nological revolution and increasing complexity of programs, staffing by support agencies and in the Congress itself are matters of the utmost importance. This is not necessarily a plea for more staff but for better staff and better utilization of existing staffs.

Of recurring concern is the matter of conflicts of interest affecting both elected representatives and employees of the Congress. Are there new rules to be written? Is there new machinery to be devised for advising Members and employees helping them to avoid conflict-of-interest situations? We must take note that in the other body a Committee on Ethical Conduct with equal representation by both parties has been authorized.

What about the regulations for lobbyists? Everyone knows they haven't had much effect. The Congress is lobbied by agents of interests all over the world. The right of petition for redress of grievances is a hallowed constitutional right, but the Congress and the public must have better means of identifying and regulating the powerful influences that play upon it year in and year out.

INQUIRY SHOULD BE BROAD

Many of the matters of possible inquiry would have to consider changes in laws and parliamentary procedures. House Concurrent Resolutions 4 and 20 contain a proviso that the joint committee would not be authorized "to make any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedures, practices, and/or precedents of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House." While this language is identical with that in the Monroney bill, Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, I personally do not believe that the study efforts which will be made should be in any manner circumscribed.

The reason for this restraining language, as we all know, is the sensitivity of each House to the constitutional provision that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings." Of course, any changes in the formal proceedings would be a matter for action separately in each House. I see no bar in constitutional or public policy against recommendations by a joint committee.

Indeed, the very purpose of a joint study effort is to lay the foundation in facts and analyses for each House to be able to judge whether changes in formal proceedings should be made. Therefore, the mandate of the committee should not be limited; and if it is authorized to study, certainly it should be authorized to make recommendations. I would gladly support an amendment to this effect in the resolution.

While I am on the subject of amendments, I note that the resolution does not have any specific time limit for its tenure. Whether or not this implies that the committee would lapse with the end of the Congress authorizing it, it might be useful to specify that the committee tenure would continue through the 89th Congress, with whatever stipulations are appropriate for the presentation of final reports.

Finally, I note that House Concurrent Resolutions 4 and 20 provide for equal representation of both parties on the joint committee. This follows the precedent of the La Follette-Monroney special committee, which had equal numbers of Republicans and Democrats of both Houses.

Ordinarily, committees reflect the party composition of each House, and some Members may prefer that these ratios be reflected on the proposed joint committee. I recall that when I sponsored a resolution back in 1951 along with Senator HUMPHREY in the Senate, provision was made for more Democrats than Republicans, in accord with party composition of the Houses. However, there are matters in which party differences should have a lesser role. I note that the Senate Committee on Ethical Conduct has equal party representation. This follows the practice of the committee which was established to rule on the conduct of the late Senator Joseph McCarthy.

Certainly party differences need not be a factor in our study of congressional reorganization. I believe that a majority of the Members in both parties favor such an effort, and I am perfectly willing to see that both parties are equally represented on the joint committee. This would be a special joint committee and would expire when its work is done.

Equal bipartisan representation is justified in the same sense that a special committee is justified. Ordinarily, the Committee on Government Operations in each House has jurisdiction over organization matters, including legislative reorganization. While it is proper for the Government Operations Committees to have and exercise such jurisdiction from year to year, we are proposing here a comprehensive one-time review, encompassing both Houses of Congress and all its operation. A special joint committee detached from day to day responsibility and limited in tenure seems more appropriate for this task, which we similarly commissioned a committee to do 20 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity to appear here and support the resolution for a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1965

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all mankind, to whom all souls are dear: For this moment of the far look, we lift our eyes from the swiftly moving scenes about us to the changeless verities by which we live.

We turn to Thee, not seeking an escape exit from the imperative duties that daily besiege us; but, rather, we beseech Thee to give us strength for our burdens, wisdom for our problems, and insight for our troubled times.

To be thus strengthened with might for the tasks we face, we would enter this forum of the people's hope always through the gateway of prayer, with the deep desire that all our deliberations on this high hill of the Nation's life should day by day be begun, continued, and ended in Thee. Thus only can we be delivered from the despair of a defeating cynicism which denies that there is any road to the fair city of our dreams.

As partners in a crusade for decency and honor and freedom—a cause in which our boys are giving their lives under alien skies these very days—bring us to the common victory for the inalienable rights of all men everywhere in all the earth.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 25, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on the Standing Rules of the Senate of the Committee on Rules and Administration was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

REENACTMENT OF SECOND INAUGURAL OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at noon on Thursday of this week, March 4, there will be held on the east steps of the Capitol a reenactment of the second inaugural of Abraham Lincoln in observance of the 100th anniversary of the event on March 4, 1865. Such a reenactment has been authorized by a joint resolution of the Congress, and has been prepared by a joint committee whose Senate members are the two Senators from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. DIRKSEN], the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE].

This will be a most important historical commemoration. The reenactment will be filmed in color in a production for which the well-known producer, Dore Schary, is giving his services without cost. Narrator for the production will be Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, who has written his own script for the reenactment. The role of Abraham Lincoln will be played by the well-known actor Robert Ryan, who will have an authentically costumed supporting cast. In

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

addition to the reenactment, a modern portion of the program will include an address by the eminent Civil War historian, Bruce Catton. At the close of the ceremony President Lincoln will leave the scene with other members of the company in two period carriages, one of them used in the inauguration of Ulysses S. Grant. The undertaking has involved authentic reproduction by the Park Service of the Lincoln inaugural stand, and every detail will be as accurately reproduced as the vast lore of Lincoln scholarship can make it.

A special section has been reserved for Members of the Congress, for the Supreme Court, and for other honored guests. Because of the official character of these ceremonies, and because of their great intrinsic value to all of us, it is anticipated that the Senate will recess from about 12 noon until 1 p.m. if it is in session on Thursday.

It is expected that a great many members of the public, including schoolchildren and teachers from the surrounding area, and many Lincoln enthusiasts from the Nation will be present for the occasion.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF PEACE CORPS ACT, AS AMENDED

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SALE OF UNIFORM CLOTHING TO THE NAVAL SEA CADET CORPS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell uniform clothing to the Naval Sea Cadet Corps (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS AWARDED ON OTHER THAN A COMPETITIVE BID BASIS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (installations and logistics) transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military construction contracts awarded on other than a competitive bid basis to the lowest responsible bidder, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REGULATION OF EXPORTS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON FINANCIAL CONDITION AND RESULTS OF THE OPERATIONS OF THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the financial condition and results of the operations of the Highway Trust Fund, dated June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on inadequacies in procedure and practices relating to selection of and review of performance of recipients of social security payments on behalf of minor and incompetent adult beneficiaries, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated February 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs to the Government by leasing rather than purchasing electric power facilities, Goddard Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, dated February 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT OF THE FOUNDATION OF THE FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION

A letter from the Secretary, the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that association, for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF 28 U.S.C. 2241, RELATING TO JURISDICTION AND VENUE OF APPLICATIONS FOR WRITS OF HABEAS CORPUS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend 28 U.S.C. section 2241 with respect to the jurisdiction and venue of applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody under judgments and sentences of State courts (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO REQUEST THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO BRING THE QUESTION OF THE LIBERATION OF THE BALTIC STATES BEFORE THE UNITED NATIONS

"Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by legal or democratic processes; and

"Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States maintains diplomatic relations with the Governments of the free Baltic Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced incorporation into the Soviet Union; and

"Whereas the select committee of the House of Representatives, created by House Resolution 346 of the 83d Congress to investigate the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, found that the incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia was contrary to established principles of international law; and

"Wheras the opinion of the free nations and the free people of the world is to eliminate any kind of colonialism and imperialism; "Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives urges the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States to request the President of the United States to bring the question of the liberation of the Baltic Sates before the United Nations and ask that body to request that the Soviet Union do the following:

"1. Withdraw all Soviet troops, secret police, agents, colonists, and all controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia;

"2. Return to their homes all Baltic exiles and deportees from Siberia, prisons, and slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union; and be it further

"Resolved, That the United Nations be further requested to conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision and punish all Russian Communists who are guilty of crimes against the peoples of the Baltic States; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the commonwealth to the U.S. Senators and U.S. Congressmen representing the people of Worcester in the U.S. Congress for appropriate action.

"House of representatives, adopted, February 10, 1965. "WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"Clerk.

"Attest: "KEVIN H. WHITE,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 3

"Resolution applying to the Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Legislature of Alabama respectfully applies to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which shall have a bicameral legislature from apportioning the membership of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

" 'SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.

" 'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.'

"Be it further resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to June 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"McDOWELL LEE,
"Secretary of Senate."

A resolution adopted by Green County Barracks No. 2315, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., of Monroe, Wis., protesting against the proposed changes in the Reserve and National Guard units; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MUNDT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relative to the apportionment of State legislatures and governing bodies of subordinate units of government

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representa-

tives concurring), That the Legislature of the State of South Dakota respectfully applies to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"'ARTICLE —

"'SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which shall have a bicameral legislature from apportioning the membership of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

"'SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.

"'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.'

"Be it further resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to June 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of South Dakota to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH (for herself and Mr. MUSKIE):

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"JOINT RESOLUTION PROTESTING THE ORDERED CLOSING OF VA HOSPITALS, DOMICILIARIES, AND REGIONAL OFFICES

"Whereas the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration has summarily and publicly announced the intention of closing permanently 31 Veterans' Administration facilities throughout the Nation, including 11 hospitals and 4 soldiers' homes; and

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration plans to transfer those veterans who are patients to other facilities, presumably including the Togus, Maine Veterans' Administration hospital which is already filled to capacity, thereby creating hardships on Maine veterans; and

"Whereas the ordered closings of the Veterans' Administration regional offices in New Hampshire and Vermont and the merging of their functions with the Boston Veterans' Administration office raises grave doubts as to the future of the Togus regional office; and

"Whereas it was clearly the intent of the Congress of the United States, the veterans organizations and a grateful Nation that our disabled veterans be cared for and that they and their dependents be rendered every possible assistance in applying for the other benefits to which they are rightly entitled; and

"Whereas the ordered closings of the Veterans' Administration facilities will render undue hardship to our Maine veterans and their families, as well as those in New England and the entire Nation, in seeking care and benefits: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the 102d Legislature of the State of Maine does hereby protest the said closings, and requests the Veterans' Administration to cease and desist in its efforts to close the said facilities; be it further

"Resolved, That the Members of the U.S. Congress from the State of Maine are hereby urgently requested to use every possible means to cause the decision to close said facilities to be reversed; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, duly authenticated by the secretary of state, be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; to the Honorable RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs; to the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives; to the Honorable William J. Driver, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration; and to the Members of the U.S. Congress from the State of Maine.

"In senate chamber, read and adopted, sent down for concurrence February 12, 1965.

"EDWIN H. PERT,
"Secretary.

"House of representatives, read and adopted, in concurrence February 16, 1965.

"JEROME G. PLANTE,
"Clerk."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine; ordered to lie on the table:

"Whereas the town of Lisbon was dealt a severe economic blow, through the closure of its two mills;

"Whereas a loss of over 900 employment opportunities ensued;

"Whereas the town of Lisbon was not in a position of self-aid due to lack of resources and technical knowledge;

"Whereas a Presidential Task Force was assigned to the town of Lisbon in which Col. Iverson Mitchell, in a spirit of true dedication, united a local force and worked unwaveringly until the objective was clear: Be it hereby

"Resolved, That this 102d Maine Legislature go on record to declare its recognition to Federal, State, and local agencies which contributed, and were instrumental in restoring a favorable economic climate to the town of Lisbon as recognized and defined below:

"President Lyndon B. Johnson; the Presidential Task Force, under the direction of Col. Iverson Mitchell, and assisted by Mr. Jerome Barnett; the Small Business Administration, headed by Mr. Thomas Noonan; the U.S. Department of Agriculture; the members of Maine congressional delegation; John H. Reed, Governor of the State of Maine; the Department of Economic Development, headed by Commissioner Standish K. Bachman and assisted by Mr. Robert Ransone; and the Maine Employment Security Commission; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this joint resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the house to the Secretary of Commerce, and heads of other assisting agencies, with the request that they accept this commendation with the sincere gratitude of the town of Lisbon and the 102d Maine Legislature.

"Presented by : Mr. Hunter of Durham.

"House of representatives read and adopted sent up for concurrence February 10, 1965.

"JEROME G. PLANTE,
"Clerk.

"In senate chamber read and adopted, in concurrence February 11, 1965.

"EDWIN H. PERT,
"Secretary."

RESOLUTION OF NEBRASKA LEGISLATURE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I present legislative Resolution 18 of the Legislature of Nebraska for appropriate reference. It has to do with the production of castor beans, a new industry, an agricultural activity that will contribute to lessening of surpluses. I am in accord with its provisions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 18

Whereas this country is faced with a continuing surplus of feed grains; and

Whereas castor beans are not in surplus but rather there is a growing demand for the oil products derived therefrom; and

Whereas the diversion of land from the production of feed grains to the production of castor beans should be encouraged because of the resulting reduction in the surplus of feed grains and because of the savings to the taxpayers arising from the reduction in payment below that which would be made for such diversion if castor beans were not planted on such land; and

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States has announced that the payment when castor beans are planted on such diverted land is to be reduced from 50 to 30 percent of the basic payment for diversion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 75th session assembled:

1. That the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States be urged to restore the payment for the production of castor beans on diverted land to 50 percent of the basic payment for diversion.

2. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States and to each U.S. Senator and Congressman from Nebraska.

PHILIP C. SORENSEN,
President of the Legislature.

Attest:

HUGO F. SRB,
Clerk of the Legislature.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures I submit a report on Federal stockpile inventories as of December 1964. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

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

FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES, DECEMBER 1964

INTRODUCTION

This is the 61st in a series of monthly reports on Federal stockpile inventories. It is for the month of December 1964.

The report is compiled from official data on quantities and cost value of commodities in these stockpiles submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Interior, and the General Services Administration.

The cost value of materials in inventories covered in this report, as of December 1, 1964, totaled $13,555,771,885 and as of December 31, 1964, they totaled $13,396,502,200, a net decrease of $159,269,685 during the month.

