but not nearly enough. Mr. Guthrie had coverage of only $3,000, and he says he "threw away that much" in ruined vegetables and other perishables.

"It knocked me down, but I'm coming back," he vows.

Mr. Guthrie's determination demonstrates the resiliency a city struck by disaster can display. Although still digging out of the debris, most Topekans already are bouncing back from the most destructive act of nature in the state's history. Mobilizing quickly, the city began the process of getting back on its feet almost as soon as the funnel lifted.

FEDERAL AGENCIES ACTIVE

"Open for business" signs on boarded-up storefronts and propped-up walls are evident throughout the tornado's path. Cleanup crews working round the clock are rapidly clearing away tons of debris. Many businessmen and homeowners are already rebuilding. Hundreds of volunteers are pitching in to aid the tornado's victims, and Uncle Sam is lending a hand, too. President Johnson has declared Topeka a disaster area eligible for Federal aid, and Federal agencies are opening makeshift offices all over town.

It's very likely that some areas of Topeka—particularly in the blighted lower-income northeast section of the city—will emerge from the devastation of the tornado in better physical shape than they were in before. New housing and shopping areas are already being planned.

Moreover, the whirling winds of the storm had hardly died before city fathers were dusting off plans, dormant for a decade, to build an expressway from southwest to northeast Topeka. The route, as initially planned, ironically parallels the path of the tornado. Previously, the right-of-way was too expensive. "But that's all unimproved property now," says one city official. City emissaries are in Washington right now laying their proposals before Federal authorities.

PREPARING FOR DISASTER

Topeka probably has fared better than many other comparable-sized communities would if they were hit with a disaster of this magnitude. Living as they do in the heart of mid-America's "tornado alley," Topekans are no strangers to violent weather, even though until last week the city had never been hit by the full force of a tornado. Hail storms are common here. Also, Topeka outshines many a larger city in its elaborate preparations for disasters. Local officials take pride in a civil defense center located in the subbasement of a recently built courthouse. There, strategy had been mapped to cope with disasters ranging in size up to nuclear attacks on nearby Forbes Air Force Base. Moreover, Topeka's storm-warning system is second to none. "Weather watchers," mostly volunteers, are posted around the city in radio-equipped cars whenever tornado conditions exist, and special warning sirens sound in every section of the city whenever a twister is sighted visually or on radar.

But there are some lessons to be learned here. Many new homes built in Topeka in recent years had neither storm cellars nor basements, as evidenced by all the concrete slab foundations exposed to view today where houses crumbled when the tornado struck. Although the loss of life was relatively small because of the repeated visual sightings of the tornado and other warnings, injuries are estimated as high as 500. These casualties could have been sharply reduced if everyone had taken proper precautions, it's generally agreed. It's even being suggested that all new homes be required by city ordinance to have a basement.

Many Topekans concede they were slow to act when the sirens sounded last week because the warning blasts had already come several times this spring and nothing much had happened. Darold D. Main, chairman of the Board of the Shawnee County Commissioners, admits he was nonchalantly working at his desk on the second floor of the county courthouse while the sirens were wailing last week. He paid little attention until debris flying past his window sent him scurrying to the civil defense shelter three floors below.

Many Topekans also appear to have put more stock in an old Indian legend than in sirens. The legend had it that Topeka was immune to tornadoes because of a feature of its topography, specifically a hill southwest of town named Burnett's Mound after the Indian chief said to be buried there. The reasoning was that since tornadoes usually move in a northeasterly direction, the hill sat directly in the path that would normally be taken by a twister headed toward Topeka. The storms would break up at the mound, never touching Topeka—or so the story went until last week.

Just before sundown last Wednesday, weather watchers stationed atop Burnett's Mound sighted a funnel moving toward the city. It didn't stop at Burnett's Mound. It danced across the hill, smashed into Twilight Street on the southwest side of Topeka and then swept northeastward with what one witness says was "the roar of 100 trains" through the city's most heavily populated sectors. The boiling black cloud ripped a half-mile-wide swath for 10 miles, whipping hard by the Weather Bureau building at the airport on its way out of town and sending the meteorologists who had earlier ordered the sirens sounded diving for cover amid flying glass.

For many Topekans the situation has never been so grim. Many lost relatives and friends; hundreds lost their life's savings. The storm left 3,000 families homeless, destroyed 200 business firms, leveled most of the stately old structures on the Washburn University campus, destroyed other buildings, and nicked the State capitol. It also overturned buses and boxcars and sucked windows from buildings and autos three blocks away from the tornado's trail. Some Topeka debris later turned up 75 miles away.

A BIG JUNKYARD

Until the bulldozers got busy, much of Topeka resembled a giant automobile junkyard, with 8,000 to 10,000 cars in tangled heaps. "This is the most terrible thing that ever happened," says William Alexander, a retired businessman. Disaster experts are just now totaling up the damages. At city-owned Washburn University, losses that are described by President John W. Henderson as "the largest damage ever to any institution of higher learning" are expected to approach $10 million.

Wrecked business structures in Topeka are swarming with some 150 insurance estimators. The Santa Fe Railway has figured damage to its facilities here at $2 million. Southwestern Bell Telephone Co. estimates its losses at more than $1.3 million; 18,000 phones were out right after the storm. Local Dodge dealer Claude Shortman, who lost 275 automobiles (175 of them new) and a dozen trucks, says his damages will surpass $1 million. All told, some building experts believe, the ultimate loss tally could run double the early estimate of $150 million.

In one low-income area hit by the tornado, insurance won't cover more than 20% of the overall loss, according to city auditor Charles Holt. Henry A. Bubb, president of Capitol Federal Savings & Loan Association, which holds about 90% of the mortgages in two fashionable residential sections in southwest Topeka that were hard hit, estimates replacement costs in those neighborhoods will exceed insured value by at least 10%.

HELP FROM WASHINGTON

Also, it's generally agreed that replacement of demolished properties will take considerable time, both because of a scarcity of labor and today's tight money situation. "We ought to be able to rebuild Topeka within a year," says contractor Clyde Senne. But businessmen like Dodge dealer Shortman fear that financing probably may slow rebuilding.

The Small Business Administration has already set up offices here—it had more than 50 inquiries the first day—to make disaster loans to both homeowners and businessmen. Topeka banker R. C. Clevenger expects to be swamped with pleas for financing. He says a bookbinder telephoned him before the bank opened the morning after the tornado to ask for help in lining up a building in which he could relocate his devastated business.

Officials like Robert Jones, Shawnee County civil defense director, worry that Topekans don't realize the enormity of the rebuilding task ahead. Some fret, too, that the initial enthusiasm to clean up and restore the tornado-damaged areas may wane. "The real test will be where Topeka is at this time next year," says Capt. James F. Barker, who directs Salvation Army aid units that are gathered here from 24 Midwestern communities.

Efforts to clean up and achieve a semblance of normality did indeed move at a feverish pace in the days immediately after the tornado. A five-mile long caravan of trucks, many hauling heavy tractors, was rushed here by the Kansas City, Mo., parks department. Equipment from as far away as St. Louis and Houston was also sent, and offers of help arrived from around the country.

A Phoenix, Ariz., mobile home dealer pledged temporary housing for displaced Topekans. Kansas, Oklahoma and Nebraska Mennonites, carrying axes and other tools for cleaning debris, were on hand within eight hours after the storm; they are part of the Mennonite Disaster Service, an organization within the Mennonite Church.

VOLUNTEERS FLOCK TO HOSPITAL

State Rep. Robert Harder, who directs Topeka antipoverty programs and whose district makes up 40% of the damaged zone, is supervising up to 3,000 local volunteers in social and welfare work for the tornado victims. Disaster agencies such as the Red Cross

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

Of course many individuals and numerous groups in this country have also lodged protests with Soviet authorities in Moscow, and have appealed urgently on behalf of these two writers. Some benevolent and kind individuals have even expressed the wish to aid these two victims of Soviet "justice" by offering to have them brought to this country and live here at their expense, without having them become public charges.

Recently I received a letter from one of my constituents, a highly public-spirited friend whose humanitarian feelings were aroused by the fate of Sinyavsky and Daniel. He wrote me stating that if the Soviet authorities want to be rid of Sinyavsky and Daniel and are willing to release them from prison and allow them to leave the Soviet Union, he "would underwrite the support of them and their families in this country for a couple of years." He expressed confidence that dozens of American writers would join him.

I wanted to explore ways by which the wish of my friend could be fulfilled, and so on April 27 I wrote to the Department of State, asking information on the possibility of obtaining the release of these two victims from their Soviet prison-labor camp, and on the chances of their coming to this country.

But the reply which I received from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, Mr. Douglas MacArthur II, was not encouraging. In his considerate reply to me, Mr. MacArthur makes it abundantly clear that appeals to the Soviet Government could offer no hope of securing the release in Sinyavsky and Daniel, since that Government has already refused to consider favorably all appeals made by innumerable other groups and individuals, including appeals made by some eminent Soviet writers and Communist intellectuals from Eastern and Western Europe. He also stresses the State Department's view that "concerned Americans and citizens of other countries should not hesitate to express their views in public about the fate of Sinyavsky and Daniel."

Under the circumstances that probably is the most and the very least we can do now. While it may not be possible to secure the release of Sinyavsky and Daniel from the Soviet prison-labor camp, I would like to voice my protest in this House against the conviction of these two gifted and innocent victims of Soviet "justice." It is my hope that such protests, from all quarters of the globe, may in some way help to deter the Soviet authorities from this type of repression in the future.

The case of Sinyavsky and Daniel is a particularly significant one for me and for the people of the First Congressional District of Massachusetts whom I am privileged to represent in this body. As a further example of the Soviet brand of "justice," it is a grim reminder of the tragic and bitterly frustrating case of young Newcomb Mott of Sheffield, Mass.

It was less than a year ago that 27-year-old Newcomb innocently wandered across the Soviet border from Norway, seeking information on how he might legally enter Russia for a brief visit. He was promptly arrested on charges of illegally entering the Soviet Union. His trial was a mockery of anything close to due process as we know it, and his conviction—18 months at hard labor in a Siberian penal colony—was considered severe even by Russian standards.

The world, of course, knows the outcome of the Mott case. Newcomb never reached Siberia. He died on the prison train, allegedly taking his own life, although the detailed circumstances of his death have never been clearly explained by the Soviets, and it is unlikely that they ever will.

It is to be hoped that Sinyavsky and Daniel will fare better on the sacrificial altar of Russian "justice" than did Newcomb Mott.

And certainly it should be crystal clear, even to the most euphemistic swallowers of Russian hogwash, that the Soviet Government cannot be trusted to react in either a plausible or predictable manner when it comes to human rights and justice. There is but one rule—expedience for the good of the state. All else is subordinate, and I repeat my earnest advice to any American foolish enough to consider placing his own welfare at the mercy of the Russian authorities. Steer well clear of any jurisdiction controlled or influenced by the Soviets. Ignore the rather surprising appeal of Russian advertising to visit the Soviet Union. The lessons are hard and clear. The risk is not worth the taking.

Mr. Speaker, the constituent of whom I spoke earlier and who has expressed interest in bringing Sinyavsky and Daniel out of Russia to this country, is the distinguished playwright, William Gibson of Stockbridge, Mass.

Mr. Gibson has made this case something of a personal crusade, since he himself has a more or less personal interest in it. Mr. Gibson is, of course, one of our more noted dissenters in this country. He makes no secret of his convictions on some of the issues confronting the Nation today—but makes equally clear his patriotic devotion to the only country in the world, perhaps, that would allow him to speak his convictions without fear of the kind of reprisals which the Soviets have taken against Sinyavsky and Daniel.

I would like to include at this point in my remarks the text of a letter written by Mr. Gibson to Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin. The letter, I feel, is in the clear tradition of the utterance by Voltaire, who said: "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend with my life your right to say it."

The letter follows:

Ambassador ANATOLY DOBRYNIN,
The Soviet Ambassador,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR AMBASSADOR DOBRYNIN: Last year I was invited by the Institute of Soviet-American Relations to visit Moscow, where two of my plays are being performed; I accepted, hoping to come when time permitted. Now I wish to state why I will not.

The sentencing to hard labor of the authors Daniel and Sinyavsky for publishing their dissent from state dogma, which to the Soviet government appears a crime and to me appears a duty, is not only a bitterness to all who hope for understanding between our countries; it should be felt by every writer in the world as a kick in the groin.

In Town Hall last month I participated in a read-in of American writers against our government's war in Viet Nam, which to me appears a crime and to others a duty, and there listened to such invective against our political leaders that even my ears burned. Surely our names without exception went into the FBI's files, but each of us spoke his fragment of the truth, in a faith as old as this country that out of many such fragments comes a wholer truth. Uninterfered with, I came home thanking my lucky stars, from the first thirteen on, that I had read my pages from a platform in New York and not in Moscow.

True, the traditions of your country and mine are so contrary that we cannot use the same language of humanity without ending in confusion, and it is a waste of breath to lecture each other. I know only that, like Sinyavsky and Daniel, I am a writer who abhors the lies which grease the machinery of every state; and while I come and go as I please on my road here, they are laboring in a prison camp; and I cannot honor my promise to visit your country while it so dishonors men like me.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM GIBSON.

CAMBODIAN AID TO THE VIETCONG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, since my return from serving on a special Armed Services Committee assignment to South Vietnam during the Easter recess, I have made a number of speeches in this Chamber on the subject of the aid the Vietcong derives from Cambodia.

Today I wish to inform my colleagues of a cable I received from the Prime Minister of Cambodia in which he, in strong and unusual language, protests the statements I had made. I wish to take this means to respond to this extraordinary communication because I believe it does more to lend credence to the charges than it does to deny them. The Prime Minister, Norodom Kantol, specifically attacks me for advocating an aggressive policy against his country, for making public "faked" information, and for the failure to be concerned about the truth of the situation along the Cambodian-Vietnamese border.

Let me first simply refer my colleagues to information which I have previously inserted in the RECORD on May 4, May 17, and May 23. At this time I would only reiterate that while in South Vietnam I was specifically told by a special forces officer of the existence of three airstrips on Cambodian soil which received daily flights with supplies for Vietcong and of the existence of a training area as well. Furthermore, I have yet to speak to a military officer of high or low rank knowledgeable of that part of the world who had the slightest doubt that the Vietcong were using Cambodia. Consequently, if it is a matter of believing the Cambodian Government or believing what our troops in the field tell me I shall believe the latter.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Senator STROM THURMOND (R), S & L.
JOHN L. MCMILLAN (D), L.
L. MENDEL RIVERS (D), S & L.
ALBERT W. WATSON (R), S.

SOUTH DAKOTA

E. Y. BERRY (R), L.
Senator KARL E. MUNDT, (R), S.
BEN REIFEL (R), L.

TENNESSEE

WILLIAM R. ANDERSON (D), S.
WILLIAM E. BROCK, 3rd (R), S.
JOHN J. DUNCAN (R), S & L.
RICHARD H. FULTON (D), S & L.

TEXAS

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH (D), L.
OMAR BURLESON (D), S.
EARLE CABELL (D), L.
BOB CASEY (D), S & L.
JOHN DOWDY (D), S & L.
O. C. FISHER (D), L.
ELIGIO DE LA GARZA (D), S & L.
HENRY B. GONZALEZ (D), S & L.
WRIGHT PATMAN (D), L.
J. J. (JAKE) PICKLE (D), S.
W. R. POAGE (D), L.
GRAHAM PURCELL (D), L.
RAY ROBERTS (D), S & L.
WALTER ROGERS (D), S.
OLIN E. TEAGUE (D), S.
CLARK W. THOMPSON (D), L.
RICHARD C. WHITE (D), S & L.
JAMES C. WRIGHT, Jr. (D), S & L.

UTAH

Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT (R), S.
Senator FRANK E. MOSS (D), S.
LAURENCE J. BURTON (R), S & L.
DAVID S. KING (D), L.

VERMONT

ROBERT T. STAFFORD (R), S.

VIRGINIA

THOMAS N. DOWNING (D), S & L.
PORTER HARDY, Jr. (D), S & L.
JOHN O. MARSH, Jr. (D), S & L.
DAVID E. SATTERFIELD, III (D), S.

WASHINGTON

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON (D), S.
BROCK ADAMS (D), S.
THOMAS S. FOLEY (D), S.
LLOYD MEEDS (D), S & L.
THOMAS M. PELLY (R), S.

WEST VIRGINIA

Senator ROBERT C. BYRD (D), S.
Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH (D), S.
Ken HECHLER (D), S & L.
JAMES KEE (D), S.
ARCH A. MOORE, Jr. (R), L.
JOHN M. SLACK, Jr. (D), S.
HARLEY O. STAGGERS (D), L.

WISCONSIN

ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER (D), S.
Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE (D), S.
GLENN R. DAVIS (R), L.
MELVIN R. LAIRD (R), S.
HENRY S. REUSS (D), S & L.
VERNON W. THOMSON (R), S.

WYOMING

Senator GALE W. MCGEE (D), S.
Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON (R), L.

EDITORIAL IN THE WASHINGTON POST, JUNE 14, 1966

(Mr. STEED asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of keeping the record straight, I call attention the following. Under the heading "Stewart's Ploy," an editorial in the Washington Post states as follows:

Although J. George Stewart, the Architect of the Capitol, did not ask for funds to construct an extension on the West Front, there is no reason to think the project has been postponed. Mr. Stewart has never favored asking for separate appropriations for his building schemes. At this stage in a session Congressmen are tempted to ask questions and demand explanations before approving expenditures. Mr. Stewart prefers to stick his requests among the supplemental appropriations items that come in the last hectic days before adjournment. He funded the East Front extension in this manner. He funded the Rayburn House Office Building in this manner.

The statements that the extension of the east front and the Rayburn Building were funded through supplemental appropriations are essentially false.

A review of the records, which could be made with great ease by anyone interested, shows the following:

Extension of the east front: $24 million was appropriated for this project and associated items. Of this amount, $19,700,000 was obtained through the regular annual appropriation acts and $4,300,000 through supplemental appropriations. It is significant that the first two appropriations made for this project, totaling $17 million, were carried in the regular acts This was more than enough to cover the total cost—$12 million—of the extension of the east front itself.

Additional House office building project: $134,500,000 was appropriated under this heading, which includes the construction of the Rayburn Building at a cost of approximately $89 million. Of the total of $134,500,000 appropriated, $124,500,000 came by the regular annual appropriations acts and $10 million by supplementals. Of the $10 million from supplementals, $5 million was earmarked for purchase of land east of the Cannon House Office Building which the Congress has now decided will be used for the Madison Memorial-Library of Congress Building. So, in fact, only $5 million from supplemental appropriations went toward payment for the Rayburn Building, remodeling of the other buildings, construction of garages and subways, and other items carried on under this project.

SINYAVSKY AND DANIEL: VICTIMS OF SOVIET "JUSTICE"

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the fate of innocent and helpless victims under Soviet law has always elicited much compassion and pity in humanity, often leading to expressions of indignation and protest. That is one of the finest and noblest feelings of all sensible and sensitive human beings. It is a trait that has long been part of our own heritage, for in our fervent desire to see justice done, we have always championed the rights of the innocent and the helpless, the downtrodden and the underdog. Such has been our behavior in human affairs touching human rights, particularly in instances where the fate of certain individuals was involved, and where, in the courts of law, justice was flouted for political consideration and baser motives.

The case of two Soviet writers who were recently tried in Moscow, convicted and then sentenced to long terms of penal servitude in prison-labor camps, is an instance in point.

Andrei Sinyavsky and Yuli Daniel are two well-known men of letters. Sinyavsky has long been known as a novelist and literary critic and also as an ardent admirer of the famous Soviet writer, Boris Pasternak. Daniel has been best known as a gifted and versatile poet. They have often written in praise of the Soviet Union's authorities. For a while, when Khrushchev was all powerful, their critical views, expressed in subtle literary forms, were tolerated and the writers were unmolested.

For years they retained their status in the Gorki Institute of World Literature in Moscow, and they continued to hold their own, even after Khrushchev's demise. Then last September they were arrested by Soviet authorities and charged with disseminating anti-Soviet propaganda in their writings abroad under assumed names. On this allegedly serious and principal charge they were tried in Moscow in a courtroom which was open to Soviet newspapermen but deliberately barred to foreign press representatives. After a 4-day trial in early February, they were found guilty, convicted and then sentenced to serve at penal prison-labor camps, Sinyavsky for 7 years and Daniel for 5 years.

At the trial the prosecution charged that Sinyavsky, under the name Abram Tertz, and Daniel as Nikolai Arzak, had written very critically of Soviet literature, and particularly about life in the Soviet Union; that they had successfully smuggled their anti-Soviet writings out of the Soviet Union by devious and illegal methods; and had them published abroad.

Both Sinyavsky and Daniel readily admitted to writing under assumed names and to having smuggled their writings out of the Soviet Union for publication abroad, but they stoutly denied the charge that their writings contained or constituted anti-Soviet propaganda. Nonetheless both men were convicted.

No sooner was the trial over early in February and the verdict known abroad, than the case of these two Soviet writers became something of an international issue. Men of letters in all parts of the free world held protest meetings and sent appeals to Soviet authorities, asking for leniency and clemency. The storm of protests from groups of writers in the west was also directed to the Soviet writers union in Moscow.

Unfortunately, these protests and appeals have not brought about any change in the fate of Sinyavsky and Daniel; and, so far as is known, they are already doing penal servitude in a prison labor camp.