Different units of measure make it impossible to summarize the quantities of com-

modities and materials which are shown in tables 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, but the cost value figures are summarized by major category, as follows:

Summary of cost value of stockpile inventories by major category

Major category	Beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1964	End of month, Dec. 31, 1964	Net change during month
Strategic and critical materials:			
National stockpile [1]	$5,577,026,200	$5,558,321,400	−$18,704,800
Defense Production Act	1,431,479,600	1,426,418,900	−5,060,700
Supplemental—barter	1,392,829,269	1,395,282,549	+2,453,280
Total, strategic and critical materials [1]	8,401,335,069	8,380,022,849	−21,312,220
Agricultural commodities:			
Price support inventory	4,740,981,789	4,599,788,344	−141,193,445
Inventory transferred from national stockpile [1]	57,735,859	57,301,993	−433,866
Total, agricultural commodities [1]	4,798,717,648	4,657,090,337	−141,627,311
Civil defense supplies and equipment:			
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense	11,878,612	11,878,731	+119
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	201,085,079	200,824,479	−260,600
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment	212,963,691	212,703,210	−260,481
Machine tools:			
Defense Production Act	45,300	45,300	
National Industrial Reserve Act	88,499,800	88,643,000	+143,200
Total, machine tools	88,545,100	88,688,300	+143,200
Helium	54,210,377	57,997,504	+3,787,127
Total, all inventories	13,555,771,885	13,396,502,200	−159,269,685

[1] Cotton inventory valued at $128,409,100 withdrawn from the national stockpile and transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation for disposal, pursuant to Public Law 87-548, during August 1962.

Detailed tables in this report show each commodity, by the major categories summarized above, in terms of quantity and cost value as of the beginning and end of the month. Net change figures reflect acquisitions, disposals, and accounting and other adjustments during the month.

The cost value figures represent generally the original acquisition cost of the commodities delivered to permanent storage locations, together with certain packaging, processing, upgrading, et cetera, costs as carried in agency inventory accounts. Quantities are stated in the designated stockpile unit of measure.

Appendix A to this report, beginning on page 19, includes program descriptions and statutory citations pertinent to each stockpile inventory within the major categories.

The stockpile inventories, covered by the report are tabulated in detail as follows:

Table 1: Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), December 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the months).

Table 2: Agricultural commodities inventories, December 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 3: Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, December 1964 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 4: Machine tools inventories, December 1964 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 5: Helium inventories, December 1964 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

NEW STOCKPILE OBJECTIVES

The Office of Emergency Planning is in the process of establishing new stockpile objectives for strategic and critical materials.

Table 1 of this report reflects the new objectives established between May 1963 and April 1964, based on essential needs in the event of a "conventional war emergency."

Appendix B, beginning on page 22, contains excerpts from Office of Emergency Planning statements setting forth the new policy and current studies with respect to objectives for strategic and critical materials required for "conventional war emergency" and "nuclear war emergency."

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), December 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1964	End of month, Dec. 31, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1964	End of month, Dec. 31, 1964	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Aluminum, metal:									
National stockpile	$487,680,600	$487,680,600		Short ton	1,128,988	1,128,988			
Defense Production Act	404,015,000	401,780,800	−$2,234,200	do	801,314	796,892	−4,422		
Total	891,695,600	889,461,400	−2,234,200	do	1,930,302	1,925,880	−4,422	450,000	1,475,880
Aluminum oxide, abrasive grain:									
Supplemental—barter	15,717,600	15,717,600		Short dry ton	50,905	50,905		[2]	50,905
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude:									
National stockpile	21,735,100	21,735,100		Short ton	200,093	200,093			
Supplemental—barter	22,747,400	22,747,400		do	178,266	178,266			
Total	44,482,500	44,482,500		do	378,359	378,359		160,000	218,359
Antimony:									
National stockpile	20,487,900	20,356,300	−131,600	do	30,275	30,092	−183		
Supplemental—barter	13,550,900	13,550,500	−400	do	22,704	22,704			
Total	34,038,800	33,906,800	−132,000	do	52,979	52,796	−183	25,500	27,296
Asbestos, amosite:									
National stockpile	2,637,600	2,637,600		do	11,705	11,705			
Supplemental—barter	9,867,562	10,004,912	+137,350	do	39,420	39,918	+498		
Total	12,505,162	12,642,512	+137,350	do	51,125	51,623	+498	40,000	11,623
Asbestos, chrysotile:									
National stockpile	3,356,200	3,356,200		do	6,224	6,224			
Defense Production Act	2,102,600	2,102,600		do	2,348	2,348			
Supplemental—barter	4,983,954	5,001,054	+17,100	do	7,576	7,576			
Total	10,442,754	10,459,854	+17,100	do	16,148	16,148		13,700	2,448
Asbestos, crocidolite:									
National stockpile	702,100	702,100		do	1,567	1,567			
Supplemental—barter	10,456,575	10,515,475	+58,900	do	40,342	40,342			
Total	11,158,675	11,217,575	+58,900	do	41,909	41,909		[2]	41,909

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), December 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1964	End of month, Dec. 30, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1964	End of month, Dec. 30, 1964	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type:									
National stockpile	$13,925,000	$13,925,000		Long dry ton	879,740	879,740			
Defense Production Act	18,168,000	18,168,000		do	1,370,077	1,370,077			
Supplemental—barter	93,857,968	94,689,502	+$831,534	do	6,107,954	6,147,490	+39,536		
Total	125,950,968	126,782,502	+831,534	do	8,357,771	8,397,307	+39,536	5,000,000	3,397,307
Bauxite, metal grade, Surinam type:									
National stockpile	78,552,500	78,552,500		do	4,962,706	4,962,706			
Supplemental—barter	45,280,400	45,197,400	−83,000	do	2,927,260	2,927,260			
Total	123,832,900	123,749,900	−83,000	do	7,889,966	7,889,966		5,300,000	2,589,966
Bauxite, refractory grade:									
National stockpile	11,347,800	11,347,800		Long calcined ton.	299,279	299,279		173,000	126,279
Beryl:									
National stockpile	9,768,400	9,768,400		Short ton	23,230	23,230			
Defense Production Act	1,425,600	1,425,600		do	2,542	2,542			
Supplemental—barter	23,049,952	23,049,952		do	12,277	12,277			
Total	34,243,952	34,243,952		do	38,049	38,049		28,000	10,049
Beryllium metal:									
Supplemental—barter	18,703,500	18,703,500		do	153	153		[2]	153
Bismuth:									
National stockpile	2,674,300	2,674,300		Pound	1,342,402	1,342,402			
Defense Production Act	52,400	52,400		do	22,901	22,901			
Supplemental—barter	5,536,700	5,536,700		do	2,506,493	2,506,493			
Total	8,263,400	8,263,400		do	3,871,796	3,871,796		3,600,000	271,796
Cadmium:									
National stockpile	15,155,000	15,148,700	−6,300	do	7,702,957	7,699,716	−3,241		
Supplemental—barter	12,326,600	12,326,600		do	7,448,389	7,448,389			
Total	27,481,600	27,475,300	−6,300	do	15,151,346	15,148,105	−3,241	5,100,000	10,048,105
Caster oil:									
National stockpile	45,511,600	45,164,600	−347,000	do	178,996,404	177,609,264	−1,387,140	22,000,000	155,609,264
Celestite:									
National stockpile	1,412,300	1,412,300		Short ton	28,816	28,816			
Supplemental—barter	812,693	827,486	+14,793	do	19,201	19,225	+24		
Total	2,224,993	2,239,786	+14,793	do	48,017	48,041	+24	10,300	37,741
Chromite, chemical grade:									
National stockpile	12,288,000	12,288,000		Short dry ton	559,452	559,452			
Supplemental—barter	21,930,200	21,993,100	+62,900	do	699,644	699,644			
Total	34,218,200	34,281,100	+62,900	do	1,259,096	1,259,096		600,000	659,096
Chromite, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	264,565,500	264,565,500		do	3,795,292	3,795,291	−1		
Defense Production Act	35,879,900	35,879,900		do	985,646	985,646			
Supplemental—barter	227,024,400	227,010,900	−13,500	do	1,558,054	1,558,054			
Total	527,469,800	527,456,300	−13,500	do	6,338,992	6,338,991	−1	2,970,000	3,368,991
Chromite, refractory grade:									
National stockpile	25,149,300	25,149,300		do	1,047,159	1,047,159			
Supplemental—barter	5,039,000	5,039,000		do	179,775	179,775			
Total	30,188,300	30,188,300		do	1,226,934	1,226,934		1,425,000	(3)
Cobalt:									
National stockpile	169,225,700	169,225,700		Pound	76,067,015	76,067,015			
Defense Production Act	52,075,300	52,075,300		do	25,066,651	25,066,651			
Supplemental—barter	2,169,000	2,169,000		do	1,065,398	1,065,398			
Total	223,470,000	223,470,000		do	102,199,064	102,199,064		42,000,000	60,199,064
Coconut oil:									
National stockpile	1,484,000	1,014,000	−470,000	do	9,790,029	6,694,027	−3,096,002	[2]	6,694,027
Colemanite:									
Supplemental—barter	2,636,400	2,636,400		Long dry ton	67,636	67,636		[2]	67,636
Columbium:									
National stockpile	24,777,200	24,818,900	+41,700	Pound	7,360,707	7,364,642	+3,935		
Defense Production Act	50,238,900	50,238,900		do	7,966,341	7,966,341			
Supplemental—barter	799,100	799,100		do	371,426	371,426			
Total	75,815,200	75,856,900	+41,700	do	15,698,474	15,702,409	+3,935	1,176,000	14,526,409
Copper:									
National stockpile	524,204,600	524,384,400	+179,800	Short ton	1,008,042	1,008,471	+429		
Defense Production Act	43,447,500	41,964,100	−1,483,400	do	77,472	74,630	−2,842		
Supplemental—barter	8,252,100	8,252,100		do	12,382	12,382			
Total	575,904,200	574,600,600	−1,303,600	do	1,097,896	1,095,483	−2,413	775,000	320,483
Cordage fibers, abaca:									
National stockpile	37,034,400	37,034,300	−100	Pound	146,934,136	146,933,858	−278	100,000,000	46,933,858

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), December 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1964	End of month, Dec. 30, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1964	End of month, Dec. 30, 1964	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Cordage fibers, sisal:									
National stockpile	$41,867,900	$41,866,600	−$1,300	Pound	309,567,177	309,558,837	−8,340	300,000,000	9,558,837
Corundum:									
National stockpile	393,100	393,100		Short ton	2,008	2,008		2,500	(3)
Cryolite:									
Defense Production Act	5,564,000	5,482,900	−81,100	do	20,149	19,855	−294	(2)	19,855
Diamond dies:									
National stockpile	584,100	592,100	+8,000	Piece	18,836	19,052	+216	25,000	(3)
Diamond, industrial, crushing bort:									
National stockpile	61,601,800	61,601,800		Carat	31,109,411	31,109,411			
Supplemental—barter	15,800,500	15,800,500		do	5,550,579	5,550,579			
Total	77,402,300	77,402,300		do	36,659,990	36,659,990		24,700,000	11,959,990
Diamond, industrial stones:									
National stockpile	100,509,400	100,509,400		do	9,319,183	9,319,183			
Supplemental—barter	186,341,500	186,341,500		do	15,425,827	15,425,827			
Total	286,850,900	286,850,900		do	24,745,010	24,745,010		16,500,000	8,245,010
Diamond tools:									
National stockpile	1,015,400	1,015,400		Piece	64,178	64,178		(2)	64,178
Feathers and down:									
National stockpile	32,316,500	31,454,300	−862,200	Pound	7,799,784	7,591,685	−208,099	3,000,000	4,591,685
Fluorspar, acid grade:									
National stockpile	26,167,500	26,167,500		Short dry ton	463,049	463,049			
Defense Production Act	1,394,400	1,394,400		do	19,700	19,700			
Supplemental—barter	33,531,100	33,531,100		do	673,232	673,232			
Total	61,093,000	61,093,000		do	1,155,981	1,155,981		540,000	615,981
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	17,332,400	17,332,400		do	369,443	369,443			
Supplemental—barter	1,508,100	1,508,100		do	42,800	42,800			
Total	18,840,500	18,840,500		do	412,243	412,243		850,000	(3)
Graphite, natural, Ceylon, amorphous lump:									
National stockpile	937,900	937,900		do	4,455	4,455			
Supplemental—barter	341,200	341,200		do	1,428	1,428			
Total	1,279,100	1,279,100		do	5,883	5,883		5,500	383
Graphite, natural, Malagasy, crystalline:									
National stockpile	6,744,800	7,732,400	−12,400	do	32,736	32,677	−59		
Supplemental—barter	232,500	232,500		do	1,908	1,908			
Total	6,977,300	6,964,900	−12,400	do	34,644	34,585	−59	18,000	16,585
Graphite, natural, other, crystalline:									
National stockpile	1,894,400	1,894,400		do	5,481	5,481		2,800	2,681
Hyoscine:									
National stockpile	30,600	30,600		Ounce	2,100	2,100		(2)	2,100
Iodine:									
National stockpile	4,082,000	4,082,000		Pound	2,956,713	2,956,713			
Supplemental—barter	1,406,700	1,412,300	+5,600	do	1,333,563	1,333,563			
Total	5,488,700	5,494,300	+5,600	do	4,290,276	4,290,276		8,000,000	(3)
Iridium:									
National stockpile	2,525,800	2,525,800		Troy ounce	13,937	13,937		17,000	(3)
Jewel bearings:									
National stockpile	4,564,600	4,564,600		Piece	52,435,065	52,435,065		57,500,000	(3)
Kyanite-mullite:									
National stockpile	734,300	725,700	−8,600	Short dry ton	8,493	8,393	−100	4,800	3,593
Lead:									
National stockpile	307,487,000	307,062,400	−424,600	Short ton	1,011,528	1,010,132	−1,396		
Supplemental—barter	78,398,500	78,398,500		do	327,998	327,998			
Total	385,885,500	385,460,900	−424,600	do	1,339,526	1,338,130	−1,396	0	1,338,130
Magnesium:									
National stockpile	125,016,200	124,437,300	−578,900	do	172,182	171,383	−799	145,000	26,383
Manganese, battery grade, natural ore:									
National stockpile	21,025,500	21,025,500		Short dry ton	144,485	144,485			
Supplemental—barter	14,064,600	14,076,600	+12,000	do	142,245	142,245			
Total	35,090,100	35,102,100	+12,000	do	286,730	286,730		80,000	206,730
Manganese, battery grade, synthetic dioxide:									
National stockpile	3,095,500	3,095,500		do	21,272	21,272			
Defense Production Act	2,524,700	2,524,700		do	3,779	3,779			
Total	5,620,200	5,620,200		do	25,051	25,051		6,700	18,351