I am impressed that by sending me this personal cable the Cambodian Prime Minister is admitting that a very sensitive nerve has been hit. His cable is not so much a rebuttal of the charges as it is a countercharge that the whole question is a fabrication of the U.S. Government to prepare the American people for a war against Cambodia. A genuinely neutral Cambodia has nothing to fear from the United States. But just how does Cambodia understand the word, "neutrality"? For one example, let me quote from a letter by the Cambodian delegate to the United Nations to the New York Times on May 27, 1966, in which he states:

> Because of her policy of strict neutrality, Cambodia refuses to be subjected to imperialist domination and to approve this war of aggression. It continues to support morally and politically the struggle of the brave Vietnam people against American aggression. We have never concealed the fact that in token of our solidarity with the Vietnam people we have offered medical supplies and dried fish to the National Liberation Front.

This, it seems to me, is a very peculiar definition of neutrality. It's clear from its hostile tone toward the United States that we must be extremely wary of the Cambodian Government's public assurances about its alleged neutrality. Therefore, while I think it is well that the invitation by Cambodia for a congressional delegation to check into the border situation has been accepted, I would strongly recommend that any such delegation should also inspect these areas with our own military people as well, preferably before journeying to Pnompenh.

The nature and extent of the aid to the Vietcong receive from Cambodia is admittedly difficult to measure. This is, of course, in part due to the very character of guerrilla warfare. No one doubts the existence of the Ho Chi Minh Trail complex but perhaps on any given day it is practically impossible to find it. Certainly we must be sure that such a delegation is not given a whitewash treatment.

Mr. Speaker, no one wants the war to be enlarged whether into Cambodia or elsewhere. Neither does anyone want the war kept going by condoning the enemy's use of Cambodian soil as a sanctuary and as a logistical base of support. The Cambodian interpretation of neutralism, whatever its intentions, clearly is being exploited by the enemies of South Vietnam. This cannot be tolerated and I believe that efforts to bring economic pressure should be undertaken until Cambodia takes more effective action to eliminate the use of its territory by the enemies of its eastern neighbor.

I note also from the Prime Minister's cable that while he invites an inspection of the border and protests my recommendation that the Mekong River be closed, he makes no offer of inspection of Cambodian port facilities. I have urged that Cambodian-bound ocean traffic using the Mekong River be stopped to eliminate the possibility of contraband reaching the Vietcong and as a weapon of economic pressure to bring Cambodia to adopt a genuine policy of neutrality. The international treaty covering the use of this river specifically was predicated on the existence of friendly relations between the countries. It also stipulates that countries may make such regulations as are necessary for the maintenance of their own security. Mr. Speaker, no one should need reminding that South Vietnam is fighting for its very existence.

Before the Cambodian Government can establish beyond reasonable doubt its neutrality, it will have to show not only that its borders are not being violated but also that goods entering the country by ship are not being diverted with or without the government's knowledge to the Vietcong. I would strongly recommend, therefore, that any congressional delegation accepting the Cambodian invitation to inspect its borders should also make a thorough inquiry regarding the possibility of supplies entering especially the capital port city of Phnom Penh by means of the Mekong River.

If I thought it would really do any good, I would also challenge the Cambodian Government to permit the full inspection of all Mekong River traffic unloading at Pnompenh by representatives of both interested and disinterested governments. By inspection, I mean not simply the examination of ships' documents but the surveillance of the actual goods in each ship. However, even if this were done, the result would still be less than adequate. Goods bound for the Vietcong could still come through the saltwater port of Sihanoukville on the Gulf of Thailand. In fact, there are already reports to this effect. Consequently, I believe that the only way to bring substantial pressure to bear on Cambodia would be to close the Mekong River since this would place a premium on all space for cargo entering the country which, hopefully, would help insure that it would be used only for domestic and peaceful purposes.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I can only say that this cable makes it clear to me that the Cambodian Government will let no opportunity pass to attack the United States as a device to shift attention from its own failure to control its territory. The Prime Minister, to borrow a phrase from Shakespeare, "doth protest too much, methinks."

The translation of Prime Minister Kantol's cable, a translation of a letter I have received from the Cambodian delegate to the United Nations, and a copy of his letter in the New York Times of May 27, together with the article by C. L. Sulzberger in the New York Times of May 1 to which the latter refers, as follows:

Mr. CHARLES CHAMBERLAIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.:

We have just learned of your astonishing statements about Cambodia from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 23, 1966. They show us that a representative of the American people is free to advocate an aggressive policy against a peaceful and neutral country on the basis of reports that he knows very well are false. We really cannot imagine that you do not know of the reports about our border areas published by major newspapers under the signature of Seymour Topping, Stanley Karnow, and Stanley Sheinbaum. This is, for us, therefore, a new picture of so-called American democracy. We invited a Delegation of American Senators and Representatives to make an on-the-spot study of the actual situation in our country. They refused, for, according to the example set by you, the search for truth is irreconcilable with the implementation of a policy of force and domination. We recently requested increased inspection of our borders by the International Control Commission in order to prove our good faith and the actual fact of our neutrality. Your Pentagon and Department of State hastened to deny the accusations made against Cambodia. You have deemed fit to ask President Johnson to bring pressure to bear on Cambodia by closing the Mekong. Such a measure would be a violation of international law, and this would be added to the innumerable violations of treaties and agreements, as well as the United Nations Charter, of which your country is guilty.

However, you may rest assured that Cambodia would be able to cope with that situation just as it is coping with the constant acts of aggression perpetrated by your forces and your mercenaries. And above all do not imagine that such a measure can destroy our independence.

NORODOM KANTEL,
President of the Council of Ministers and Minister of Foreign Affairs.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
New York, June 1, 1966.

[Translation (French)]

(Rep. CHAMBERLAIN.)

(Permanent mission of Cambodia to the United Nations Organization, No. 2397.)

Mr. CONGRESSMAN: It is with great surprise and regret that I read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 23, 1966, the remarks extended by you in the House of Representatives relative to my country.

By taking up the slanderous (and unfounded) accusations of the Psychological (Warfare) Services of the U.S. Armed Forces in South Vietnam, taken up by some American and "free world" newspapers for the purpose of justifying and creating a pretext for an American aggression on my country, you have, to my great regret, been a party to this campaign of poisoning American public opinion.

You saw fit to stress that "press reports indicate there is no (reason to) doubt that Cambodia is a sanctuary, a training ground, and a source of supply for the Viet Cong."

Mr. Congressman, do you know that recently, perhaps during your visit to South Vietnam, the Royal Government of Cambodia, invited the representatives of the American press, Mr. Seymour Topping of The New York Times, Mr. Stanley Karnow of The Washington Post, and Mr. Stanley Sheinbaum of the periodical Ramparts, to conduct investigations in the border areas suspected, according to the Psychological Services of the U.S. Armed Forces in South Vietnam, of harboring the forces of North Vietnam and of the Viet Cong? The results of their inquiries were published in the newspapers in question. All confirmed that Cambodia has never been and in no way is being used as a base, as a sanctuary, or as a training ground for the Viet Cong. In addition to the affirmations of these American newspaper correspondents, there are also those of the members of the International Control Commission, of the Military Attaches of the countries (including those of the Western countries) accredited to my country who acknowledged that no base, no sanctuary of the Viet Cong existed in Cambodia.

If you are so sure that Cambodia is harboring the Viet Cong, how does it happen that the U.S. Senate refused the invitation which

the President of the National Assembly of Cambodia addressed to its President last January to send three representatives of different trends of opinion to conduct meticulous investigations in Cambodia? We have a right to ask ourselves why the distinguished representatives of the American people showed no curiosity to come to the spot, i.e., to Cambodia, to check out the merits of the reports of the American military personnel or press? It was a good chance for the distinguished representatives to let the Senate or the House of Representatives, or even the American people and world opinion know whether or not Cambodia is really a sanctuary, a training ground, or a source of supply for the People's forces in South Vietnam. But you prefer, with flagrant injustice, to discredit us and to continue to accuse us unfoundedly.

I am taking this opportunity to stress again that the policy of neutrality pursued by my government since 1955 is a genuine one. That is why the Royal Khmer Armed Forces, exercising a strict and vigilant control along our borders, were given orders to oppose all infiltrations of foreign forces, including those of the Viet Cong. However, up to the present, the only forces who have violated our borders and murdered our population are American-South Vietnamese and Thai forces. As for the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, we are satisfied with their scrupulous respect of our independence, of our neutrality and of our territorial integrity.

In a recent formal statement to the Diplomatic Corps, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, head of the Cambodian State, declared once more:

"In the Vietnamese affair we have never sided with one camp against the other."

"We only maintain the right of a people to their independence, to their full sovereignty, the right of a people to self-determination without outside interference, the right of a people to prefer peace to war."

"By doing this we remain faithful to the spirit and the letter of the United Nations Charter and to an ideal of justice and freedom."

"In order to defend these sacred principles we have decided to side with the Vietnamese people against those who prevent them from finding peace and independence again."

"These principles are our only safeguard. That is why we are defending them."

"Can it be claimed that Cambodia is not neutral because it wants to respect the Geneva Agreements?"

"These Agreements provide, among other stipulations, that elections be held in South as well as in North Vietnam to enable the Vietnamese people to decide upon their own fate. . . . Is to formulate the application of them to turn away from neutrality?"

I also beg to call to mind that in 1962 Cambodia suggested that the countries suspecting it of being an accomplice of the Viet Cong endow the International Control Commission, an organism created by the Geneva Agreements of 1954, with means for carrying out a strict and efficacious control of our borders. There is no country in the world which, in order to prove its good faith, would agree, as did my country, to transferring a part of its sovereignty. But it is my duty to inform you that it was your Government which disdained this Cambodian proposal.

In the same speech you recommended to the President of the United States that he urge the Saigon Government to close the Mekong River, without taking into account the existence of the Agreement concerning this international river. In other words, you recommended to the Saigon Government that it violate an existing International Agreement and the principles of international law. I shall not make (further) comments on this truly unfortunate speech.

Very truly yours,

HUOT SAMPATH,
Permanent Representative of Cambodia.
[Translated by Elizabeth Hanunian.]

[From the New York Times, Friday, May 27, 1966]

VIETCONG BASES IN CAMBODIA DENIED

To the EDITOR:

In his May 1 column on the editorial page C. L. Sulzberger dwells on the so-called existence in Cambodia of sanctuaries and bases for the Vietcong forces of South Vietnam and for North Vietnamese troops, even though Sulzberger himself, who visited my country two weeks before for an on-the-spot verification, reported then to the contrary.

This sudden change by Mr. Sulzberger results, he states, from having "heard American, South Vietnamese and Montagnard accounts of what was happening inside Cambodia. . . ." He prefers to believe these accounts sooner than credit what he himself saw. If he had any doubts, he should have done some careful checking while in Cambodia, because it is not the first time that news services have issued these accusations which have been found to be complete fabrications by his colleagues Seymour Topping, Stanley Karnow and Stanley Sheinbaum.

INVENTED ACCOUNTS

I should like to remind you that these accounts of guerrilla sanctuaries and bases in Cambodia are always invented by the American psychological services in order to justify in advance, in the eyes of international opinion, open warfare against my country. To see the sudden switch to the various new slanders against the actual stand of Cambodia is to realize that the system of brainwashing is indeed efficacious.

To demonstrate our good faith, with the aim of refuting the slanderous accusation so often repeated by American military authorities—although such official and qualified observers as the International Control Commission, the military attachés accredited to Cambodia as well as reliable American newspaper correspondents have substantiated the fact that there do not exist in Cambodia either sanctuaries or bases for Vietcong forces or North Vietnamese troops—the National Assembly of Cambodia has invited, without success, three members of the U.S. Congress to come and conduct an on-the-spot check to complete the careful investigation mentioned above.

Because of her policy of strict neutrality, Cambodia refuses to be subjected to imperialist domination and to approve this war of aggression. It continues to support morally and politically the struggle of the brave Vietnam people against American aggression. We have never concealed the fact that in token of our solidarity with the Vietnam people we have offered medical supplies and dried fish to the National Liberation Front.

Despite the massive intervention and aggression by the United States in Vietnam and of American allies at our borders, we have never given up our policy of neutrality. If we are attacked, we shall reserve the right to respond in legitimate defense.

HUOT SAMBATH,
Permanent Representative of Cambodia to the United Nations.
NEW YORK, May 13, 1966.

[From the New York Times, Sunday, May 1, 1966]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: NEUTRAL IS AS NEUTRAL DOES

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

DAK PEK, KONTUM PROVINCE, SOUTH VIETNAM.—The first guerrilla "war of liberation" following World War II was the Greek Communist insurrection. This was put down by Greece's national army with extensive American help and a U.S. mission of military "advisers" under Gen. James Van Fleet.

The Communists received massive aid through Bulgaria, Yugoslavia (which hadn't yet broken with Moscow) and Albania. Furthermore the guerrillas used frontier regions of Albania as a sanctuary and supply base. The uprising was crushed only after Tito split with the Cominform, closed Yugoslavia's borders, isolated Albania and cut off the insurgents.

South Vietnam's "war of liberation" is similar to that of Greece although on a far, far larger scale. But one problem is identical—a gaping, open flank. In this case Laos plays the Yugoslav role, funneling arms and men from North Vietnam to the South, and Cambodia assumes the Albanian role as sanctuary and base.

IS CAMBODIA NEUTRAL?

Recently I was persuaded in Pnom Penh that Cambodia was trying to be truly neutral in the Vietnamese conflict. I wrote: "Those who are paid to know such things insist Cambodia is not willingly allowing the Vietcong to use this country's territory as a sanctuary or supply route and that any violations are of relatively minor importance."

I was wrong. I have satisfied myself of this on a trip by plane and helicopter along the Cambodian border right up to its juncture with Laos. I visited military positions and remote U.S. Special Forces outposts at Song Be, Duc Co, Dak To and Dak Pek, in areas inhabited by the following Montagnard tribes: Jarai, Bahnar, Jeh, Sedang and Hlang. I heard American, South Vietnamese and Montagnard accounts of what was happening inside Cambodia, a few miles away.

SOURCE AND SANCTUARY

On the basis of this investigation I have reversed my previous impression and concluded that Cambodia is indeed a sanctuary and supply source for the Vietcong on such a scale that the Pnom Penh Government must know it. From the extreme south to Laos in the north, Cambodia is violating its proclaimed neutrality.

Chief of State Prince Sihanouk broadcast on March 22 that the Vietcong could send their wounded to Cambodian hospitals and, when they recovered, they would be returned to the battlefield. On March 23 he announced he was furnishing the Vietcong with rice and "we have given this aid to them by closing our eyes because we and the Vietcong have a common enemy, which is U.S. imperialism." Although these statements were omitted from official Pnom Penh versions, Sihanouk's speeches were monitored.

The Vietcong's 263 Transportation Escort Group handles wounded, weapons and munitions in South Cambodia. Cambodian 25 pounders, artillery not possessed by the Vietcong, fired at the Cai Cai Special Forces camp on April 3, killing one U.S. officer. An impressive buildup of Vietcong and North Vietnamese troops is under way on the Cambodian side of the Chu Pong mountain massif.

There appear to be three North Vietnamese regiments inside Cambodia around Chu Pong and seven others across the border in Pleiku Province, supplied from Cambodia. This represents at least 25,000 men who came southward through Laos and Cambodia to avoid U.S. aerial attacks. Although the frontier is heavily forested, fourteen well-traveled crossing trails have been marked near Chu Pong.

"SIHANOUK ROAD"

A Cambodian supply route called the "Sihanouk Road" by Americans has been developed from Siem Pang northward to Laos where it swings eastward and southward to-

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

ward Chu Pong along a jeep trail. In the vicinity of present North Vietnamese concentrations are scattered elements of the 26th, 23d and 27th Cambodian battalions which could scarcely fail to observe the foreigners. Cambodia now sends 30,000 tons of rice annually to Vietcong and North Vietnamese troops. A staging area between Vietcong forces in War Zone C and the 4th Corps region exists in East Cambodian Svay Rieng. Fleeing Viecong units take refuge in Cambodia.

BASE OF OPERATIONS

Like Greece's Communists, who maintained headquarters in Epirus on the Albanian frontier, the Vietcong has its principal headquarters about three miles from Cambodia where C.O.S.V.N. (Central Office for South Vietnam) is established. C.O.S.V.N. directs the puppet National Liberation Front located nearby. The details are numberless. Near Duc Co an American Special Forces captain was recently killed and his body dragged to Cambodia. At Dak To the intelligence officer wryly comments: "The V.C. is using Cambodia all over the place." At Dak Pek Montagnards report the southward passage of Communist troops along Cambodian trails.

I was wrong in what I wrote a fortnight ago from Pnom Penh and Western diplomats and military attachés there are being fooled. Cambodia isn't acting in the least bit neutral, no matter what it pretends. In no sense do I advocate extending the nasty Indo-China war but I do advocate warning Sihanouk to cease his interference.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF CHARTERING OF BOY SCOUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today we are celebrating the 50th anniversary of the chartering of the Boy Scouts of America by Congress. It is with a great deal of pride and confidence in our young generation that I rise today to commend one of the finest organizations in our country. I have been associated with the Boy Scouts for more than 47 years, having organized one of the first Scout troops in the southwest at Linden, Tex., in March of 1919. That was only 3 years after the Boy Scouts were chartered by Congress. All of my sons have been active in the Scouting movement.

Many of our colleagues here in Congress are former Scouts and have long been associated with Scouting, as I have been. I have long considered Scouting not just a great organization, but a testimony to the character of our young men.

EAGLE SCOUT AWARDS IN TEXARKANA

The Eagle Scout Award is a pinnacle of achievement in boy scouting, an award that comes only after long and difficult work, perseverance, and dedication. It is an award that testifies to the strength of character, resourcefulness, and ingenuity of young men. The time spent on meeting the difficult requirements of the Eagle Award is time well invested in the future character of the men of our Nation.

On May 9, 1966, in the student center of Texarkana College, Texarkana, Tex., 42 Scouts of the Caddo Area Council Boy Scouts of America were awarded the coveted Eagle Scout Award. I am including in the RECORD following my remarks the recent Eagle Scout Award winners of that Council.

The acceptance speech by one of these recent Eagle Scout recipients is a testimony to the type of young men who strives for excellence. Randy Guillot, of Texarkana, Tex., addressed his fellow Scouts and friends on the topic, "Scout Oath and Law," which I recommend highly to the Members. I am indeed proud of what this represents in our youth and of young Randy Guillot.

The list of winners and speech follow:

THE 1965–66 EAGLE SCOUT WINNERS, CADDO AREA COUNCIL, BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

TEXARKANA, TEX.

David F. Basye.
Garry Mitchell Covington.
John Leonard Dalby.
Robert Earl Dalby.
Randall P. Guillot.
Leonard Bruce Hargrave.
Rhondy L. Holtzclaw.
John E. Howell.
Joseph M. Laurrell.
Robert D. Meadows.
Lloyd F. Mercer, Jr.
Forest L. Miller.
Josh R. Morriss III.
John Dudley Mosele.
Don O. Moser.
Karl F. Moser.
John B. Norton.
Alan Reeves.
Phil Reeves.
Arthur W. Singleton.
Charles T. Tooke.
Randy B. Walker.
Michael E. Wands.
Charles M. Yancy III.

TEXARKANA, ARK.

James L. Curtis.
John C. Goline.
John C. Johnson.
Don E. Kidd.
Clifford L. Killett.

HUGHES SPRINGS, TEX.

Dwight L. Bowers.
Gary Burleson.
Charles E. Middleton.
Danny B. Welch.

NEW BOSTON, TEX.

Thomas B. Brown, Jr.
Michael Gerald Green.
Joe E. Lewis.
Thomas T. McGee.

DE KALB, TEX.

Eddie M. Harkey.

ASHDOWN, ARK.

Alfred L. Dempsey.
Curtis E. Smith.

DE QUEEN, ARK.

Robert D. McNeice.

FOREMAN, ARK.

Steven Wayne Reid.

SCOUT OATH AND LAW

Scouting is a game, and like all other games, it has rules you must follow to be a member of the team.

The Scout Oath is:

"On my honor I will do my best

"To do my duty to God and my country and to obey the Scout Law;

"To help other people at all times;

"To keep myself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight."

To do my duty to God: As I think of this part of the Scout Oath, it brings to my mind how in very recent years our country was deprived of the leadership of a great President. I speak of President John F. Kennedy. Had Lee Harvey Oswald lived up to the laws of God instead of the godlessness of Communism, and been able to put into practice this part of the Scout Oath, John F. Kennedy would still be President of the United States.

To do my duty to my country: As I think of this part of the Scout Oath, it brings to my mind something that happened several centuries ago. We all know the part Benedict Arnold had in the history of our country. He was the trusted general who worked out a plan to surrender an American Fort to the British. Had Benedict Arnold had an opportunity to become an Eagle Scout, would the history of our country be any different?

To do my duty to other people: As I think of this part of the Scout Oath, I think of the Golden Rule that we have all been taught, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." Wouldn't our community be a much better place to live in if each one of us here tonight did something to help someone else during the next week?

To do my duty to myself: As I think of this part of the Scout Oath, I recall the numerous articles that appear in our newspapers today about youth delinquency. Many of these youth have great abilities and ideals which are never developed in the right direction. I wonder how many delinquent youths who could have become successful adults and contributed something to our community and country are in penitentiaries today. Had these youth had the opportunity of becoming Eagle Scouts, perhaps their character could have been developed and they could have become useful citizens.

THE SCOUT LAW IS: A Scout is trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean, and reverent.