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), December 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1964	End of month, Dec. 30, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1964	End of month, Dec. 30, 1964	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Manganese, chemical grade, type A:									
National stockpile	$2,133,300	$2,133,300		Short dry ton	29,307	29,307			
Supplemental—barter	7,922,100	7,922,100		do	117,607	117,607			
Total	10,055,400	10,055,400		do	146,914	146,914		68,500	78,414
Manganese, chemical grade, type B:									
National stockpile	132,600	132,600		do	1,822	1,822			
Supplemental—barter	6,669,800	6,669,800		do	99,016	99,016			
Total	6,802,400	6,802,400		do	100,838	100,838		64,000	36,838
Manganese, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	248,240,900	248,240,900		do	5,852,192	5,852,191	−1		
Defense Production Act	172,681,800	172,122,100	−$559,700	do	2,990,084	2,980,257	−9,827		
Supplemental—barter	261,804,075	263,061,197	+1,257,122	do	3,932,316	3,945,112	+12,796		
Total	682,726,775	683,424,197	+697,422	do	12,774,592	12,777,560	+2,968	7,900,000	4,877,560
Mercury:									
National stockpile	33,075,900	33,077,100	+1,200	Flask	184,456	184,456			
Supplemental—barter	3,446,200	3,446,200		do	16,000	16,000			
Total	36,522,100	36,523,300	+1,200	do	200,456	200,456		200,000	456
Mica, muscovite block:									
National stockpile	27,627,600	27,627,600		Pound	11,622,775	11,622,775			
Defense Production Act	40,689,700	40,689,700		do	6,432,569	6,432,569			
Supplemental—barter	6,493,896	6,668,411	+174,515	do	1,923,982	1,950,682	+26,700		
Total	74,811,196	74,985,711	+174,515	do	19,979,326	20,006,026	+26,700	6,000,000	14,006,026
Mica, muscovite film:									
National stockpile	9,058,100	9,058,100		do	1,719,308	1,719,308			
Defense Production Act	633,300	633,300		do	102,681	102,681			
Supplemental—barter	1,142,300	1,060,200	−82,100	do	116,558	116,556	−2		
Total	10,833,700	10,751,600	−82,100	do	1,938,547	1,938,545	−2	2,000,000	[3]
Mica, muscovite splittings:									
National stockpile	40,598,300	40,598,300		do	40,040,169	40,040,169			
Supplemental—barter	6,225,800	6,225,800		do	4,826,257	4,826,257			
Total	46,824,100	46,824,100		do	44,866,426	44,866,426		22,200,000	22,666,426
Mica, phlogopite block:									
National stockpile	303,600	303,600		do	223,239	223,239		17,000	206,239
Mica, phlogopite splittings:									
National stockpile	2,580,500	2,580,500		do	3,079,062	3,079,062			
Supplemental—barter	2,501,800	2,501,800		do	1,986,902	1,986,902			
Total	5,082,300	5,082,300		do	5,065,964	5,065,964		1,300,000	3,765,964
Molybdenum:									
National stockpile	77,102,600	74,926,600	−2,176,000	do	74,087,632	72,077,936	−2,009,696	68,000,000	4,077,936
Nickel:									
National stockpile	181,737,000	181,737,000		Short ton	166,761	166,761			
Defense Production Act	95,227,100	95,045,500	−181,600	do	50,341	50,241	−100		
Total	276,964,100	276,782,500	−181,600	do	217,102	217,002	−100	50,000	167,002
Opium:									
National stockpile	13,661,700	13,661,700		Pound	196,364	196,364		141,280	55,084
Palladium:									
National stockpile	2,079,000	2,079,000		Troy ounce	89,811	89,811			
Supplemental—barter	12,170,200	12,170,200		do	648,124	648,124			
Total	14,249,200	14,249,200		do	737,935	737,935		1,300,000	[3]
Palm oil:									
National stockpile	1,852,100	1,852,100		Pound	10,290,233	10,290,233		[3]	10,290,233
Platinum:									
National stockpile	56,879,900	56,879,900		Troy ounce	716,343	716,343			
Supplemental—barter	4,024,500	4,024,500		do	49,999	49,999			
Total	60,904,400	60,904,400		do	766,342	766,342		450,000	316,342
Pyrethrum:									
National stockpile	415,100	415,100		Pound	67,065	67,065		25,000	42,065
Quartz crystals:									
National stockpile	67,473,900	67,473,900		do	5,470,013	5,470,013			
Supplemental—barter	3,519,200	3,519,200		do	232,352	232,352			
Total	70,993,100	70,993,100		do	5,702,365	5,702,365		650,000	5,052,365
Quinidine:									
National stockpile	1,846,000	1,846,000		Ounce	1,600,428	1,600,428		2,000,000	[3]
Quinine:									
National stockpile	2,617,000	2,617,000		do	4,137,733	4,137,733		4,130,000	7,733
Rare earths:									
National stockpile	7,134,900	7,134,900		Short dry ton	9,969	9,969			
Supplemental—barter	5,830,900	5,830,900		do	5,810	5,810			
Total	12,965,800	12,965,800		do	15,779	15,779		3,000	12,779

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), December 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1964	End of month, Dec. 30, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1964	End of month, Dec. 30, 1964	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Rare earths residue:									
Defense Production Act	$657,200	$657,200		Pound	6,079,983	6,079,983		(2)	6,079,983
Rhodium:									
National stockpile	78,200	78,200		Troy ounce	618	618		(2)	618
Rubber:									
National stockpile	672,049,800	665,404,900	−$6,644,900	Long ton	869,141	860,551	−8,590	130,000	730,551
Ruthenium:									
Supplemental—barter	559,500	559,500		Troy ounce	15,001	15,001		(2)	15,001
Rutile:									
National stockpile	2,070,100	2,070,100		Short dry ton	18,599	18,599			
Defense Production Act	2,725,100	2,725,100		do	17,385	17,385			
Supplemental—barter	1,061,300	1,061,300		do	11,632	11,632			
Total	5,856,500	5,856,500		do	47,616	47,616		51,000	(3)
Sapphire and ruby:									
National stockpile	190,000	190,000		Carat	16,187,500	16,187,500		18,000,000	(3)
Selenium:									
National stockpile	757,100	757,100		Pound	97,100	97,100			
Supplemental—barter	1,533,094	1,593,560	+60,466	do	273,876	289,299	+15,423		
Total	2,290,194	2,350,660	+60,466	do	370,976	386,399	+15,423	475,000	(3)
Shellac:									
National stockpile	8,274,500	8,221,300	−53,200	do	16,504,799	16,398,690	−106,109	8,300,000	8,098,690
Silicon carbide, crude:									
National stockpile	11,394,500	11,394,500		Short ton	64,697	64,697			
Supplemental—barter	26,803,600	26,803,600		do	131,805	131,805			
Total	38,198,100	38,198,100		do	196,502	196,502		30,000	166,502
Silk noils and waste:									
National stockpile	1,232,100	1,232,100		Pound	979,924	979,924		(2)	979,924
Silk, raw:									
National stockpile	486,600	486,600		do	113,515	113,515		(2)	113,515
Sperm oil:									
National stockpile	4,775,400	4,775,400		do	23,442,158	23,442,158		23,400,000	42,158
Talc, steatite block and lump:									
National stockpile	494,800	494,800		Short ton	1,269	1,269		200	1,069
Talc, steatite ground:									
National stockpile	231,200	231,200		do	3,901	3,901		(2)	3,901
Tantalum:									
National stockpile	11,964,700	12,104,200	+139,500	Pound	3,142,473	3,148,556	+6,083		
Defense Production Act	9,734,400	9,734,400		do	1,536,023	1,536,023			
Supplemental—barter	21,100	21,100		do	8,036	8,036			
Total	21,720,200	21,859,700	+139,500	do	4,686,532	4,692,615	+6,083	3,400,000	1,262,615
Thorium:									
Supplemental—barter	17,991,700	17,991,700		do	3,965,428	3,965,461	+33	500,000	3,465,461
Thorium residue:									
Defense Production Act	42,000	42,000		do	848,354	848,354		(2)	848,354
Tin:									
National stockpile	739,245,500	732,503,900	−6,741,600	Long ton	304,008	301,236	−2,772		
Supplemental—barter	16,404,000	16,404,000		do	7,505	7,505			
Total	755,649,500	748,907,900	−6,741,600	do	311,513	308,741	−2,772	200,000	108,741
Titanium sponge:									
Defense Production Act	175,879,000	175,871,900	−7,100	Short ton	22,340	22,339	−1		
Supplemental—barter	32,097,700	32,097,700		do	9,021	9,021			
Total	207,976,700	207,969,600	−7,100	do	31,361	31,360	−1	20,500	10,860
Tungsten:									
National stockpile	369,128,100	369,128,100		Pound	120,014,168	120,014,398	+230		
Defense Production Act	316,321,700	315,808,100	−513,600	do	77,559,581	77,434,549	−125,032		
Supplemental—barter	18,651,400	18,651,400		do	5,774,827	5,774,827			
Total	704,101,200	703,587,600	−513,600	do	203,348,576	203,223,774	−124,802	44,000,000	159,223,774
Vanadium:									
National stockpile	31,567,900	31,567,900		Short ton	7,865	7,865		1,400	6,465
Vegetable tannin extract, chestnut:									
National stockpile	10,209,400	10,078,600	−130,000	Long ton	36,591	36,123	−468	15,000	21,123
Vegetable tannin extract, quebracho:									
National stockpile	48,858,500	48,858,500		do	197,472	197,472		86,000	111,472
Vegetable tannin extract, wattle:									
National stockpile	9,826,900	9,826,900		do	38,962	38,962		15,000	23,962

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), December 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1964	End of month, Dec. 30, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1964	End of month, Dec. 30, 1964	Net change during month	Stockpile objective	Excess over stockpile objective
Zinc:									
National stockpile	$343,215,200	$342,729,700	−$485,500	Short ton	1,183,365	1,181,338	−2,027		
Supplemental—barter	79,588,400	79,588,400		do	323,896	323,896			
Total	422,803,700	422,318,100	−485,500	do	1,507,261	1,505,234	−2,027	0	1,505,234
Zirconium ore, baddeleyite:									
National stockpile	710,600	710,600		Short dry ton	16,533	16,533		(2)	16,533
Zirconium ore, zircon:									
National stockpile	113,300	113,300		do	1,920	1,920		(2)	1,920
Total:									
National stockpile	5,577,026,200	5,558,321,400	−18,704,800						
Defense Production Act	1,431,479,600	1,426,418,900	−5,060,700						
Supplemental-barter	1,392,829,269	1,395,282,549	+2,453,280						
Total, strategic and critical materials	8,401,335,069	8,380,022,849	−21,312,220						

[1] Stockpile objectives for strategic and critical materials are determined pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h). The Office of Emergency Planning is currently in the process of revising stockpile objectives. (See app. B, p. 3731.)
[2] No present objective.
[3] Not in excess of stockpile objective.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration and the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 2.—*Agricultural commodities inventories, December 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1964	End of month, Dec. 31, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1964	End of month, Dec. 31, 1964	Net change during month
Price-support inventory:							
Basic commodities:							
Corn	$1,023,459,014	$1,018,873,562	−$4,585,452	Bushel	839,566,038	835,426,048	−4,139,990
Corn products	34,181		−34,181	Pound	997,100		−997,100
Cotton, extra-long staple	34,807,878	33,300,077	−1,507,801	Bale	131,837	126,319	−5,518
Cotton, upland	1,309,733,817	1,267,429,095	−42,304,722	do	7,925,111	7,666,277	−258,834
Peanuts, farmers' stock		9,301	+9,301	Pound		78,291	+78,291
Peanuts, shelled	4,585,753	4,685,629	+99,876	do	26,094,715	26,797,547	+702,832
Rice, milled	90	176,221	+176,131	Hundredweight	8	17,626	+17,618
Rice, rough	5,972,556	5,411,857	−560,699	do	1,140,504	1,042,687	−97,817
Wheat	1,498,330,257	1,457,765,451	−40,564,806	Bushel	732,645,481	711,529,727	−21,115,754
Wheat, rolled	2,324		−2,324	Pound	52,910		−52,910
Wheat flour	380,868	428,497	+47,629	do	6,818,300	7,711,000	+892,700
Bulgur	10,287		−10,287	do	250,073		−250,073
Total, basic commodities	3,877,317,025	3,788,079,690	−89,237,335				
Designated nonbasic commodities:							
Barley	21,846,389	19,492,784	−2,353,604	Bushel	25,129,923	22,624,057	−2,505,866
Grain sorghum	670,343,497	661,266,306	−9,077,191	do	596,936,964	587,274,248	−9,662,716
Milk and butterfat:							
Butter	58,637,460	29,110,540	−29,526,920	Pound	100,697,086	50,065,848	−50,631,238
Butter oil	8,415,460	8,283,408	−132,052	do	10,889,582	10,719,252	−170,330
Cheese	14,121,520	12,519,189	−1,602,331	do	36,976,328	32,645,432	−4,330,896
Milk, dried	25,659,254	22,930,031	−2,729,223	do	168,118,166	150,830,074	−17,288,092
Oats	19,982,822	19,636,510	−346,312	Bushel	33,142,026	32,514,253	−627,773
Rye	699,024	517,029	−181,995	do	642,690	465,298	−177,392
Tung oil	3,556,314	3,556,314		Pound	14,818,194	14,818,194	
Total, designated nonbasic commodities	823,261,740	777,312,112	−45,949,628				
Other nonbasic commodities:							
Beans, dry, edible	6,052,408	4,691,482	−1,360,926	Hundredweight	858,689	671,828	−186,861
Cottonseed oil, refined, other	9,683,663	9,138,869	−544,794	Pound	86,238,245	81,387,761	−4,850,484
Cottonseed, oil, refined, salad oil [1]	1,583,189	1,880,176	+296,987	do	8,489,215	9,942,990	+1,453,775
Flaxseed	9,890,137	8,533,733	−1,356,404	Bushel	3,332,035	2,878,285	−453,750
Linseed oil	8,693,240	8,995,663	+302,423	Pound	73,435,680	75,889,780	+2,454,100
Soybeans	4,500,387	1,156,619	−3,343,768	Bushel	1,923,824	497,109	−1,426,715
Total, other nonbasic commodities	40,403,024	34,396,542	−6,006,482				
Total, price support inventory	4,740,981,789	4,599,788,344	−141,193,445				
Inventory transferred from national stockpile: [2]							
Cotton, Egyptian	35,007,651	34,729,705	−277,946	Bale	41,438	41,109	−329
Cotton, American-Egyptian	22,728,208	22,572,288	−155,920	do	45,188	44,878	−310
Total, inventory transferred from national stockpile	57,735,859	57,301,993	−433,866	do	86,626	85,987	−639
Total, agricultural commodities	4,798,717,648	4,657,090,337	−141,627,311				

[1] Reported as "Cottonseed oil, refined," prior to February 1964.
[2] Transferred from General Services Administration pursuant to Public Law 85-96 and Public Law 87-548. (See app. A, p. 3730.)

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 3.—*Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, December 1964 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1964	End of month, Dec. 31, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1964	End of month, Dec. 31, 1964	Net change during month
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense:							
Engineering equipment (engine generators, pumps, chlorinators, purifiers, pipe, and fittings)	$10,080,668	$10,080,635	−$33	10 mile units	45	45	
Chemical and biological equipment	1,797,944	1,798,096	+152	(1)			
Total	11,878,612	11,878,731	+119				
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:							
Medical bulk stocks, and associated items at civil defense mobilization warehouses	136,001,799	117,719,157	−18,282,642	(1)			
Medical bulk stock at manufacturer locations	5,536,639	5,090,353	−446,286	(1)			
Civil defense emergency hospitals	53,610,830	71,323,061	+17,712,231	Each	2,016	2,186	+170
Supply additions (for packaged disaster hospitals)	5,935,811	6,691,908	+756,097	(1)			
Total	201,085,079	200,824,479	−260,600				
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment	212,963,691	212,703,210	−260,481				

1 Composite group of many different items.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Defense and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 4.—*Machine tools inventories, December 1964 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1964	End of month, Dec. 31, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1964	End of month, Dec. 31, 1964	Net change during month
Defense Production Act:							
On loan	$45,300	$45,300		Tool	7	7	
National Industrial Reserve Act:							
In storage	75,843,700	75,867,500	+$23,800	do	6,584	6,590	+6
On lease	27,500	27,500		do	1	1	
On loan to other agencies	14,900	14,900		do	3	3	
On loan to school programs	12,613,700	12,733,100	+119,400	do	3,002	3,030	+28
Total	88,499,800	88,643,000	+143,200	do	9,590	9,624	+34
Total, machine tools	88,545,100	88,688,300	+143,200	do	9,597	9,631	+34

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration.

TABLE 5.—*Helium inventories, December 1964 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1964	End of month, Dec. 31, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1964	End of month, Dec. 31, 1964	Net change during month
Helium:							
Stored above ground	$270,926	$236,463	−$33,563	Cubic foot	24,100,000	21,400,000	−2,700,000
Stored underground	53,940,351	57,761,041	+3,820,690	do	5,090,900,000	5,433,500,000	+342,600,000
Total, helium	54,210,377	57,997,504	+3,787,127	do	5,115,000,000	5,454,900,000	+339,900,000

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of the Interior.

APPENDIX A—PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS AND STATUTORY CITATIONS

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

National stockpile

The Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) provides for the establishment and maintenance of a national stockpile of strategic and critical materials. The General Services Administration is responsible for making purchases of strategic and critical materials and providing for their storage, security, and maintenance. These functions are performed in accordance with directives issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. The act also provides for the transfer from other Government agencies of strategic and critical materials which are excess to the needs of such other agencies and are required to meet the stockpile objectives established by OEP. In addition, the General Services Administration is responsible for disposing of those strategic and critical materials which OEP determines to be no longer needed for stockpile purposes.

General policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling are contained in DMO V–7, issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning and published in the Federal Register of December 19, 1959 (24 F.R. 10309). Portions of this order relate also to Defense Production Act inventories.

Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration is authorized to make purchases of or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other materials, for Government use or resale, in order to expand productive capacity and supply, and also to store the materials acquired as a result of such purchases or commitments. Such functions are carried out in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

Supplemental—barter

As a result of a delegation of authority from OEP (32A C.F.R., ch. I, DMO V–4) the General Services Administration is responsible for the maintenance and storage of materials placed in the supplemental stockpile. Section 206 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1856) provides that strategic and other materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural products, unless acquired for the national stockpile or for other purposes, shall be transferred to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). In addition to the materials which have been or may be so acquired, the materials obtained under the programs established pursuant to the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 (50 U.S.C. App. 2191–

2195), which terminated December 31, 1958, have been transferred to the supplemental stockpile, as authorized by the provisions of said Production and Purchase Act.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The price-support program

Price-support operations are carried out under the charter powers (15 U.S.C. 714) of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, in conformity with the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421), the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1741), which includes the National Wool Act of 1954, the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1442), the Agricultural Act of 1958 and with respect to certain types of tobacco, in conformity with the act of July 28, 1945, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1312). Under the Agricultural Act of 1949, price support is mandatory for the basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—and specific nonbasic commodities; namely, tung nuts, honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat. Under the Agricultural Act of 1958, as producers of corn voted in favor of the new price-support program for corn authorized by that act, price support is mandatory for barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums. Price support for wool and mohair is mandatory under the National Wool Act of 1954, through the marketing year ending March 31, 1966. Price support for other nonbasic agricultural commodities is discretionary except that, whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other must be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market. This program may also include operations to remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities for the purpose of stabilizing prices at levels not in excess of permissible price-support levels.

Price support is made available through loans, purchase agreements, purchases, and other operations and, in the case of wool and mohair, through incentive payments based on marketings. The producers' commodities serve as collateral for price-support loans. With limited exceptions, price-support loans are nonrecourse and the Corporation looks only to the pledged or mortgaged collateral for satisfaction of the loan. Purchase agreements generally are available during the same period that loans are available. By signing a purchase agreement, a producer receives an option to sell to the Corporation any quantity of the commodity which he may elect within the maximum specified in the agreement.

The major effect on budgetary expenditures is represented by the disbursements for price-support loans. The largest part of the commodity acquisitions under the program result from the forfeiting of commodities pledged as loan collateral for which the expenditures occurred at the time of making the loan, rather than at the time of acquiring the commodities.

Dispositions of commodities acquired by the Corporation in its price-support operations are made in compliance with sections 202, 407, and 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and other applicable legislation, particularly the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691), title I of the Agricultural Act of 1954, title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Agricultural Act of 1958, the act of August 19, 1958, in the case of cornmeal and wheat flour, and the act of September 21, 1959, with regard to sales of livestock feed in emergency areas.

Inventory transferred from national stockpile

This inventory, all cotton, was transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation at no cost from the national stockpile pursuant to Public Law 85-96 and Public Law 87-548. The proceeds from sales, less costs incurred by CCC, are covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts; therefore, such proceeds and costs are not recorded in the operating accounts. The cost value as shown for this cotton has been computed on the basis of average per bale cost of each type of cotton when purchased by CCC for the national stockpile.

CIVIL DEFENSE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

Civil defense stockpile

The Department of Defense conducts this stockpiling program pursuant to section 201 (h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as amended. The program is designed to provide some of the most essential materials to minimize the effects upon the civilian population which would be caused by an attack upon the United States. Supplies and equipment normally unavailable, or lacking in quantity needed to cope with such conditions, are stockpiled at strategic locations in a nationwide warehouse system consisting of general storage facilities.

Civil defense medical stockpile

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare conducts the stockpiling program for medical supplies and equipment pursuant to section 201(h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as delegated by the President following the intent of Reorganization Plan No. 1, of 1958. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare plans and directs the procurement, storage, maintenance, inspection, survey, distribution, and utilization of essential supplies and equipment for emergency health services. The medical stockpile includes a program designed to pre-position assembled emergency hospitals and other medical supplies and equipment into communities throughout the Nation.

MACHINE TOOLS

Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration has acquired machine tools in furtherance of expansion of productive capacity, in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

National industrial equipment reserve

Under general policies established and directives issued by the Secretary of Defense, the General Services Administration is responsible for care, maintenance, utilization, transfer, leasing, lending to nonprofit schools, disposal, transportation, repair, restoration, and renovation of national industrial reserve equipment transferred to GSA under the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451-462).

HELIUM

The helium conservation program is conducted by the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Helium Act, approved September 13, 1960 (Public Law 86-777; 74 Stat. 918; 50 U.S.C. 167) and subsequent appropriations acts which have established fiscal limitations and provided borrowing authority for the program. Among other things, the Helium Act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to produce helium in Government plants, to acquire helium from private plants, to sell helium to meet current demands, and to store for future use helium that is so produced or acquired in excess of that required to meet current demands. Sales of helium by the Secretary of the Interior shall be at prices established by him which shall be adequate to liquidate the costs of the program within 25 years, except that this period may be extended by the Secretary for not more than 10 years for funds borrowed for purposes other than the acquisition and construction of helium plants and facilities.

This report covers helium that is produced in Government plants and acquired from private plants. Helium in excess of current demands is stored in the Cliffside gasfield near Amarillo, Tex. The unit of measure is cubic foot at 14.7 pounds per square inch absolute pressure and 70° F.

APPENDIX B—NEW STOCKPILE OBJECTIVES

The Office of Emergency Planning is in the process of establishing new objectives for strategic and critical materials. Table 1 of this report reflects the new objectives established between May 1963 and April 1964 for 79 materials (including 3 removed from stockpile list), based on essential needs in the event of a "conventional war emergency." The new objective for each material has been noted in the reports, beginning with June 1963, for the months in which the respective objectives were established.

The following excerpts from OEP statements dated July 11 and 19, 1963, February 28, 1964, March 6, 13, 20, and 27, 1964, and April 3 and 10, 1964, set forth the new policy with respect to objectives for strategic and critical materials:

"The Office of Emergency Planning is now conducting supply-requirements studies for all stockpile materials which will reflect current military, industrial, and other essential needs in the event of a conventional war emergency. On the basis of recently completed supply-requirements studies for the foregoing materials, the new stockpile objectives were established with the advice and assistance of the Interdepartmental Materials Advisory Committee, a group chaired by the Office of Emergency Planning and composed of representatives of the Departments of State, Defense, the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, and the General Services Administration, the Agency for International Development, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Small Business Administration participate as observers.

"These new objectives reflect a new policy to establish a single objective for each stockpile material. They have been determined on the basis of criteria heretofore used in establishing maximum objectives, and reflect the approximate calculated emergency deficits for the materials for conventional war and do not have any arbitrary adjustments for possible increased requirements for other types of emergency.

"Heretofore, there was a 'basic objective' and a 'maximum objective' for each material. The basic objectives assumed some continued reliance on foreign sources of supply in an emergency. The former maximum objectives completely discounted foreign sources of supply beyond North America and comparable accessible areas.

"Previously, maximum objectives could not be less than 6 months' normal usage of the material by industry in the United States in periods of active demand. The 6-month rule has been eliminated in establishing the new calculated conventional war objectives.

"The Office of Emergency Planning also announced that the present Defense Mobilization Order V-7, dealing with general policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling, was now being revised to reflect these new policies. When finally prepared and approved, the new order will be published in the Federal Register.

"New conventional war objectives for the remaining stockpile materials are being developed as rapidly as new supply-requirements data become available. They will be released as they are approved.

"The Office of Emergency Planning is also making studies to determine stockpile needs to meet the requirements of general nuclear

war and reconstruction. Stockpile objectives for nuclear war have not previously been developed. Some commodity objectives may be higher and others may be lower than the objectives established for conventional war.

"After the nuclear war supply-requirements studies are completed, stockpile objectives will be based upon calculated deficits for either conventional war or nuclear war, whichever need is larger.

"The Office of Emergency Planning stressed that any long-range disposal programs undertaken prior to the development of objectives based on nuclear war assumptions would provide against disposing of quantities which might be needed to meet essential requirements in the event of nuclear attack. While the disposal of surplus materials can produce many problems which have not heretofore arisen, every effort will be made to see that the interest of producers, processors, and consumers, and the international interests of the United States are carefully considered, both in the development and carrying out of disposal programs. Before decisions are made regarding the adoption of a long-range disposal program for a particular item in the stockpile, there will be appropriate consultations with industry in order to obtain the advice of interested parties."

The OEP statement of April 17, 1964, contained the following excerpts:

"Today's action completes supply-requirements studies for all stockpile materials based on current military, industrial, and other essential needs in the event of a conventional war emergency. Objectives for 79 materials in the stockpile were established with the advice and assistance of the Interdepartmental Materials Advisory Committee, a group chaired by OEP and composed of representatives of the Departments of State, Defense, the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, and the General Services Administration, the Agency for International Development, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Small Business Administration participate as observers.

"These new objectives reflect a new policy which accords with the recommendation of the Executive Stockpile Committee to establish a single objective for each material in the national stockpile. These new objectives will be reviewed and revised as necessary each year. Because military requirements and estimated emergency supplies of stockpile materials are constantly shifting, the supply-requirements balance for any material that is now or may become important to defense must be kept under continuing surveillance. Supply-requirements studies of the conventional war needs of approximately 20 other strategic and critical materials, which do not have stockpile objectives, are underway and are expected to be completed in the next few weeks. At the same time, studies on supply-requirements for nuclear war are going forward. No definite date for completion of these studies has been established as yet.

"OEP stressed that long-range programs for disposal of identified surpluses would take into account the interests of producers, processors, and consumers, as well as the international interests of the United States. Appropriate consultation with industry will precede all decisions for the adoption of every disposal program and the advice of interested parties will be sought."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The cost value of Federal stockpile inventories as of December 31, 1964, totaled $13,396,502,200. This was a net decrease of $159,269,685, as compared with the December 1 total of $13,555,771,885. Net changes during the month are summarized by major category as follows:

Major category	Cost value, December 1964	
	Net change during month	Total, end of month
Strategic and critical materials	−$21,312,220	$8,380,022,849
Agricultural commodities	−141,627,311	4,657,090,337
Civil defense supplies and equipment	−260,481	212,703,210
Machine tools	+143,200	88,688,300
Helium	+3,787,127	57,997,504
Total	−159,269,685	13,396,502,200

These figures are from the December 1964 report on Federal stockpile inventories compiled from official agency data by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, showing detail with respect to quantity and cost value of each commodity in the inventories covered.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

So-called strategic and critical materials are stored by the Government in (1) the national stockpile, (2) the Defense Production Act inventory, and (3) the supplemental-barter stockpile.

Overall, there are now 94 materials stockpiled in the strategic and critical inventories. Stockpile objectives—in terms of volume—are presently fixed for 76 of these 94 materials. Of the 76 materials having stockpile objectives, 63 were stockpiled in excess of their objectives as of December 31, 1964.

Increases in cost value were reported in 15 of the materials stockpiled in all strategic and critical inventories, decreases were reported in 26 materials, and 53 materials remained unchanged during December.