As Eagle Scouts, we learn to live by these laws, hoping that as we grow older, it will help us to accept the challenges that are bound to face us as our generation will take its place in history. Actually, one does not have to be an Eagle Scout to practice these laws. They are meant for all people of all nations. If the world leaders are looking for a common denominator to achieve peace, wouldn't the Scout Law be a perfect example to follow?

Yes, I feel that the Eagle Scouts present here tonight are ready to accept your challenge because of the leadership of many of the adults present here who have given us the opportunity to learn the true meaning of the Scout Oath and Scout Law. There should be no doubt in your mind that we will assume responsible and active positions in our community.

THE SIXTH KENNEDY ROUND OF TRADE NEGOTIATIONS UNDER THE GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to address myself to a portion of the "Report on the Sixth Kennedy Round of Trade Negotiations Under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade," presented to this body by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] on May 31 of this year. I shall speak only to that portion entitled the "Long-Term Arrangement Regarding Trade in Cotton Textiles," which I will do momentarily, but before proceeding on that point of the report submitted by the

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

gentleman from Missouri I believe it is most important to refresh our recollection as to the indispensable role which the domestic textile industry plays in the life of this Nation.

It is almost trite to refer to the fact that every man, woman, and child in this Nation is clothed in the products produced by our textile industry. It is universally recognized whenever reference is made to the minimum essentialities of life that one of the three is clothing. The other two are food and housing.

During World War II the textile industry supplied over 10,000 separate end use products to our Armed Forces. The Quartermaster General of the Army at that time declared that textiles were second only to steel as an essential commodity to our war effort. So when any discussions arise with respect to the textile industry and the part that it plays in the life of every citizen of this Nation, whether in civilian attire or military uniform, it becomes apparent that this industry is basically essential to our way of life. This being so, the economic health and welfare of this industry plays a significant role in the economic welfare of the entire Nation. When the textile industry is depressed, when it is in economic difficulty, our general economy is adversely affected. Conversely, when all of those factors which contribute to a growing, dynamic and progressive textile industry, such as is taking place today, not only is the welfare of all those associated with this industry, whether directly or indirectly, greatly enhanced but this contributes to the general well-being of our economy as a whole.

We all recall that in the decade of the 1950's a combination of circumstances, primarily the result of governmental actions, were bearing heavily upon the textile industry and were retarding its economic growth as compared with the general upturn within the rest of American industry. These factors were primarily three in number.

First. Under our foreign policy, tariffs were cut from 25 to 50 percent on textile products. This enhanced the opportunity for foreign exporters to enter the American domestic market.

Second. The Congress in order to assist the United States in attempting to recapture its historical share in the sale of raw cotton in the world market enacted legislation which resulted in the creation of what we know as two-price cotton. This meant that foreigners could purchase U.S.-grown raw cotton cheaper than our domestic industry could. When coupled with the production and labor costs advantages the foreigners enjoy over U.S. manufacturers, this further enhanced the ability of foreign textile manufacturers to invade the American market.

Third. The tax depreciation schedules imposed upon the textile industry seriously impaired the ability of this industry to modernize itself.

These conditions in combination, over which the industry itself had no control, were depressing the domestic industry to such a degree that it became necessary for the industry to seek the assistance of the Federal Government in order for it to maintain its proper role in our economic spectrum.

As you recall, several significant steps were taken: More favorable tax depreciation schedules were established. This Congress enacted a one price cotton law, and a long-term cotton tax arrangement was negotiated by this Government with 17 foreign textile producing nations. As the name indicates, this arrangement addressed itself to cotton textiles which was the principal import coming into this country from abroad. It is on this single aspect of the problem to which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] addressed himself in his report to this body on May 31, that I shall speak.

On the very same day that the gentleman from Missouri [Representative CURTIS] urged a "phasing out" of the long-term arrangement on cotton textiles and apparel, the Department of Commerce issued a press release showing that imports of these products in April hit an alltime high.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] in his talk May 31, saw the long-term arrangement as a worldwide scheme to impose on the less developed nations of the world rigid controls which severely limit their exports. He saw the long-term arrangement as denying these underdeveloped nations their "justified hard currency earnings" and their "ability to earn development capital."

The statistics released by the Department of Commerce, on behalf of the Interagency Textile Administrative Committee for the month of April and for the 7-month period of the fourth long-term arrangement year—that is, October 1965–April 1966—just do not bear out this picture.

For the month of April, imports of cotton textiles and apparel reached 162 million square yards, a record high for any month in U.S. history. This was an increase of 27 percent above April of last year.

During the 7-month period of the fourth long-term-arrangement year, imports totaled 932 million square yards. This was an increase of about 34 percent above the same period a year earlier.

These imports are now at a rate more than double the rate of imports in fiscal year 1961, the last year before the short-term arrangement went into effect, and which was the base year for the short-term arrangement.

Let us also examine the imports from some individual countries to see whether the long-term arrangement is causing this severe hardship pictured by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS]. If we compare imports for the 12 month period ending in April with imports for fiscal year 1961, the latest period in which imports were completely uncontrolled, we see that imports from India rose from less than 26 million square yards to nearly 74 million; from Pakistan the increase was from 13 million to 41 million; the Hong Kong increase was from 203 million to 315 million; for Portugal 49 million to 79 million; for Brazil less than 3 million to nearly 80 million; for Taiwan less than 24 million to 57 million; and Korea, 10 million to nearly 25 million.

These substantial increases just do not agree with the picture presented of the long-term arrangement operating as a rigidly protective device.

In the same manner exports of textiles and apparel to the United States are actually a considerable source of hard currency earnings to these countries, amounting to nearly $400 million for the 12 month period ending April 1966.

At the same time, it must also be pointed out that these rapidly increasing imports also represent a considerable drain on the United States at a time when this Nation is striving to improve its balance-of-payments situation.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] also says that phasing out of the long-term arrangement should be "economically acceptable" to the U.S. industry and gives the high rate of capital spending as one of several reasons for this assumption.

It must be emphasized that the high rate of capital spending is but one of the major factors which shows clearly that the long-term arrangement is serving a desired purpose, to present the U.S. industry with a breathing spell against unrestrained cutthroat competition, a period in which it could improve its efficiency to compete with low wage exporting nations.

As the long-term arrangement operated to make more orderly the rapid increase in U.S. imports, the industry responded with greater faith in the future, plowing back its profits for increased modernization and efficiency.

Just last year, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development issued an international study on the world cotton textile industry showing clearly that more and more it is becoming a capital intensive rather than a labor intensive industry.

Mr. CURTIS' proposal would cut short the long-term arrangement before it has achieved its full desired effect, before the industry has fully achieved its goal of modernization.

He refers to a speech by Commerce Secretary Connor of March 26, before the American Textile Manufacturers Institute in which Mr. Connor urged the industry to try to sell more in export markets.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] should have read the entire speech and not just the part on exports. In that speech, Secretary Connor also said:

> If the long-term arrangement is not extended in its present form, exporters abroad should not assume that uncontrolled cotton textile trade in the U.S. market would result.

It is an indisputable fact that the U.S. cotton textile industry is in a much better position now than it was before the long-term arrangement went into operation.

It is also indisputable that the long-term arrangement's operation has played a major role in this improved situation.

If the United States were to permit the present substantial increases already

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

packaging and labeling. We must not countenance this even though some merchants insist they do so in order to protect themselves against unfair competition by a few unscrupulous and greedy manufacturers. The point of no return has been reached. It requires the intervention of the Government to reverse this practice. Unless all are compelled to desist from these practices, the ethical manufacturer is at the mercy of the fraud and the cheat.

While the honorable and ethical manufacturer would, I am sure, prefer to compete on the basis of superior products, service, packaging, distribution and lower prices based upon economies in production and distribution and all the other legitimate factors, he is powerless to compete succesfully against unethical and deceptive competition. He must beat the other fellow at his own game or be destroyed.

Truth-in-packaging legislation would restore honesty and integrity to the marketplace. It is needed. The ethical manufacturer welcomes it, for under it he can compete on the basis of merit. We have heard it said that the ethics of the marketplace become the ethic of the culture. If that is so then our course is clear.

I have introduced a new bill which I believe combines the best features of those already introduced.

My bill also contains provisions to protect the public against the improper marketing of drugs and cosmetics that may be deleterious to the health and well-being of humans.

I am sure it can stand further improvement and refinement. The hearings will develop the best approach.

Early action is needed and I hope we will get it.

VN

GOP SHIFTS ITS VIET STAND

(Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon (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. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I read a news story on page three of the Washington, D.C., Daily News by Ted Knapp, a Scripps-Howard staff writer.

The headline is "GOP Shifts Its Viet Stand." The thrust of the article is to the effect that the Republican campaign strategists have decided to make the Vietnam conflict a partisan political issue in the fall elections. Toward the end of the article is a most astounding and disturbing quotation ascribed to an unnamed GOP "spokesman." The quotation is:

> We want to destroy voters' confidence in Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that any responsible Republican leader would make such a statement at a critical time in this Nation's history and at a time when some 270,000 American troops are committed in Vietnam. These troops are not there as Democrats or as Republicans, but as American committed to turning back Communist aggression. I point out again that the "spokesman" is unnamed. It is not the statement of the minority leader of either body.

This is no time to deliberately set out to destroy confidence in the Commander in Chief. To do so may give immediate partisan political advantage but do irreparable damage to the Nation and the cause of freedom and self-determination for which we have fought so long under leadership of both parties.

Generally speaking, the Republican congressional leadership has adopted a constructive and responsible position in regard to the problems of southeast Asia. The distinguished minority leader said on February 24:

> I believe that Republicans are generally impressed with the administration's firmness against Communist aggression in South Viet Nam.

The same cannot be said of others in the country today including some of both political parties from my own State.

Responsible political opposition is not easy. It implies a constant and critical review of policy. It requires criticism of specific policies only after an evaluation of alternatives and a willingness to commit oneself to a reasonable alternative.

When we agree that Communist aggression is a threat, not just to South Vietnam, but to the nations of Asia and ultimately to our own free society; when we agree that there is no power or combination of powers in Asia capable of withstanding Communist attack without the support of the United States; when the American commitment in South Vietnam is an accomplished fact and the significance of its success or failure upon the whole world irrefutable; when the alternatives available to us are so limited and have been and are being so completely considered, cannot we agree that the proper function of all Americans is to follow the example set by the late Senator Vandenberg and join hands to support the Government of the United States in this critical time and on this critical issue, rather than seeking to undermine confidence in the leadership.

I have never asked a single question of the administration that they have not tried to answer completely and candidly. Weekly briefings are held here on the Hill by the State Department. Cabinet members troop to the Hill almost daily for hearings before committees of the Congress. For days there was a complete and thorough review of this entire question before the Senate Foreign Relations Commmittee and the TV cameras of all the networks. Many Members have gone to the scene of conflict and returned to report to their colleagues on the conditions they found. I doubt if there has ever been an issue as thoroughly examined, explained and debated as has this question of our policy in southeast Asia.