National stockpile

The cost value of materials in the national stockpile as of December 31, 1964, totaled $5,558,321,400. This was a net decrease of $18,704,800 during the month. The largest decreases were $6,741,600 in tin, $6,644,900 in rubber, and $2,176,000 in molybdenum.

Defense Production Act inventory

The cost value of materials in the Defense Production Act inventory as of December 31, 1964, totaled $1,426,418,900. This was a net decrease of $5,060,700. The largest decreases were in aluminum and copper.

Supplemental-barter

The cost value of materials in the supplemental-barter stockpile as of December 31, 1964, totaled $1,395,282,549. This was a net increase of $2,453,280. The largest increases were in manganese and bauxite.

OTHER STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Among the other categories of stockpiled materials covered by the report the largest is $4.7 billion in agricultural commodities. Major decreases in agricultural commodities during December were reported for cotton, wheat, and milk and butterfat.

Inventories of civil defense supplies and equipment showed a net decrease; the machine tools inventories showed a net increase; and the helium inventories showed a net increase during December.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Luther L. Terry, of Alabama, to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1300. A bill for the relief of Amalia Seresly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1301. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the duties on ornamented fabrics and fabrics with tucks; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1302. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments for special meteorological services; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 1303. A bill to grant credit in the filling of certain positions in the postal field service to persons who have served in such positions under temporary appointments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 1304. A bill for the relief of Mario Bozicevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. Mr. COOPER, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. HARTKE):

S. 1305. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 1306. A bill for the relief of Parvin Rahimian Gaulke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1307. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to a handicapped individual for expenses of transportation to and from work; to allow an additional exemption for a taxpayer, a spouse, or dependent who is physically or mentally incapacitated and unable to work; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 1308. A bill to authorize revised procedures for the destruction of unfit Federal Reserve notes, and for other purposes; and

S. 1309. A bill to authorize checks to be drawn in favor of banking organizations for the credit of a person's account, under certain conditions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. ROBERTSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1310. A bill relating to the National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1311. A bill to provide that the Commissioners may accept or permit the acceptance of the performance by volunteers of services for and on behalf of the municipal government of the District of Columbia;

S. 1312. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act;

S. 1313. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to acquire, construct, operate, and regulate a public off-street parking facility;

S. 1314. A bill to amend the Street Readjustment Act of the District of Columbia so as to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close all or part of a street, road, highway, or alley in accordance with the requirements of an approved redevelopment or urban renewal plan, without regard to the notice provisions of such act, and for other purposes;

S. 1315. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended;

S. 1316. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into joint contracts for supplies and services on behalf of the District of Columbia and for other political divisions and subdivisions in the National Capital region;

S. 1317. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe penalties for the handling and collection of dishonored checks or money orders;

S. 1318. A bill to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and institutions in the District of Columbia of certain physical abuse of children;

S. 1319. A bill to authorize a work release program for persons sentenced by the courts of the District of Columbia; to define the powers and duties in relation thereto, and for other purposes;

S. 1320. A bill to amend certain criminal laws applicable to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 1321. A bill to amend section 501(e) of title 16 of the District of Columbia Code relating to bond requirements in connection with attachment before judgment; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 1322. A bill to establish the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 1323. A bill to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, so as to authorize the military departments, in certain cases, to ship automobiles to and from the State of Alaska by commercial motor carrier via the Alaska ferry system and other surface transportation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1324. A bill for the relief of Ante Dunatov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 1325. A bill for the relief of Dr. Oton Socarraz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1326. A bill for the relief of Baltazar Ganade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAYH:

S. 1327. A bill for the relief of George Sgouritsas;

S. 1328. A bill for the relief of Fotios G. Milonas;

S. 1329. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Metanias;

S. 1330. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Roumeliotis and Panagiota Roumeliotis; and

S. 1331. A bill for the relief of Dr. Adriano A. Agana and Consuelo R. Agana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 1332. A bill to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1333. A bill to amend the adjustment assistance provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 with respect to determinations by the Tariff Commission of injury or threatened injury to firms or groups of workers; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1334. A bill for the relief of Patsy J. Darby; and

S. 1335. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Colvern D. Henry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

TO CREATE A SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY GOLD PRODUCTION IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BARTLETT submitted a resolution (S. Res. 83) to create a Select Committee To Study Gold Production in the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

DUTY ON ORNAMENTED FABRICS AND FABRICS WITH TUCKS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill designed to correct a loophole in the tariff schedules of the United States relating to the duty on ornamented fabrics and fabrics with tucks.

In the last Congress I sponsored legislation to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to close the loophole under which certain ornamented or tucked fabrics were allowed to enter the United States at a duty rate about one-half of that ordinarily applicable to such fabrics.

Action on that bill was delayed, partly because it was hoped that the new tariff schedules for the United States, which went into effect in the summer of 1963, would take care of the situation. Unfortunately, the new schedules did not close the loophole, and attempts to avoid the higher duty rate have continued.

Congress last year considered general legislation to correct certain errors in the new TSUS. This bill, which included a provision similar to the legislation which I had filed, relating to ornamented and tucked fabrics, was approved by both the House and Senate. However, because of problems which arose over certain other sections of the bill, it died in conference, and final action was not taken.

The bill I am introducing today will amend items 353.50 and 357.60 of the tariff schedules of the United States to provide that the duty on "ornamented" or "tucked" fabrics will be no less than that applicable to fabrics without ornamentation or tucks.

I am hopeful that the Congress will take action on this bill. It would be of immeasurable assistance to our beleaguered domestic textile industry, which is already suffering adverse competition from imported textile products. By passing this bill, we could help to lessen the injurious effect of imports.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1301) to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the duties on ornamented fabrics and fabrics with tucks, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

UTILIZATION OF FUNDS RECEIVED FROM STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR SPECIAL METEOROLOGICAL SERVICES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments for special meteorological services. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation, together with an enclosed statement of purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement of purpose will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1302) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments for special meteorological services introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement of purpose, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., February 10, 1965.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed four copies of a draft bill "To authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments for special meteorological services" and four copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN T. CONNOR,
Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO UTILIZE FUNDS RECEIVED FROM STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR SPECIAL METEOROLOGICAL SERVICES

The Weather Bureau has often been requested by various State and local governments to provide or undertake special meteorological investigations, tests, and services which the personnel and facilities of the Weather Bureau are specially capable of carrying out. It has become increasingly difficult for the Weather Bureau to perform such functions, which ordinarily cannot be effectively undertaken by any other organizations, because of the lack of adequate statutory authorization to utilize funds for these

purposes which the requesting public agency would be willing to provide. The purpose of this proposed legislation is to enable the Weather Bureau to accept and use funds provided by State and local governments for special services required by them which cannot be financed from available Weather Bureau resources. The proposed legislation provides that if work or services requested have no value to the public at large, the Secretary of Commerce must require reimbursement for the total direct and indirect costs before undertaking such work or services. Moreover, the Secretary of Commerce could not undertake work or services having no public value unless they cannot be obtained from private firms or individuals with special competence.

Some instances in which the authorization herein proposed could be utilized for the benefit of local needs are as follows:

1. The State of California is embarking on a large-scale water resources program (headed by its department of water resources) for which it requires a large increase in precipitation stations, in reporting, in maintenance, and inspection of stations, and in processing of data. The Weather Bureau's responsibility is national, with its available funds actually insufficient to cover the local needs of California. The State is willing to pay for the increase required to meet its needs. The necessary funds cannot be accepted and utilized by the Bureau unless the proposed legislation is enacted.

2. In 1955 the Kansas Water Resources Factfinding and Research Committee recommended to the Governor and legislature a "cooperative program with the U.S. Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Geological Survey, U.S. Weather Bureau, and U.S. Soil Conservation Service for comprehensive research in hydrology of small watersheds, requiring detailed data on all aspects of the water cycle and effects of man's operation. Estimated State funds, $150,000 per year for 20 years, to be matched by Federal funds." But of the four Federal agencies mentioned, only the Weather Bureau cannot now accept and utilize the State funds.

3. Many thousands of communities on lesser tributaries and in headwater areas suffer devastating flash floods. With the support of the Weather Bureau's national main stem and tributary flood forecasting system and its developing radar network, these communities could be warned effectively in many cases after establishment of special local observational and reporting networks and communications, development of localized forecast and warning procedures, and educational liaison in planning actions based on warnings. The costs may average only a few thousand dollars per community per year. There are thousands of such communities, and the Bureau is able to serve only a token few with its available funds. The job could be done wherever the community felt it was sufficiently needed to pay for it if the Bureau could accept and use funds made available by the community.

4. Fire-Weather Service of the Weather Bureau is another service which operates on a cost-sharing basis in many instances, and which is handicapped in its operation by lack of adequate legislative authority. The Service provides day-to-day forecasts and advice during the fire season and issues detailed localized operational forecasts for going fires. The Bureau is subject to a heavy demand from forest protection agencies for an expansion of this service to new areas. In most cases it is unable to provide the needed assistance. Enactment of the proposed legislation would greatly facilitate arrangements to provide additional badly needed services of this nature where Federal funds are not available but State or local governments are willing to help.

5. Agricultural weather services, particularly those requiring highly localized and detailed forecasts and special instrumentation, would be greatly benefited by enactment of the proposed legislation. This type of service cannot be adequately handled through the general forecast service and as a rule it is of direct benefit to a relatively small segment of the population. Accordingly, such services are often arranged on a cost-sharing basis where the recipients of the service assume a share of the costs involved. The Horticultural Protection Service which operates in Florida, California, Washington, Oregon, and a few other States is a good example of a specialized weather service that often uses cost-sharing procedures. Under present law the cooperating agency is limited to furnishing such items as communication expenses and office quarters while the full salary of the employee limits the number of points where such service can be provided since the major expense must continue to be handled by the Federal Government. The Bureau has had many requests from all parts of the country for more agricultural weather service of the above-mentioned type. Although cost-sharing is one good way of furnishing more service of this kind, the Bureau is seriously handicapped by the present inability to utilize funds which the localities would be willing to furnish.

6. The Weather Bureau has, in the past few years, received several requests for special observations and assistance in the field of air pollution. Two specific examples of recent origin are the request from the Los Angeles County Air Pollution Control District for the reinstitution of intermediate upper air sounding at Santa Monica, Calif., and the request from the San Diego County Air Pollution District for additional wind installations and additional upper air soundings in the vicinity of San Diego. There have been other similar requests in the past. The Bureau has generally met such requests either by declining on the basis of inadequate funds or, where consultation work and a minimum of observations would suffice, arranging for support through other agencies such as the Public Health Service or the Atomic Energy Commission. In light of the increased interest in air pollution, it can be expected that the number of these requests will increase, particularly for specialized observational data such as low-level radiosondes and additional wind measurements. The Bureau will be unable to accommodate most of these requests unless it can accept reimbursement.

On December 22, 1955, the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy recommended:

"Continued cooperation with States and municipalities should be encouraged. Such cooperation serves to supplement the basic data programs of the Federal Government in fields in which there is substantial joint interest. State and local participation contribute to the fundamental programs for interpretation, analysis, and research which are primarily national in character and extend beyond the interests of any single geographical area. Federal matching of State financial support for data programs on a 50–50 basis has been mutually satisfactory and should continue to be a sound basis for such cooperation. Authorization for cooperative participation should be provided if necessary authorization is lacking."

The Bureau cannot provide the cooperation proposed unless legislation is enacted authorizing it to utilize State funds.

Harvey O. Banks, director of water resources, State of California, in supporting legislation such as here proposed, said:

"In many areas, there is need to supplement the basic information now gathered in order that more detailed evaluation may be made of the nature and occurrence of water supplies. California is most vitally interested in the most efficient and complete control and utilization of its water resources to meet the need of all beneficial uses. Therefore, it is the recommendations of the State of California that legislation be enacted by the Congress which would permit agreements permitting cooperative financing between the Weather Bureau and non-Federal agencies under which the trained personnel of the Weather Bureau might be assigned to these cooperative endeavors to obtain and develop information and to make analyses thereof, in addition to that gathered under the Bureau's present basic responsibilities. If this legislation is enacted, we expect to take advantage of it, by entering into such a cooperative agreement at an early date."

NEEDED REVIEW OF U.S. ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill introduced on behalf of myself, and Senators COOPER, BREWSTER, and HARTKE, to establish a Federal commission to carry out a much needed review of the antitrust laws of the United States. This bill will be introduced today in the House of Representatives by Representatives LINDSAY and REID of New York.

Our antitrust laws were written in the 1880's and they have not been reviewed in 20 years. It is my belief that in certain of their applications, they are having an adverse effect upon U.S. domestic productivity, on our long-range economic growth, on trade and foreign investment, and foreign economic policy generally.

So much emphasis has been placed on tax reduction during the past year that there is an impression that it was the sole needed remedy for the Nation's economic ills. But other important actions must be taken at the same time—and one of them is to bring our antitrust laws into line with the needs of our Nation. We cannot afford to continue to stumble along with an antitrust policy created for an almost entirely different economic world than the one we face today; a great deal of it is still valid but much needs to be revised, too.

The bill calls for the creation of a 24-member bipartisan commission composed of 8 Members of Congress, 4 members of the executive branch, and 12 experts from the private sector. The Commission would examine the antitrust laws and their impact on U.S. productivity and policy and would make recommendations for revising them, both in substance and procedure.

The antitrust laws of the United States as they operate abroad today materially prejudice the ability of U.S. concerns to deal across national boundaries. It is well recognized that in order to meet our balance-of-payments problems we must keep our exports at the highest possible level. To do this our exporters must have a fair competitive status in relation to their competitors abroad. In my judgment and that of many experts in the field, our antitrust laws put our companies at a serious competitive disadvantage abroad. At home many of our businesses seek an expression of the Nation's antitrust philosophy and goals. Some legal experts have stated that the existing laws have contributed to rigid domestic price structures and prevented innovation of marketing techniques.

No less pressing is the need to encourage the investment of private capital of the United States and other developed countries in the underdeveloped countries. Again it is widely felt that our antitrust laws are an inhibiting factor, particularly to the establishment of consortia of United States and other private companies from industrialized countries grouping to invest in less-developed countries. In both instances, there is a deep conflict between our antitrust philosophy and other major national policies when there should be coordination and thoughtful accommodation between them.

Many experts who have called for reexamination of antitrust policy in the foreign field in recent years have included an impressive array, including the Committee on International Trade Regulation of the Section of International and Comparative Law of the American Bar Association, 1953; the National Foreign Trade Council and the United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, 1955; the report of the Subcommittee on Subsidiaries in Foreign Trade of the Committee on Antitrust Problems in International Trade, Antitrust Section of the American Bar Association, 1955; the Special Committee on Antitrust Laws and Foreign Trade of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, 1957; the President's Committee on World Economic Practices, 1959; former Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, 1961; former Attorney General Herbert Brownell, 1962; the White House Conference on Foreign Trade, 1963; and the Committee on International Trade Regulation of the section of International and Comparative Law of the American Bar Association, 1963.

All these experts have concluded that uncertainty about enforcement of U.S. antitrust laws extraterritorially is the greatest single inhibitor to increased foreign trade and investment. The report of the ABA Committee on Trade Regulation in 1963, for example, highlighted the following principal specific areas of uncertainty in this field:

1. Uncertainty as to the terms under which a U.S. business may enter into a joint venture with a competitor, either American or foreign, to engage in business abroad;

2. Uncertainty as to the extent to which U.S. business may cooperate in association with foreign competitors, even when the association is required or permitted by the laws of the foreign country where the activity takes place;

3. Uncertainty as to the extent to which a U.S. business may include territorial and other limitations in patents, trademarks, and know-how licenses;

4. Uncertainty due to conflicts between antitrust laws of the United States and the laws of foreign countries and most unfortunately, economic communities, such as the European Common Market; and

5. Protests by foreign Governments due to extraterritorial application of U.S. antitrust laws to their nationals.

Other areas for study include first, the extraterritorial application of the antitrust laws where potential United States and European private enterprise cooperate for development of underdeveloped nations; second, the development of business organizations along the lines of the Communications Satellite Corp. including the possibility of wide-scale joint cooperative efforts by government and industry in partially public, partially private, corporations to undertake vast ventures in the realm of space and atomic technology. The size and complexity of the subject matter and the public interest involved in such undertakings may make wholly private ownership unfeasible and the productive capacity of private ownership and technological risks involved make wholly public ownership unsatisfactory. Numerous other potential applications of this novel and very hopeful technique make a thorough study of antitrust implications highly important, particularly in view of the strong attack on the Communications Satellite Corporation measure made by a minority of Senators on antitrust grounds.

The list of critical cases which the proposed Commission would be charged with studying could be elaborated at much greater length. But these are some of the major areas of concern.

It is my deep conviction that revision of the antitrust laws in accordance with the recommendations of such a broad-based Commission should be a high priority one in the President's program to lift the Nation out of its present inadequate economic growth situation, along with a new approach to serious national-interest strikes, and labor-management relations in general. America must stay competitive in the world even as it struggles to achieve a fully stable, viable, economy at home. We are remiss, I believe, if we do not examine very carefully those forces throughout the economy that inhibit competitiveness and growth.

In the last analysis the enormous job of studying, recommending, and enacting the antitrust laws is with the Congress. The tendency has been in recent years for a major part of antitrust policy to be articulated by the enforcement agencies and the courts. The Commission, I propose, would reassert a firm congressional voice in basic antitrust policy. I believe an antitrust revision ranks as one of the important incentives to our Nation's urgently needed increase in economic growth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1305) for the establishment of a Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws of the United States, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LEGISLATION TO AID HANDICAPPED

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, our handicapped citizens face special problems, problems which should be a matter of very special concern to this Congress.

In recent years, considerable progress has been made in rehabilitating the handicapped.

For instance, in fiscal year 1964 nearly 120,000 physically or mentally handicapped men and women were rehabilitated under the State-Federal program administered by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration. This was a record total and an increase of 9 percent over the previous year when the figure stood at 110,136.

My Commonwealth of Pennsylvania led the Nation in number of disabled persons rehabilitated with 11,581. This was an increase of 704 persons over our total for 1963.

This overall increase represents a long stride toward the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration's goal of 200,000 rehabilitated handicapped persons per year.

But the difficulties and challenges which face our handicapped citizens do not stop with successful rehabilitation programs, or the finding of the right job. A whole new set of problems all too frequently arises.

Many persons who have lost their eyesight, or the use of one or both legs or both arms, for example, can use normal means of public transportation only with undue hardship and danger. Special means of transportation must be arranged at costs frequently far out of proportion to the individual's earning capacity.

That is why I am introducing a bill today to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to handicapped individuals for transportation expenses to and from work, and to give an additional tax exemption to a taxpayer who is handicapped, or who has a handicapped spouse or dependent.

Most of our handicapped citizens have faced their problems with courage that should be a source of pride and inspiration for us all. We should do all that we can to help them in this struggle.

My bill would help handicapped Americans to help themselves as they cope with the extra difficulties which they must overcome to hold productive positions in our society.

I urge its early consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1307) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to a handicapped individual for expenses of transportation to and from work; to allow an additional exemption for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is physically or mentally incapacitated and unable to work; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

REVISED PROCEDURES FOR DESTRUCTION OF UNFIT FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, a bill to authorize revised procedures for the destruction of unfit Federal Reserve notes, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury recommending this bill, and a copy of the bill, together with a comparative print showing the changes in the law be put in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred;

and, without objection, the bill and comparative print will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1308) to authorize revised procedures for the destruction of unfit Federal Reserve notes, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1308

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the third paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 413), is hereby further amended by revising the last sentence thereof to read as follows: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Federal Reserve notes unfit for circulation shall be canceled, destroyed, and accounted for under procedures prescribed and at locations designated by the Secretary of the Treasury. Upon destruction of such notes, credit with respect thereto shall be apportioned among the twelve Federal Reserve banks as determined by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System."

The letter and comparative print presented by Mr. ROBERTSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, February 15, 1965.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a proposed bill to authorize revised procedures for the destruction of unfit Federal Reserve notes, and for other purposes.

The proposed legislation is needed in order to conserve an annual savings of about $500,000 now being realized in the cost of destroying $1 bills that are unfit for further circulation, and to avoid incurring an expense of more than $300,000 annually in sorting $1 bills. These savings would otherwise be lost and the increased cost added now that, under the provisions of the act of June 4, 1963, Public Law 88–36, $1 silver certificates are being replaced by $1 Federal Reserve notes.

There are two reasons for this. Unfit Treasury currency (silver certificates and U.S. notes) is now verified and destroyed at the various Federal Reserve banks and branches. This saves about $500,000 annually in handling expenses, and in the cost of shipping currency to the Treasury in Washington for verification and destruction. Federal Reserve notes, however, are now required by law to be returned to the Comptroller of the Currency for cancellation and destruction. The proposed legislation would eliminate this requirement.

The other reason is that it has been considered necessary to sort unfit Federal Reserve notes by bank of issue before their destruction. This sorting of unfit $1 Federal Reserve notes would add more than $300,000 annually to the cost of retiring the notes. Since the issuance of Federal Reserve notes began, which was about 50 years ago, several billion have been issued and retired, and enough is now known about the relation of issues of each bank to retirements of each that it is no longer considered necessary to make a physical sort of unfit notes as they are retired. Collateral requirements and accountability for outstanding notes can be provided for on a formula basis fixed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The proposed legislation would provide that Federal Reserve notes unfit for circulation shall be canceled, destroyed, and accounted for under procedures prescribed and at locations designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, and credit for the notes so retired allocated among the Federal Reserve banks as prescribed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The destruction of unfit Treasury currency at the Federal Reserve banks and branches has been performed under regulations and procedures prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury and the destruction operations are inspected by his representatives. This procedure has been satisfactory in all respects. The proposed legislation contemplates that the same type of procedure and control would be provided for by the Treasury with respect to regional destruction of Federal Reserve notes.

It will be appreciated if you will lay the attached proposed bill before the Senate. A similar communication has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

A bill to authorize revised procedures for the destruction of unfit Federal Reserve notes, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the third paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 413), is hereby further amended by revising the last sentence thereof to read as follows: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Federal Reserve notes unfit for circulation shall be canceled, destroyed, and accounted for under procedures prescribed and at locations designated by the Secretary of the Treasury. Upon destruction of such notes, credit with respect thereto shall be apportioned among the twelve Federal Reserve banks as determined by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System."

COMPARATIVE TYPE SHOWING CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY BILL

Changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in brackets; new matter italicized):

The last sentence of the third paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 413):

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Federal Reserve notes unfit for circulation shall be [returned by the Federal Reserve agents to the Comptroller of the Currency for cancellation and destruction.] *canceled, destroyed, and accounted for under procedures prescribed and at locations designated by the Secretary of the Treasury. Upon destruction of such notes, credit with respect thereto shall be apportioned among the twelve Federal Reserve banks as determined by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.*

AUTHORIZATION FOR CHECKS TO BE DRAWN IN FAVOR OF BANKING ORGANIZATIONS FOR THE CREDIT OF A PERSON'S ACCOUNT UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, a bill to authorize checks to be drawn in favor of certain organizations for the credit of a person's account, under certain conditions.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary of the Air Force recommending this bill, together with a copy of the bill, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

This is the same as S. 2937 of the 88th Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1309) to authorize checks to be drawn in favor of banking organizations for the credit of a person's account, under certain conditions, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1309

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3620 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 492), is amended—

(1) by inserting the designation "(a)" before the word "Except" at the beginning thereof; and

(2) by adding the following new subscriptions at the end thereof:

"(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a) or any other provision of law, and under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, the head of an agency may, upon the written request of a person to whom a payment is to be made, authorize a disbursing officer to make the payment—

"(1) by sending to the bank, savings institution, or Federal or State chartered credit union designated by that person a check that is drawn in favor of that organization and for credit to the account of that person; or

"(2) if more than one person to whom a payment is to be made designates the same banking organization, by sending to the organization a check that is drawn in favor of the organization for the total amount due those persons and by specifying the amount to be credited to the account of each of those persons.

In this subsection, 'agency' means any department, agency, independent establishment, board, office, commission, or other establishment in the executive, legislative, or judicial branch, of the Government, any wholly owned or controlled Government corporation, and the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

"(c) Payment by the United States of a check, drawn in accordance with subsection (b) and properly indorsed, shall constitute a full acquittance for the amount due to the person requesting payment."

The letter presented by Mr. ROBERTSON is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, January 28, 1965.

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To authorize checks to be drawn in favor of banking organizations for the credit of a person's account, under certain conditions."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense Legislative Program for the 89th Congress. In accordance with the recommendation of the Treasury Department, the proposal was made applicable to all Government agencies. The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is

recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

Generally, the purpose of the proposed legislation, which is Government-wide in scope, is to authorize Government agencies, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, to draw checks in favor of banking organizations for the credit of a person's account, under certain conditions. Specifically, it would permit the heads of departments, agencies, independent establishments, boards, commissions, and offices in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government, wholly owned or controlled Government corporations, and the municipal government of the District of Columbia to authorize the drawing of a check by a disbursing officer in favor of a bank, savings institution, or Federal or State chartered credit union which represents payments to one or more persons who use that organization as a depository. In other words, if more than one person designates the same banking organization as a depository, a single check may be drawn in favor of the banking organization for the total amount due to such persons and transmitted to the banking organization, identifying each person, and the individual amount to be deposited to his account. The method of payment authorized by this proposal would cover payments of a repetitive type (payroll, retirement, pension, etc.) and apply to persons who are (1) civilian officers or employees in or under the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Government; (2) Members of Congress; (3) civilian officers or employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia; and (4) members or former members of the uniformed services. It would also apply to persons who are retired.

This procedure has been used by the Department of the Army since 1913 in administering officers' pay and since 1956 in administering the pay of other personnel. It has been used by the Air Force since 1955. Although this procedure has not been specifically authorized by the Department of the Navy, it has been used by the Marine Corps since 1958 and by a few Navy activities in the payment of military personnel.

As background, using one service, the Department of the Air Force only, as an example to eliminate duplication of remarks, the following information is submitted:

(a) Paragraph 70401.1, AFM 173–50 (now paragraph 30316, AFM 177–108), Finance Systems and Procedures permitted the drawing of checks payable to banking organizations for the credit of the account of a civilian employee on his request. It also provided that when more than one person designated the same banking organization, a single check could be drawn in the total amount, if each employee and the amount to be deposited to his account was identified with the check.

(b) The Comptroller General of the United States, in Decision No. B–141025, November 12, 1959, took specific exception to the procedure contained in paragraph 70401.1, AFM 173–50. He held that drawing checks covering salary payments of civilian employees, in favor of banks, for deposit to the employees' account, is in contravention of law. Sections 3477 and 3620 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 203 and 492, respectively) were cited.

(c) After intensive study, the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (financial management) dispatched a letter to the Comptroller General of the United States on May 13, 1960, citing the benefits of the single check procedure and inclosing a savings study and an opinion of the Air Force general counsel. Reply to this letter was dated August 3, 1960, and held that there was no legal basis for modification or revision of his original decision.

(d) Again on September 29, 1960, the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (financial management) requested reconsideration of the opinion and placed questions for clarification in the event the decision was confirmed. The decisions of November 12, 1959, and August 3, 1960, were sustained by the Comptroller General on December 20, 1960. In this letter it became apparent that the applicability of the original decision would have to be extended to the procedure for the payment of military members. Paragraph 30406b, AFM 173–10 (now paragraph 30316, AFM 177–108), organization, functions and responsibilities of finance offices, permitted the same procedure as contained in paragraph 70401.1, AFM 173–50 for drawing checks payable to the banking organizations for the credit of the military member.

(e) Finally, the Comptroller General has agreed with representatives of the Department of Defense that present procedures in the military departments may remain unchanged pending actions on the proposed legislation. The procedure will not be expanded until legislation is obtained.

The proposed legislation permitting the drawing of checks payable to banking organizations has been drafted to permit use of a single check when more than one person has designated that banking organization. The practice of consolidating payment of multiple vouchers into one check to one payee is presently encouraged in settling commercial invoices throughout the Government in paragraph 5010.40, title 7, General Accounting Official Manual.

The mailing of payroll checks to an address designated by the employee or military member has become increasingly prevalent within the Department of Defense. The advantages to the Government are manifold.

(a) Payroll action is complete at the time the check has been drawn, enveloped, and dispatched. The civilian personnel office staff is not involved in the distribution.

(b) Circumstantially, banking facility hours are normally within the working day. Although no valid computation of working time lost by individuals in banking or cashing of payroll checks during duty hours can be made, this cannot be ignored. By mailing checks to a home address or to a bank, this problem of lost time is materially reduced. When mailed to the bank, no occasion for a visit to the banking facility arises to dispose of the check. When the check is mailed to the home address, cashing or depositing is usually conducted during other than duty hours.