Yet if we continue to say that the administration has not been candid or that there is a credibility gap, often enough, it will be printed and it will be read and it will be believed by enough to seriously impair our national effort and our national effectiveness.

As a matter of fact all is not hopeless in the world and the effort in southeast Asia has not been without success. The military picture is vastly improved over the dark days of 1965. In spite of the civil unrest, typical of every emerging nation in the world, elections are scheduled in South Vietnam and the military rule has been diluted by civilian membership on the ruling Directorate. In Indonesia, communism has been dealt a death blow, the attack on Malaysia terminated and there is talk of that country's return to the United Nations. Conditions in Laos seem somewhat better and there are rumbles of a lessening of the tensions with Cambodia concurrent with rumbles of internal difficulties in China, itself. Success can crown our efforts.

There are details of our policy with which I disagree and I know that there are details with which all disagree. No one—neither the President, nor I, nor any of you, nor any American—likes the situation. Everyone would like it to go away. It will not go away easily but it will pass into history as a victory for the free world if we all pull together, and if we—Republicans and Democrats alike—revert to constructive criticism and not seek simply "to destroy voters' confidence in Johnson"—if we do not we may unintentionally destroy far more.

As I heard one man say the other day, what we need is a willingness on the part of public officials to brave the political casualty lists with the same willingness our soldiers and sailors and marines risk the casualty lists of battle.

EXCESS PROPERTY IN LATIN AMERICA

(Mr. MONAGAN (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. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the 1965 Foreign Assistance Act called on the Agency for International Development to utilize excess personal property wherever practicable in lieu of the procurement of new items for U.S.-assisted projects and programs. It is obvious that such utilization can promote efficiency and economy. Therefore, the Special Subcommittee on Donable Property, of which I am chairman, and of which the Committee on Government Operations is the parent committee, has devoted much study to this matter.

Last April, the Committee on Government Operations approved a report entitled "The Use of Excess Property by the U.S. Foreign Aid Program in Latin America"—House Report No. 1466, 89th Congress. The committee found that the great opportunities for using excess property in the U.S. Government programs there were not being adequately realized. The report also called attention to the parallel opportunity of assisting U.S. nonprofit voluntary organizations to obtain more excess property, under the authority of sections 607 and 608 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. It made a number of recommendations designed to improve the economy and efficiency of the excess property program by AID in Latin America.

The other day The Washington Daily News summed up the report in an ex-

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE MESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, recently in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I have cautioned against overburdening our national medical facilities with extensive Government-sponsored medical programs. I cited the case of Great Britain which for 18 years has been granting to everyone medical care for a very slight regular charge. According to Mrs. Joan Hobson, a British doctor's wife, in her article, entitled "The Crisis in British Medicine," which appeared recently in Kiwanis magazine, each contributor in Great Britain now pays $2.50 weekly for medical care, sickness benefits, unemployment compensation, and old age pensions. Only a nickel of this amount is devoted to medical care, leaving general tax funds to supply the missing millions needed to keep the National Health Service in business. So overburdened has been the British National Health Service since 1948 that from an initial cost of $363 million the bill for state medicine in 1966 will be an estimated $26 billion. Concludes Mrs. Hobson:

> If the health service does manage to survive, its cost will go up year after year.

As yet, contemplated medical coverage in the United States under Government programs is not a cradle-to-the-grave proposition as in Britain. But if recent developments are any indication, the expansion of such programs has just begun. For example, the Chicago Tribune of Sunday, June 12, 1966, carried the headline: "New York Budgets More Than United States For Medicare." The lead paragraph stated:

> With New York ready to spend more on a federal-state welfare medical program than the Johnson administration planned to spend nation-wide, Congress has the jitters.

The explanation for this incongruity lies in the fact that the Federal Medicare Act under title 19 provides that persons of any age who earn enough to take care of all but medical needs, may receive aid through a State-administered program. By taking advantage of this provision, New York, according to press reports, plans to provide free full medical care for 40 to 44 percent of its population. To date seven States and Puerto Rico have already gotten tentative approval for such programs, with the applications of New York and Connecticut now pending.

Even now, with so few States now participating under title 19, and with the medicare kickoff due to begin on July 1, fears of inundating our national medical facilities have been voiced. In the light of Great Britain's experience, prudence demands that the overextension of our medical facilities be given careful consideration.

The London Daily Telegraph of May 24, 1966, carried an item entitled, "Britain Loses Heart Surgeon to America," which is certainly pertinent to this issue. Commenting on the present condition of the British National Health Service, Dr. John Raison, one of Britain's leading heart surgeons, observed:

> I would like to stay but the hospital service in Britain is near to floundering.

The decline of any nation's health service is certain regrettable, and I certainly hope that remedial action will correct this situation. As far as our Nation is concerned, judicious restraint should be the order of the day concerning the expansion of our Government-sponsored medical programs.

I place the above-mentioned item from the London Daily Telegraph in the RECORD at this point:

BRITAIN LOSES HEART SURGEON TO AMERICA

One of Britain's leading heart surgeons, Mr. John Raison, 40, said last night that he is emigrating to America in September because of lack of facilities for research and treatment in Britain.

Mr. Raison has been pioneering heart surgery techniques for seven years. He has played a leading part in research into the use of heart-lung machines.

He and his team at the King Edward VII Memorial Chest Hospital at Warwick have been responsible for many hole-in-the-heart operations and have helped to save hundreds of lives.

At his home at Moreton Morrell, near Warwick, last night, Mr. Raison said that his new job is that of senior physiologist in cardiac surgical research at the Presbyterian Medical Centre in San Francisco.

"Although my salary will be practically doubled this is not why I am going. "At best I have 20 more years work ahead of me and I want to save as many lives as I can. I cannot do that with the facilities available in Britain.

"We know how to save patients who a few years ago would never have had a hope. But Britain won't afford to keep me. I would like to stay but the hospital service in Britain is near to floundering.

TRUTH-IN-PACKAGING

(Mr. MULTER (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. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the consumer products industry has developed a bagful of tricks which intentionally or not do tend to defraud the American public. The worker's wages are being eroded constantly by this misconduct in the marketplace.

When shoppers enter the local supermarket they are overwhelmed by the bargains being offered. We find the crowded aisles piled high with goods that appear to offer bargains. Too frequently this is not the case. What appear to be bargains turn out to be not even true values. Even the most alert may be victimized despite the utmost caution. Taking unfair advantage of consumer has developed into a high art by our marketing experts.

A common practice is to package goods in various weights indiscriminately in gaudily printed boxes of varying sizes at different prices. The joker in this packaging scheme is that frequently there is little or no relationship between the size of the package and the quantity of merchandise in it. Legerdemain is fine on the stage, but it has no place in the consumers market. What the eye sees bears no relation to the true quantity of the contents in the package.

What is worse is the cheating label. Their composers have indeed mastered the art of misleading. What they say is rarely what they try to make the consumer believe. The "cents off" label for example looks like a reduction in price, except that the original price from which the cents are supposedly taken off is omitted, so that the consumer has no way of knowing that in fact there was no price reduction. These gentlemen have given the language such euphemisms as "regular," when there is no regular quantity against which the contents of the package can be checked; "large-size," whatever that means (larger than what?); "jumbo-size," "super-size," "super," or "super-dooper-size," and the many other wild exaggerations of their fertile imaginations which are unrelated to any known or recognizable system of measurements.

They have also given us "jumbo-quart" which upon closer examination turns out to consist of 16 ounces—the same as its less romantic brother, just plain old Mr. Quart. The same is true of "big-gallon" and "giant-pint." To protect himself against the charge of fraud, the manufacturer microscopically hides the actual weight in some corner of the label.

Let us not forget the manufacturer who packs his goods lightly in large packages to make them appear as better buys, the 3-inch soap bar in the 4-inch wrapper.

The consumer marketing field needs remedial legislation. To eliminate these deceptive practices that cost the consumer millions of dollars, truth-in-packaging bills have been introduced in the Congress. I am pleased that unions such as the Seafarers International Union, among others, is supporting the AFL-CIO demand for passage of truth-in-packaging legislation.

These bills will bring intelligible, standardized packaging and labeling to the market place. It would bring order out of chaos and make it possible for the consumer to get his money's worth. This seems to be a modest enough objective to which no fair-minded person should object.

More important, the Food and Drug Administration would be authorized to enforce the law for food, drugs and cosmetics, while the Federal Trade Commission would enforce it for other consumer products. They would set weight and quantity standards for packaged goods, prohibit deceptive size and shape packages, define such terms as "king-size", "jumbo-size," and so forth, require labels to truly reflect the contents and compel clearly-marked net contents statements on the package.

The consumer products industry opposes "truth-in-packaging" laws. They resort to scare tactics and threaten that such law would result in a drop in sales, falling wages and rising unemployment. They are alarmed that such law would give dangerous new powers to the Federal Government. These bills give little new power; but they put teeth into the powers already vested in the enforcement agencies.

The consumer products industry should not object to this legislation. It has become necessary because of the industry's increasing use of deceptive

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

Results of questionnaire, 1966

	Yes		No		Undecided	
	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
Do you favor?						
1. (a) Continuing present U.S. policy in South Vietnam?	1,465	56.04	800	30.60	349	13.36
(b) Escalation of our military effort?	1,385	52.98	740	28.31	489	18.71
(c) Retirement to coastal enclaves?	222	8.49	1,648	63.05	744	28.46
(d) Bombing Hanoi?	1,150	43.99	820	31.37	644	24.64
(e) Blockade of Haiphong?	1,655	63.31	398	15.23	561	21.46
(f) Complete withdrawal of U.S. troops?	470	17.98	1,714	65.57	430	16.45
2. Increasing the present $1.25 per hour Federal minimum wage level to $1.60?	1,277	48.85	1,202	45.99	135	5.16
3. Legislation to control interstate shipment of firearms?	1,992	76.20	510	19.52	112	4.28
4. A 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives?	1,532	58.61	956	36.57	136	4.82
5. Expansion of Federal programs to assist local-State efforts to combat water pollution?	2,264	86.61	280	10.71	70	2.68
6. Income tax exemption or credit for persons paying expenses of college students?	1,957	74.87	591	22.61	66	2.52
7. U.S. adoption of the metric system of weights and measures?	1,384	52.94	937	35.84	293	11.22
8. Stricter regulation of the handling of animals used in laboratory research?	1,635	62.55	707	27.05	272	10.40
9. A demonstration cities program to rebuild entire slum areas?	1,353	51.76	960	36.72	301	11.52
10. Establishment of a Cabinet-level Department of Transportation with unification of transportation activities?	1,537	58.80	812	31.06	265	10.14
11. A constitutional amendment to permit the voluntary recitation of prayer in public schools?	2,123	81.22	425	16.26	66	2.52
12. A constitutional amendment to permit a State to apportion one house of its legislature on a basis other than population?	1,276	48.81	1,068	40.86	270	10.33

UN

HOW MUCH TIME DOES THE UNITED STATES HAVE IN VIETNAM?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following interesting report with respect to the conflict in Vietnam from the Washington Post of June 8, 1966:

MATTER OF FACT: HURRY UP, PLEASE

(By Joseph Alsop)

The final, central problem that has to be faced in Vietnam in the present phase is the problem of time.

It is anyone's guess how much time General Westmoreland has in hand to achieve a relatively decisive result. It could be 10 months, a year, or even 18 months. But to everyone who knows the situation on the spot, it now appears urgent to reach the turning point in the war as soon as possible.

That need not mean the end of the war, to be sure. The turning point that it is so urgent to reach is the effective defeat of the Vietcong main forces. If the enemy's backbone-army can be effectively defeated, much of the local infra-structure of the V.C. can be expected to break up and crumble away. Large additional areas of South Vietnam should be rapidly freed from the Vietcong terrorism and pressure.

Here and there, however, remnants of the infra-structure will probably survive. The job of mopping up and rooting the remnants out may well be long. But it will be far less costly and burdensome than the present stage of the war. It will require a much smaller American presence and effort. And it will leave room for the long-suffering Vietnamese to find their own way at last, with no serious external menace.

It is urgent to reach this kind of turning point for both political and economic reasons. The main error of judgment of the Americans on the spot in Vietnam, emphatically shared by this reporter, it must be confessed, was the judgment that the restoration of hope would at least insure a political truce in Vietnam until the war ended.

This was half or even two-thirds correct. Before the American intervention, the progressive loss of hope had turned Saigon politics into a kind of dance of death. After the American intervention, there was indeed a most valuable political truce that lasted close to a year. But as anyone can see who reads the papers, the truce did not last long enough.

There are good judges in Saigon who lay this development to a renewed loss of hope—the feeling, caused by the peace offensive and other factors, that there was still no end in sight. Significantly, one of the propaganda points made by Thich Tri Quang's Buddhist agents in the army was that the U.S. was not going all out to win the war as soon as possible, and therefore wished to prolong the war indefinitely.

At any rate, the South Vietnamese now desperately need the reassurance of a real turning point in the fighting. They have shown astonishing patience, courage and resiliency. But war weariness, inflation, all the human and economic problems caused by larger and larger numbers of American troops in this small country, are beginning to combine to make the situation fragile. The South cannot be counted on to hold together indefinitely, unless a turning point is reached within a reasonable time period.

That unavoidably raises the problem of the North Vietnamese Communist takeover of the war in South Vietnam. As just reported in this space, even the Vietcong civilian administration, of tax collectors, provincial committeemen and the like, is by now one half composed of invaders from the north. By the end of this year, furthermore, two-thirds of the main force-backbone of the enemy will also be composed of invading northern troops.

Already, American soldiers are mainly fighting regular soldiers of the North Vietnamese Communist army. By any ordinary test, therefore, President Johnson is fully justified in doing everything he can prudently do, as riposte to this massive North Vietnamese Communist invasion of South Vietnam.

That does not mean attacking the civilian populations of Hanoi or Haiphong, or even flattening the North Vietnamese industrial plants that do not contribute to the war effort. But it certainly means intensifying the bombing attacks on the North in all the ways that may be militarily useful.

People say, "The northern bombing has accomplished too little." It has indeed, for the simple reason that the bombing tactics thus far employed have violated every rule in every air tactical manual written in the last 30 years. As all manuals emphasize, mere attacks on roads, bridges, and railroads can never be counted on for solid results. The effort must be in depth and that means attacking power stations, oil fuel stores and the like.

This kind of bombing effort ought to accomplish a great deal—and still without attacks on noncombatants, please remember. There are the best possible reasons to believe that President Johnson was on the verge of ordering just such an intensified effort in March, when the first round of political trouble in the South began, and again a few weeks ago, just before the second round of trouble started.

The time factor now demands that everything possible be done to hasten the war's turning point; and the fact that our soldiers are already mainly fighting North Vietnamese underlines the lesson of the time factor. One of the biggest things that can be done is to include the North's power stations and oil stores in the target lists.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

To Mr. KREBS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) for today on account of official business.

To Mr. CUNNINGHAM (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

To Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. WHITE of Texas), for June 15, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS, for 60 minutes, on June 20; and to revise and extend her remarks.

Mr. LANDRUM, for 45 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDOWELL (at the request of Mr. WHITE of Texas), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

involving 40 employers and unions. This week he personally heard complaints newly brought against U.S. Steel by NAACP's Birmingham chapter, after inviting the local chairman, Dr. John Nixon, to bring five of the complainants with him to Washington. The settlement of this case could have far-reaching results, since a possible strike against this basic industry would affect our entire economy.

(Mr. HANNA (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. HANNA'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

QUESTIONNAIRE REPORT, FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

(Mr. MONAGAN (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. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the tabulation of returns on my 1966 annual questionnaire has just been completed and I wish at this time to report to my colleagues, and to my constituents, on this cross section of opinion on important issues which currently are before the Congress and the administration.

My 1966 congressional questionnaire was mailed early in May to constituents whose names are on my regular mailing list as a result of earlier correspondence or expressions of interest in legislative matters. This list was supplemented by requests for cards resulting from newspaper, radio, and television announcement of the survey. Once again, I can report that the people of the Fifth Congressional District of Connecticut, whom I have the honor to represent, have shown a gratifying interest in the affairs of our Nation.

I include with this report the complete chart showing total and percentage "yes," "no," and "undecided" opinions on each of the 12 issues included in the survey. Most important to me, and I think to the people of the Nation, is the return on the questions concerning the conduct of the war in Vietnam. I presented the Vietnam question in six categories. I did not include the alternative of negotiation because in my opinion this is not a controversial question. It is my feeling that all of us would welcome the termination of the Vietnam conflict through proper negotiation.

I want to call particular attention to some of the highlights of the questionnaire returns: 56.04 percent of those responding expressed themselves in favor of continuing our present U.S. policy in Vietnam; 52.98 percent recommended escalation of our military efforts; 43.99 percent would bomb Hanoi, and 63.31 percent would blockade Haiphong; 8.49 percent favored retirement to coastal enclaves; and 17.98 percent favored complete withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam.

As a student and advocate of programs to correct the national catastrophe of water pollution, I was gratified with the 86.61 percent vote of support for the expansion of Federal programs to assist local-State efforts to combat water pollution. No other score approached the total favoring water pollution control. Other issues showing major support were a constitutional amendment to permit the voluntary recitation of prayer in public schools, 81.22 percent; an income tax exemption or credit for persons paying expenses of college students, 74.87 percent; legislation to control interstate shipment of firearms, 76.20 percent; and stricter regulation of the handling of animals used in laboratory research, 62.55 percent.

Other scores: 58.61 percent in favor of a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives; 58.80 percent for establishment of a Cabinet-level Department of Transportation; 52.94 percent in support of adoption of the metric system of weights and measures; 51.76 percent for a demonstration cities program to rebuild entire slum areas; 48.85 percent in favor of increasing the Federal minimum wage level to $1.60; and 48.81 percent for a constitutional amendment to permit a State to apportion one house of its legislature on a basis other than population.

As I have previously stated, a question which limits the answer to "yes" or "no" leaves much to be desired, but this form is made necessary by space limitations. Even with this restriction, however, I have found the response to the 1966 questionnaire most heartening and informative. I have also been favored by many letters from constituents who have given me the benefit of their views with detailed comments. I welcome and appreciate these comments and I am grateful to all those who took the time to complete the questionnaire and return it to me.

I do not look upon these returns as an official mandate, nor do I endeavor to identify this program as a professional sampling, but the returns are a helpful guidance in their indication of public opinion trends. As in the past, I shall continue to exercise my own judgment and to vote on issues as I see them and their influence on the people of my district and of the Nation, but most assuredly the returns will help me to form this judgment.

I also want to emphasize the point that this questionnaire was not printed at Government expense, and the cards were returned to me by constituents who were willing to pay the postage. I have expressed my gratitude for the response to this survey and for the hundreds of letters and messages which have come to me together with the questionnaire returns.

All of the messages were not complimentary.

However, a Cheshire resident "not a member of my party" sent a $10 check to help defray the cost of printing the questionnaire, and included words of encouragement.

A two-page typewritten letter came from a resident of Trumbull, who said, "I would have written earlier but for illness, business, and laziness."

He signed off with, "Well, you asked for my opinions. Best of luck."

A Prospect resident who criticized U.S. conduct in Vietnam, said, "We are just bandits taking over a foreign country" and signed himself, "Damned Mad."

A Meriden resident wrote a 12-page letter with the preface:

> Again your congressional questionnaire is very good, but does not allow for an expression of ideas. So, along with my answers are my personal opinions.

Another Meriden resident said:

> The answer to qustion No. 1—I am of the opinion that we must fight to win or get out of South Vietnam.

A Seymore resident wrote:

> Thank you for the privilege. Would like to see a ceiling on wages; strikes prohibited.

From Waterbury:

> I was delighted to get a questionnaire. I think it is a very good idea on your part in getting the written expessions of people in the State of Connecticut. On Vietnam, in other words, either we go all out or get out.

Another Waterburian:

> May God bless you with vigor and continued good health to keep up the pace that you are going on.

From Wallingford:

> I favor the elimination of all Bureaus or Departments that have to do with hand-outs for any purpose. This will reduce the political pressures from Washington and, particularly, from Texas.

A Cheshire man wrote:

> We are in Vietnam as a result of stupid statesmanship. We have to see it through. However, this past stupidity cannot be blamed entirely on the present Administration. That goes back to Roosevelt, Truman, Stillwell, Latimer and others of that kind. We are now paying the price for past blunders.

A Waterbury woman wrote:

> I have read, Congressman MONAGAN, how you were in Vietnam and right with our boys. You must know what really goes on. I'm so glad you're back.

From Meriden:

> May you have guidance in your decisions from the forces higher up than just mere man.

I include here the complete tabulation of the returns on the 12 questions and subsections covered by my 1966 questionnaire, showing the results in figures as well as in percentages:

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

In conclusion, Gentlemen, let's not rob Peter to pay Paul. Please heed the need for economic stability in the Pittsburgh area.

WM. J. HART,
Director, United Steelworkers of America, District 19; President, Allegheny County Labor Council.

UN

Vietnam AID Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, because of the critical nature of the AID program in South Vietnam, and the wide interest in the nonmilitary side of the U.S. effort in that nation, I insert the following reports from the Christian Science Monitor of June 8, 1966, and the Chicago Daily News of May 12, 1966:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 8, 1966]

CONGRESSMEN SEE U.S. AID DOLLARS STRAYING IN VIETNAM

(By William C. Selover)

WASHINGTON.—Few businessmen in the world are hauling in as much profit as those in Saigon.

Business there is booming.