(c) Persons normally designated to distribute checks need not leave their place of duty either to pick up, distribute, or return undelivered checks. Factually, at Warner Robins Air Force Base, Ga., with a civilian payroll of 15,000 civilians (all of whom are now paid by checks), 350 man-hours were used each week in the distribution process, under the individual check system. In addition to the monetary saving, which is obvious, under the single check system, these individuals are now available for their primary duty during the time which was formerly used for the distribution of checks.

(d) At Warner Robins Air Force Base, with 15,000 civilian employees on the payroll, more than 6,000 had designated banks as mailing addresses. This designation was completely voluntary and can be considered as a reasonable percentage of a typical civilian employee group. If the mailing service is made available, it can be assumed that there is a potential of 120,000 persons within the approximately 300,000 Air Force civilian employees who would designate a bank as a mailing address. Among military members in the Washington area paid through the Bolling and Andrews Air Force Base offices, approximately 2,500 of 6,000 Air Force officers have designated a bank as a mailing address. Although the use of banks as a mailing address by enlisted Air Force personnel is not as prevalent as among civilians and officers, approximately 8 percent in the Washington area have designated banks as mailing addresses.

(e) The factual data obtained at Warner Robins Air Force Base reveals that 3,000 employees are being paid each week by the use of 11 checks payable to banks. Approximately 155,000 fewer Treasury checks are drawn each year at that base by use of the single check procedure.

(f) Assuming that the experience data furnished by Warner Robins Air Force Base is typical of civilian payrolls then:

1. Elimination of 155,000 checks per year in the payment of 15,000 civilian employees would indicate that if the single check program is extended to cover all 300,000 Air Force employees then a substantial savings in the drawing of 3,100,000 Treasury checks per year will result.

2. The following is a computation of the cost of mailing a Treasury check to a banking organization and ultimate cancellation by Treasury:

Cost of printed check	$0.00250
Cost of window envelope	.00300
Postage	.05000
Treasury processing [1]	.004
Machine preparation [2]	.01330
Cost of Treasury check	.07280

[1] Provided by Treasury Department.
[2] Cost data from Air Force Accounting and Finance Center.

3. Use of the single check for only civilian payrolls within the Air Force can produce a substantial savings each year in the basic cost of processing and mailing of Treasury checks. Conversion to a computer system for military pay has recently required changes in our procedures. We expect to program for the use of the blanket check procedure where economies can be achieved. However, at this point in time we cannot predict the extent of its utilization. Most Air Force enlisted members are now paid on a semimonthly basis. Use of the program for even a small percentage of enlisted personnel is expected to generate measurable savings.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The cost of drawing and processing a Treasury check by mechanical or electronic means has been greatly reduced during the past several years in Government offices and commercial institutions. However, the basic cost of a printed check and envelope, postage and processing must be considered when the quantity is significant. The use of the single check procedure will produce sizable savings to the U.S. Government. Enactment of the proposed legislation will be extremely advantageous to civilian employees and military members and will generate sizable savings to the U.S. Government through the use of the single check when banking organizations are designated as a mailing address. No compromise of payroll computation procedures or change to these procedures is necessary.

Sincerely,

EUGENE M. ZUCKERT.

NATIONAL MUSEUM OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for more effective cooperation between the Smithsonian Institution and the Nation's museums. This bill has been recommended

by the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian, of which I and the other two cosponsors are members. I ask unanimous consent that the summary of the proposed bill and its text be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1310) relating to the National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1310

Whereas the museums of the Nation constitute a cultural and educational asset of great importance to the Nation's progress; and

Whereas national recognition is necessary to insure that museum resources for preserving and interpreting the Nation's heritage may be more fully utilized in the enrichment of public life in the individual community: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Museum Act of 1965".

SEC. 2. The Director of the National Museum shall (1) report annually to the Congress on progress in museums and their collections and other activities, such report to be be included in the Smithsonian Institution's annual report of its other operations; (2) advise and cooperate with departments and agencies of the Government of the United States operating, assisting, or otherwise concerned with museums; (3) cooperate with museums and their professional organizations in a continuing study of museum problems and opportunities; (4) assist museums and their professional organizations in training career employees in museum practices; (5) prepare and distribute significant museum publications; and (6) perform research on, and otherwise contribute to, the development of museum techniques.

SEC. 3. The first paragraph under the heading "National Museum" contained in the Act of July 7, 1884 (23 Stat. 214; 20 U.S.C. 65), is amended by deleting the following sentence: "And the Director of the National Museum is hereby directed to report annually to the Congress the progress of the museum during the year and its present condition.".

The summary presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

III. NATIONAL MUSEUM ACT OF 1965

The recent growth in the number of museums, their collections and activities, has far outstripped the ability of the museum profession to provide trained personnel for the study, planning, coordination, and staffing of the Nation's museums. The achievements of a few outstanding museums in investigating new techniques for display, cataloguing, and conservation, new relationships between historic, scientific, and artistic objects, and new concepts of communication, reveal how much remains to be done to make effective the universal opportunities for education and cultural progress which these institutions could offer to the public.

The primary responsibility for the support of the individual museum should remain with the community which it serves. However, needs for a national and international program of cooperative research and training to assist museums large and small to make their maximum contribution require national recognition and leadership.

Much is already being done. The U.S. Office of Education has taken a constructive interest in the educational activities of museums, particularly with regard to the functions of the museum as a support facility for university and public school education. The National Science Foundation is considering the role of museums in furthering scientific research and raising the level of public scientific awareness. The Department of State has made a number of leader grants to foreign museum professionals to stimulate the international exchange of ideas and experience in the museum field. The Smithsonian Institution, in one of its primary roles as the National Museum, has long recognized its responsibilities to the national museum profession. It has recently undertaken to introduce a limited number of museology interns in its museums and has engaged in a joint program with the American Association of Museums in the complementary areas of museum training, education, publications, and a continuing survey of museum problems and resources.

It is proposed that the present activities of the Smithsonian Institution in museum research, training, and technology be recognized and strengthened by the passage of a National Museum Act which would establish within the National Museum a coordinated program of national and international research, training, and publication in the museum field. The program would be supervised by the Director of the National Museum under the direction of the Board of Regents and Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, during the past several weeks, President Johnson has sent many important messages to the Congress. His message on natural beauty of our country included an eloquent plea for the careful development of the Potomac River Basin. He recommended that the Potomac "serve as a model of scenic and recreation values for the entire country."

In this same message the President recommended that a program be undertaken to "clean up the river and keep it clean," protect its natural beauty, provide for adequate recreational facilities, and complete the presently authorized George Washington Memorial Parkway on both sides of the river.

In his more recent message regarding the Nation's Capital, the President correctly emphasized the regional nature of many of Washington's problems.

As a representative of a State bordering on the District of Columbia, I am constantly reminded of the interrelationship between Maryland, Virginia, and the Nation's Capital. As the President pointed out in that message, the problems of transportation, water and air pollution, sewage and waste disposal, fire and police protection, recreation, employment, and economic development do not recognize jurisdictional lines.

Constructive efforts toward coping with regional problems have already been made in the National Capital region. The Washington Metropolitan Council of Governments—of which I am a member—and the National Capital Area Planning Council have both brought about a measure of regional cooperation. The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin comprised of the States of Maryland and West Virginia, the Commonwealths of Virginia and Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia—has encouraged river basin cooperation in the abatement of water pollution.

Since 1960, the White House has demonstrated a strong interest in Metropolitan Washington problems. I know that this demonstrated interest has been welcomed by the citizens of Maryland.

Since being elected to the Senate 2 years ago, I have been carefully studying the problems confronting the Potomac River Basin and the National Capital region. I am extremely pleased that President Johnson is focusing his attention on these regional problems.

During the Senate's recent consideration of the Appalachian Development Act, I pointed out that many small communities cannot afford badly needed sewer and water systems. This is especially true in the Potomac River Basin, where at least 10 communities continue to dump raw sewage into the same river that supplies drinking water to the Nation's Capital. To add to these, many communities which have totally inadequate sewage treatment facilities.

I am sure that you recognize the problem facing these small communities. It is one compounded by low income and low tax base, coupled with extremely expensive engineering and construction costs due to the steep and frequently rocky terrain. Most of these communities will have to receive substantial assistance from State and Federal sources if sewage dumping is to be eliminated.

Other pollution problems will have to be resolved before the President's dream of boating, swimming, and fishing in clean Potomac waters will become a reality.

Again, the Appalachia bill which the Senate recently approved contains programs which will assist in this endeavor.

The problem of pollution from mine acid in the North Branch must be greatly reduced, if not totally eliminated.

The major pollution problem of the Potomac River is the increasing quantity of sediment it carries and deposits. A recent study by the Geological Survey shows that about 2½ million tons of sediment are discharged annually. The study further showed that 50 percent of this sediment load comes from the drainage basin upstream from Point of Rocks, Md.

To decrease this erosion rate in rural areas, the current activities of the Soil Conservation Service must be intensified. The construction of 409 headwater projects proposed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers should be commenced as soon as possible. The extreme need for these small dams is well recognized and their construction should not be delayed pending the outcome of the remainder of the Engineers' proposed plan. Many people, including myself, are totally opposed to the corps' proposed high dam at Seneca.

Turning now to the urban areas of the Potomac River Basin, it is abundantly clear that conservation activities must

be stepped up in order to reduce annual sediment discharge rates that go as high as 2,300 tons per square mile. The existing excellent programs of stream valley acquisition must be intensified so as to keep ahead of the metropolitan area's rapid expansion.

Stricter regulations are needed to reduce erosion connected with construction projects. The Federal, State, and local governments should cooperate in this field by promulgating antierosion regulations for Government financed and assisted projects. The lengthy construction period for the Dulles interceptor sewer and the George Washington Memorial Parkway on the Maryland side of the Potomac above Washington are prime examples of encouraging soil erosion. Speedier construction could greatly reduce sediment discharge rates in urban areas.

Earlier in my speech, I mentioned the seriousness of the sediment problem in the Potomac. Current estimates show that the removal of sediment from the National Capital region's water supply costs $1½ million annually. This cost is increasing. Silting and consequent dredging in the estuary of the Potomac account for the loss of many fine oyster beds. Oyster production has decreased to a mere one-fourth of what it was in 1892. Proper conservation of the Potomac River could greatly contribute to the development of a multimillion dollar oyster and clam industry in an area which is now economically depressed. It is difficult to estimate the economic losses resulting from fish kills and the general reduction in marine life in the Potomac. It is clear that efforts to reduce damage from waste disposal must continue. Steps must soon be taken to make sewage waste 90 percent clean as opposed to the current rate of 80 percent. A mere 10 percent increase in treatment will become extremely important by the year 2000 when it is expected that the average flow through the District's pollution control plan will reach 360 million gallons daily.

I am sure that all of these problems are being given careful consideration by the Secretary of the Interior who is now studying the problems of the Potomac River Basin at the request of President Johnson. I hope that the Secretary will carefully consider the possibility of creating a new multipurpose compact to plan and coordinate Federal, State, and local activities relating to the conservation, utilization, development, and control of the water and related resources of the Potomac River Basin. Such a compact would serve to better recognize and deal with the multijurisdictional problems of the Potomac River. It would provide a realistic planning unit for the interstate region.

Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to create the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park. The creation of this park will represent a major step forward in the overall protection and conservation of the Potomac River Valley. Not only does this area have an enormous potential for recreational activities, but its historical value is unique. The C. & O. Canal was a major passage to the developing western frontier. One cannot help but be impressed by the feat of engineering that was required to complete the canal. Today, it is one of the few canals remaining from that great American era of inland waterway transportation.

The C. & O. Canal offers one of the best possible sites for a national park. The existing 4,800-acre C. & O. National Monument provides an excellent nucleus for a park. The historic and scenic caliber of the canal and the many opportunities that exist there for hiking, camping, fishing, boating, bicycling, and other forms of outdoor recreation make it a nationally significant recreation area. Over 18 million people live within 150 miles of the proposed park area. This population is rapidly doubling.

The bill I have introduced provides for a national historical park not to exceed 15,000 acres. Roughly one-third of this land is already under the jurisdiction of the Park Service. The additional land would be acquired to allow for the development of adequate service facilities to accommodate visitors, access roads, river frontage, camp and picnic grounds, parking areas, and necessary administrative facilities. The park is to extend along the line of the C. & O. Canal from a point above the Great Falls of the Potomac to a point in the vicinity of Cumberland, Md., a distance of approximately 165 miles.

In view of rising land values and the need for additional land to permit the development of essential recreational and service facilities, it is important that this park receive early consideration. Only the purchase of additional land and the gaining of scenic easement rights on adjoining properties can prevent the dense urban development which is now threatening along portions of the Potomac River.

The C. & O. Canal National Historical Park will not only serve the millions of people living near it, but it will provide needed camping facilities for millions of Americans who come to visit their Nation's Capital. They will have an unexcelled opportunity to view the beauty of the Potomac Valley as it was in the days of Thomas Jefferson when he looked down into the valley from a nearby hill and said, "The view from this rock is worth a voyage across the Atlantic."

Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to establish the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD following my remarks, and that the bill lay on the table until the close of business next Monday in order that my colleagues will have an opportunity to join in sponsoring this worthwhile legislation which will help to make the Potomac the model river that President Johnson and the Nation envisage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Maryland.

The bill (S. 1322) to establish the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BREWSTER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1322

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, for the purpose of preserving and interpreting certain property in the State of Maryland for the benefit and inspiration of the people. The park, as initially established, shall comprise that particular property in Federal ownership containing not to exceed four thousand, eight hundred acres, including the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Monument, which property is situated along the line of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal between the terminus of the George Washington Memorial Parkway, above the Great Falls of the Potomac River and a point within or in the vicinity of the city of Cumberland, Maryland, as may be determined by the Secretary of the Interior. The park may comprise such additional lands as may be acquired pursuant to subsection (b) hereof: *Provided,* That the total area of such park, including land already in Federal ownership, shall not exceed fifteen thousand acres.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to acquire in such manner as he may consider to be in the public interest such lands and interests in lands in the State of Maryland in the vicinity of the canal and existing Government canal property as he deems desirable for the purposes of the said park.

(c) Subject to the purposes and general requirements of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to cooperate with the State of Maryland, with its political subdivisions and with other Federal agencies, in promoting such land use or development programs, through cooperative agreements or leases for terms not to exceed fifty years, as will further the objectives for the park and of the State of Maryland concerning wildlife propagation, wilderness conservation, public recreation, and related purposes.