But Congress is beginning to wonder if it should be quite so good.

In fact, members of a special congressional delegation just returned from Vietnam are raising serious questions about the lack of checks and restraints on profiteering carried out by Vietnamese businessmen at the direct expense of American taxpayers.

The basic problem stems from the vast American aid program.

Since 1955, the United States has pumped some $1.7 billion worth of consumer goods into Vietnam under its commodity import program (CIP). This amounts to 80 percent of all nonmilitary aid sent to that country in that period.

FINAL USE QUESTIONED

This program allows Saigon businessmen on license by the South Vietnamese Government to contract for goods with American businessmen, import the goods to Vietnam, then pay for them in piasters, the local currency. American aid dollars are used to reimburse the American businesses, and the piasters used to pay for the goods go into a joint United States-Vietnamese account.

The aim of the program is to stem inflation while promoting economic stability in the country.

But members of the House foreign operations and government information subcommittee found that CIP money is virtually subsidizing some 40 to 50 big businessmen in Saigon. Furthermore, there is practically no control over final use of the goods. Subcommittee members believe that some of these goods are being resold to the Viet Cong, the North Vietnamese, and even the Chinese Communists. Unfortunately, restraints are so slack, there is no way of knowing for sure.

BUSINESSMEN PROFIT

Here are some of the findings which deeply disturb individual members of the subcommittee:

The exchange rate set for the CIP program is 60 piasters to the dollar. The official rate is 118 to the dollar, and the black-market rate is 190 to 200.

This means United States taxpayers are getting about 30 cents of real value out of every dollar spent. Saigon businessmen pocket the difference. It also means these businessmen can resell the goods for terrific profits—for dollars or even gold.

There is no check on the appropriate amount of a specific item imported into Vietnam, and there is no way of checking what it will be used for—there is no "end use audit" procedure. Here are two recent blatant examples of what this can mean:

Subcommittee members learned that about 15 times the amount of silver nitrate which South Vietnam could possibly use went into that country last year.

SHIPMENTS HALTED

Likewise, about 10 times the amount of another chemical, unicel, which could possibly be used in their country was sold to Saigon businessmen.

Both these chemicals can be broken into ingredients for high explosives. And the silver can be extracted from silver nitrate for hoarding. Shipments of these two chemicals have been halted now, according to officials of the Agency for International Development (AID). Congressmen suspect much of these chemicals ended up in Viet Cong hands.

The United States and South Vietnam Governments know practically nothing about the Vietnamese businessmen who hold the CIP licenses. United States officials lack basic knowledge, for example, of whether they are Chinese or Vietnamese in background or what their business connections are.

SUGGESTIONS VETOED

Goods originally ordered by businessmen can be turned down on arrival and not paid for. South Vietnam officials then confiscate them, auction them off at "a very reduced rate"—and the money then goes into the South Vietnam coffers, not into the joint United States-Vietnamese account. One subcommittee member pointed out that the Viet Cong could be buying these goods at auction—because there is no check on who buys them.

The joint United States-Vietnamese account, into which Vietnamese businessmen pay piasters for the goods, was intended to be used for United States civil-aid projects. Also, an agreed amount supports the South Vietnamese governmental budget. But, in effect, the government of South Vietnam exercises a veto over the use of these funds so completely that the aims of the civil-aid projects are seriously frustrated.

Recent examples of projects the United States Embassy was pushing but which failed to gain approval of the South Vietnamese Government: use of the funds to pay for garbage collection in Saigon, to build police barracks, and to establish a fund from which to pay Vietnamese claims against the United States.

One subcommittee member called the failure of United States controls over this progam a "windfall" for Saigon businessmen.

REPORTS WITHHELD

Another member of the delegation, ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, now Republican Senator from Michigan, was blunt in his observations. "What we saw over there is a situation where Saigon businessmen have a vested interest in the prolongation of the war," he charged in an interview.

The subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Rep. JOHN E. MOSS (D) of California, is preparing a report on its findings. No one can say what its final shape will take since it has not been completed. But it will probably place strong blame for the slack program on both AID officials and on the General Accounting Office (GAO), charged with the responsibility to double-check the administration of government programs all over the world.

STAFF INCREASED

One subcommittee member charged that AID administrators in Washington "simply couldn't answer basic questions about their programs. That's why we went to Vietnam." He said they found that AID officials in Vietnam were simply holding onto the audit reports to update them. "They were never sent to Washington." No wonder Washington officials couldn't answer question, he observed

Subcommittee members are especially disturbed about what they see as dangerous understaffing of the CIP program, especially in accounting and auditing.

In the 10-month period between June, 1965, and April, 1966, the number of AID personnel increased from 630 to 1,900. But until the past few months, only two of these employees were principally concerned with the CIP. A year ago, only one American was in charge. Now, after the subcommittee began investigations seven or eight months ago, the number has increased to seven.

Yet, this year $370 million out of a total AID commitment of $630 million, went to the CIP.

The only formal report issued by the GAO on governmental programs in Vietnam in the past seven years came in 1964. Then the GAO, which is an independent arm of the Congress, set up in 1921 to ride herd on the administration, charged that AID was operating under completely inadequate procedures—that nonessential commodities were being admitted into the CIP, that profiteering and overpricing were being allowed.

"Yet, in spite of this report, AID conducted no audit until we got there," said one delegation member.

INADEQUACY CHARGED

Rutherford M. Poats, director of AID for the Far East, says the procedures are still "not adequate."

He said they have steadily expanded the AID auditing staff to 17. He conceded, however, that seven of those were trainees.

He said AID had increased the authorized positions to 26, but that since Vietnam is such a dangerous place, it is very hard to get auditors to go there. AID now is "ordering them from other AID missions around the world by forced draft to go to Vietnam."

Another problem is getting local Vietnamese for the staff. "We can't pay more than the local wages. We've lost some key people to private business which can pay much more."

Still there is no "end use" auditing procedure.

GAO officials admit that after the 1964 report they had "no one physically in Vietnam," until "a team of four people" went there briefly this spring. One congressional source said of the GAO: "They have been conspicuously absent in Vietnam."

Subcommittee members tend to excuse the GAO on the grounds that it has "no continuing responsibility" in any special area. Its investigations are made at the discretion of the comptroller general, and at the request of Congress.

PERMANENCY STUDIES

Yet, GAO officials themselves say that with the size of the program and the "tremendous expenditure," it might be useful to establish a permanent office there.

"The salutary effect of our presence could be a factor of some consequence," said an official. But there are no plans to do this at present.

"We were aware that we had not covered anything there in a number of years," he said explaining the decision to investigate in 1964.

"But we have some reservations in deciding what practically can be accomplished in sending our people to Vietnam under war-

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8

time conditions. It might be a better idea to go other places where we could accomplish more," said an official of the GAO international operations division.

STAFF DIFFICULTIES

He also cited the difficulty in getting a staff overseas.

The total worldwide staff of GAO is about 2,000. The Far East headquarters in Hawaii has a staff of about 35. But GAO presently has no one in Vietnam, which has the largest United States AID program in the world.

Apparently, the subcommittee's investigation has set the ball rolling.

Since it started, the State Department's inspector general of foreign assistance and the AID comptroller have been to Vietnam. Also the director of foreign service personnel was scheduled to go.

Whatever the final recommendations of the subcommittee will be, there are sure to be some strong recommendations for a greater United States role in overseeing the use of United States taxpayer's money. From what these congressmen say, such supervision barely exists at all today.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, May 12, 1966]

CONGRESS TEAM IN SAIGON RAPS AID PROGRAM FLAWS

(By Raymond R. Coffey)

SAIGON.—The United States has more than 250,000 men here fighting the military end of the Viet Nam war, but until recently it had assigned only two men to direct an aid program that costs U.S. taxpayers $400,000,000 a year.

That is one of several points about the Commercial Import Program phase of the U.S. Agency for International Development's operation here, which a congressional subcommittee gave a stern going-over.

The congressmen also complained privately about other weaknesses in the CIP, which accounts for considerably more than half of the total U.S. aid effort in Viet Nam:

There is no reliable system for checking whether items imported under the program ever reach the people or the purpose for which they are intended.

There is no way of checking on the backgrounds, loyalty, honesty or secret connections of the people who are permitted to profit from the import program.

One purpose of the program is to help stem the soaring inflation in Viet Nam. But the cost of living has climbed by about 50 per cent in the last year, indicating that the CIP operation and other anti-inflationary measures have failed so far.

Apart from the U.S. purposes served by the CIP, it is also working to "make the rich richer"—one of the major complaints that ordinary Vietnamese have against the whole U.S. presence here.

CIP in the current fiscal year accounts for about $380,000,000 of the total U.S. aid program. In the coming fiscal year, CIP will represent $420,000,000 out of a total aid commitment of $735,000,000, according to subcommittee sources.

CIP is a complicated economic exercise that is best condensed thus:

Vietnamese government revenues and foreign exchange possibilities don't come anywhere near meeting the financial needs of a country at war.

Hence the United States steps in with a handout in this form: A Vietnamese importer applies, for example, for a license to import 100 farm tractors.

The license is approved and the tractors are ordered from a U.S. manufacturer. The United States then pays the manufacturer—in dollars—for the tractors.

The importer pays the Vietnamese government—in Vietnamese piastres—for the tractors and the piastres go into the deficit-ridden Vietnamese defense budget.

There are several economic rationales behind the program:

1. The Vietnamese government does not have to expend its foreign currency reserves.

2. It helps balance the defense budget while supposedly stimulating the Vietnamese economy.

3. It helps combat inflation by making goods available for people to buy and thus soaking up some of the cheap money causing inflation.

4. U.S. business gets a boost, and gets paid in good solid dollars by the U.S. government.

The problem is that things have not been working out that way, according to a house subcommittee on foreign operations, headed by Rep. JOHN MOSS (D-Calif.), which held hearings on the aid program here this week.

"The problem is one of procedures more than policy," a committee source said. "Right now, for example, we have no way of knowing if the housing materials we sent over for the import program are being used for houses or for Viet Cong bunkers," he added.

Similarly, he said, there is no way of knowing if importers of the goods paid for by the United States are shipping them out of the country again to make a greater profit elsewhere.

The granting of import licenses is entirely in the hands of Vietnamese government officials and corruption in the program is an open secret.

"We have no way of knowing whether or not some of the generals in the government are secret partners of the importers they grant licenses to," the committee spokesman said.

"In fact," he added, "the assumption is that they are."

Furthermore, even an AID program official admitted that the licenses are now granted to a "tight little circle" of importers and that the United States has been trying—without success—to get the Vietnamese government to open up the program to more people.

Also, the AID official conceded, the CIP operation is helping to create a vastly wealthy class of importers.

What seemed most incredible to the congressmen was the small number of people assigned to direct the check on the programs.

"Until a month ago they were running a program with only two people," a committee source said. "Now they've got seven and they're going to increase it to 16 soon."

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080011-8