(d) The authority granted in the Act of September 22, 1950 (64 Stat. 905), to effect land exchanges for the purposes of the proposed Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Parkway and in the Act of August 1, 1953 (67 Stat. 359), to grant easements for rights-of-way through, over, or under lands along the line of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal is hereby continued and may hereafter be exercised by the Secretary of the Interior with respect to lands included in the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park. The Secretary is authorized also to convey such Chesapeake and Ohio Canal lands within and in the vicinity of Cumberland, Maryland, which are not included in the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historial Park in exchange for other land or interests therein of approximately equal value that are authorized by this Act to be acquired for the park.

Notwithstanding section 1(a) of the Act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 482, 483), that portion of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal between the terminus of the George Washington Memorial Parkway above Great Falls and Point of Rocks, in the State of Maryland, shall hereafter be part of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park.

(e) Any funds that may be available for purposes of administration of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal property above the Great Falls terminus of the George Washington Memorial Parkway may hereafter be used by the Secretary for the purposes of the

Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park.

SEC. 2. (a) Within five years after the approval of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall file with the National Archives a map showing the lands within the maximum authorized acreage prescribed in section 1(a) of this Act which are to comprise the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park: *Provided,* That the filing of such map shall not affect the authority of the Secretary subsequently to acquire, in accordance with section 1(b), non-Federal lands within the boundaries of the park as depicted on said map. Such historical park shall be administered under the general laws and requirements governing areas of the national park system in such manner as to preserve the historic, scenic, and recreational values and features thereof.

(b) The enactment of this Act shall not affect adversely any valid rights heretofore existing within the areas hereby established as the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park.

SEC. 3. Any portion of the lands and interests in lands comprising the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park shall be made available upon Federal statutory authorization for public nonpark uses when such uses shall have been found, in consideration of the public interest, to have a greater public necessity than the uses authorized by this Act.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

THE USE OF THE ALASKA MARINE HIGHWAY FOR THE TRANSPORTATION OF AUTOMOBILES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference on behalf of my colleague from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and myself, a bill to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, designed to correct an omission in existing law governing transportation of privately owned vehicles of military personnel assigned to duty in the State of Alaska. The existing legislation specifying forms of transportation authorized for use by the Department of Defense in transporting these vehicles has been interpreted by the Department to prohibit the Department from the use of forms of transportation which would be less costly to the Government than those now authorized.

In particular, the language to be amended by this bill now precludes use of the ferry system wholly financed and operated by the State of Alaska which could be useful in transporting vehicles of personnel traveling to Alaska. The State ferry system, which operates from Prince Rupert, British Columbia, to ports in southeastern Alaska and between Anchorage and Kodiak, has proved to be a very popular and highly beneficial addition to the transportation pattern in the State of Alaska. This unique ferry operation, completely owned and run by our State government, is the only one of its kind in the United States. As the system began operating after enactment of the Defense Department legislation to be amended by this bill there was no provision in the law or regulations for use of this very valuable service.

That the use of the Alaska ferry system will save money has been emphasized by the Department of Defense and by private motor carriers in Alaska. One carrier has advised that if the Defense Department could use the ferry system, allowing transfer to motor trailer of privately owned vehicles for transportation to ultimate point of destination, there could be a saving of approximately $100 per vehicle. It has been estimated this could amount to an annual saving of $100,000.

When this bill was introduced during the last session of Congress as H.R. 8676—by Representative RALPH RIVERS of Alaska—and S. 2197—by my colleague, Senator BARTLETT, and me—it received a favorable report by the Defense Department and was passed by the House of Representatives.

It is my hope this very useful legislation will be acted upon favorably and rapidly.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the report of the Department of Defense on S. 2197, 88th Congress, be included in the RECORD at the close of these remarks, together with the text of the bill I introduce on behalf of my colleague and myself and ask that the bill be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and report will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1323) to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, so as to authorize the military departments, in certain cases, to ship automobiles to and from the State of Alaska by commercial motor carrier via the Alaska ferry system and other surface transportation introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for Mr. BARTLETT and himself), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) striking out the word "or" at the end of clause (1);

(2) striking out the period at the end of clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or"; and

(3) adding at the end thereof a new clause as follows:

"(3) in the case of movements to and from Alaska, by commercial motor carrier via highways and the Alaska ferry system or other surface transportation between customary ports of embarkation and debarkation, if such means of transport is more economical for the United States than other authorized means."

The report presented by Mr. GRUENING is as follows:

April 3, 1964.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request to the Secretary of Defense for the views of the Department of Defense on S. 2197, 88th Congress, a bill "To amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, so as to authorize the military departments, in certain cases, to ship automobiles to and from the State of Alaska by commercial motor carrier via highways and the Alaska ferry system." The Secretary of Defense has delegated to the Department of the Army responsibility for expressing the views of the Department of Defense thereon.

The transportation of a privately owned motor vehicle of a member of the Armed Forces to his new duty station is specifically limited by 10 U.S.C. 2634 to shipment by a vessel owned by the United States, or by privately owned American shipping services. Enactment of S. 2197 would amend this statute to permit, in the case of movements to and from Alaska, the use of commercial motor carriers by highways and the Alaska ferry system, provided such method is more economical to the Government.

As a matter of general policy, the military departments are required to evaluate all modes of transportation and to select the most economical mode available. Water transportation is usually the most economical means for the movement of motor vehicles. However, Alaska as an oversea station is unique in that it is accessible by land. Due to the highly developed highways, and the Alaska ferry system operating between Prince Rupert and points within Alaska, motor carriers have become competitive with water carriers and conceivably could be more economical. While the permissive authority contained in S. 2197 is considered desirable in order that the military departments may consider all possible modes and benefit by the economies which may be available through the utilization of motor carriers, it is believed that the bill should be expanded to include railroads and train-ship service. Such broader authority would give the Department of Defense greater flexibility in its logistical planning and possibly result in a further reduction of costs because of the additional competition. It is therefore recommended that S. 2197 be amended to also provide authority for the use of railroads and train-ship service in the transportation of privately owned vehicles to and from Alaska. Subject thereto, the Department of the Army, on behalf of the Department of Defense, favors enactment of S. 2197.

The precise fiscal effects of this bill cannot be estimated since the carrier interest in these movements, as well as the rates which may be available, are unknown. However, since the bill provides that this additional authority will be used only if it is more economical, no adverse fiscal effects will result.

This report has been coordinated within the Department of Defense in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN AILES,
Secretary of the Army.

EXTENSION OF EXPORT CONTROL ACT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I introduce by request, a bill to extend and amend the Export Control Act of 1949. I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal from the Secretary of Commerce, together with a copy of the bill and an explanatory statement be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter, bill, and explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1332) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The letter, bill, and explanatory statement presented by Mr. ROBERTSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1965.
Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.
and
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed four copies of a draft bill to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes, and four copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that enactment of this legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN T. CONNOR,
Secretary of Commerce.

A bill to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 12 of the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended, is repealed.

SEC. 2. Section 5 of the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsections (c), (d), and (e) as follows:

"(c) The head of any department or agency exercising any functions under this Act (and officers or employees of such department or agency specifically designated by the head thereof) may impose a civil penalty not to exceed $1,000 for each violation of this Act or any regulation, order, or license issued hereunder, either in addition to, or in lieu of, any other liability or penalty which may be imposed.

"(d) The head of any department or agency exercising any functions under this Act (and officers or employees of such department or agency specifically designated by the head thereof) may compromise and settle any administrative proceeding commenced with respect to any violation of this Act or any regulation, order, or license issued hereunder, upon payment of a sum not to exceed $1,000 for each such violation.

"(e) The amount of any penalty imposed or sum to be paid in compromise and settlement pursuant to subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall be payable into the Treasury of the United States and shall be recoverable in a civil suit in the name of the United States. Nothing contained in those subsections shall be construed to limit in any way (i) the availability of other administrative remedies with respect to violations of this Act or any regulation, order, or license issued hereunder, (ii) the authority to compromise and settle administrative proceedings brought with respect to violations of this Act or any regulation, order, or license issued hereunder on terms which do not require the payment of money, or (iii) the authority to compromise, remit, or mitigate seizures and forfeitures pursuant to the Act of August 13, 1953 (67 Stat. 577)."

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REGULATION OF EXPORTS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

This proposed legislation would extend indefinitely the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. secs. 2021–2032), which is now scheduled to expire by its terms on June 30, 1965. The proposal would also amend section 5 of the act to amplify existing noncriminal remedies for violations of the Export Control Act.

The Export Control Act authorizes the President to regulate exports from the United States to the extent necessary to safeguard our national security and domestic economy and to further our foreign policy. The Department of Commerce administers the act by delegation of authority from the President. Under current administrative policies and procedures, specific export licenses, issued on the basis of applications submitted by exporters, are required for exports of certain strategic commodities and technical data to destinations other than Canada, in order to prevent the Sino-Soviet bloc from obtaining them by direct or indirect means from U.S. sources. Practically all exports are prohibited to Cuba, Communist China, North Korea, and North Vietnam in accordance with our security and foreign policy interests.

Exports to friendly nations are encouraged and are kept free of restrictive export controls except to the extent necessary to prevent diversion to unauthorized destinations or an excessive drain of materials in domestic scarce supply or other significant frustrations of U.S. export control objectives.

While today there appear to be some hopeful signs of a possible future easing of world political tensions, it would be very harmful to our security and foreign policy interests to allow the authority to restrict strategic exports to lapse, as it will if the Export Control Act is permitted to expire next June 30. Realistically, a need for control over exports of strategic commodities will probably continue for some time in the future. The United States should not be left without authority to exercise such control. The act provides the flexibility necessary to permit changes to be made in the scope and direction of export controls, as and when conditions change. Since the act has been in force in one form or another for nearly 25 years, and there appears little likelihood that it will soon become unnecessary, we recommend an indefinite extension.

The proposed legislation would accomplish this result by repealing section 12 of the act. That section now provides that the authority granted under the act will terminate on June 30, 1965, or upon any prior date which the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate.

The proposed amendments to section 5 of the act would expand existing administrative techniques for enforcement of the act by authorizing imposition of a civil penalty up to $1,000, either in addition to, or in lieu of, any other sanction already authorized under the act and would also authorize compromise and settlement of administrative proceedings under the act on monetary terms (up to $1,000 for each violation) as well as nonmonetary terms. Accompanying language would insure that the new fining and compromise authority are not intended to limit existing noncriminal procedures and remedies for export control violations.

The Export Control Act now provides criminal penalties for violations of the act or of any regulation, order, or license issued thereunder. Additionally, by regulation, the Department of Commerce may curtail or deny the violator's privilege of participating in future exports of U.S. commodities or technical data, as a result of administrative compliance proceedings involving a complaint and hearing procedure within the Department of Commerce. The authority to impose monetary penalties would provide a needed flexibility in the sanctions available, by permitting appropriate deterrent action to be taken in cases of export control violations which involve no serious security or foreign policy consequences. Typical of such cases are negligent violations of export clearance requirements by freight forwarders, and false declaration of exports of nonstrategic goods to friendly foreign countries in order to evade the latter's import duties and controls. Violations of this sort take substantial investigative time and effort away from the more important work of enforcing truly strategic export controls. Yet, to take no action with respect to these lesser violations, especially when they occur repeatedly, tends to encourage similar violations by others and to invite evasion of our strategic controls as well. The only present alternative to criminal punishment or denial of export privileges in most of these relatively minor cases is to send letters warning the violator that repetitions will be punished. On the one hand these "warning letters" have little deterrent effect on persons other than the violators, and on the other hand the threatened criminal and administrative sanctions now available often seem too extreme. This is true even in the case of repeated minor violations, where the firm is one doing a large volume of business.

The Customs Bureau's power to seize and forfeit illegal exports under another law (see 22 U.S.C. 401) is of practical deterrent value only where the goods have not already left the country and only if the actual violator, rather than an innocent party who happens to own the goods at the time of seizure, will bear the monetary loss resulting from forfeiture. This combination of circumstances occurs in only a small minority of cases, because of the mechanics and legal terms of international trade.

Under the proposed amendment, fines of up to $1,000 for each proven violation—and there are often several violations involved in a single export—could be imposed, or alternatively, such sums could be accepted in compromise of, and as a substitute for, an administrative order denying the violator future export privileges. These monetary penalties would serve as an effective deterrent to violations involving corner-cutting, petty illegality, and repeated inexcusable negligence, as opposed to more serious schemes to evade our strategic controls. However, the imposition of such a penalty would not foreclose criminal or other noncriminal sanctions as well. The proposed compromise power would authorize the Department of Commerce to settle administrative compliance proceedings on payment by the respondent of a sum up to $1,000 in lieu of other administrative remedies such as an order denying future export privileges to the respondent. The amendments would expressly leave unaffected the Customs Bureau's present power to compromise, remit and mitigate forfeitures under 22 U.S.C. 401, as well as existing administrative "denial order" procedures of the Department of Commerce. The language of the proposed amendments has been adapted from acts of Congress which grant similar powers to departments and agencies administering other Federal regulatory laws.

We urge consideration of the enclosed draft bill by the Congress as early in this session as possible, in view of the act's scheduled expiration on June 30, 1965. Prompt passage of the legislation is needed for budgetary, planning, and personnel reasons, and to prevent any doubt in the United States or abroad concerning the continuance of this important facet of our economic defense program.

AMENDMENT OF TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, under the Trade Expansion Act, in order for a firm or a group of workers to become eligible for adjustment assistance, two distinct tests, or hurdles, must be overcome. First, the firm or the group of

workers must establish to the satisfaction of the Tariff Commission that articles competitive with those they produce are being imported in such quantities as to cause, or threaten to cause, serious injury or unemployment or underemployment. Moreover, they must show that the increased imports are a result in major part of concessions granted under trade agreements.

If they are successful in overcoming this first obstacle, and in 18 straight instances firms, workers, and industries have failed to overcome this obstacle, then the firm or workers must face another and possibly more severe test. This second test comes from the provision which states that increased imports shall be considered to cause, or threaten to cause, serious injury to a firm, or unemployment or underemployment when the Tariff Commission finds that such increased imports have been the major factor in causing the injury of unemployment.

I do not say the Tariff Commission has been wrong in 18 straight cases. However, it has become clear to many of us that firms or workers injured by imports are not going to have the relief under the existing criteria that Congress intended when it approved the Trade Expansion Act.

Therefore, in order to make trade adjustment assistance available under more appropriate terms to injured firms and unemployed workers, I propose to amend section 301(c) of the Trade Expansion Act.

Under my amendment there will continue to be two tests which must be met for firms or groups of workers to become eligible for adjustment assistance. The standards of these tests are modified, however, to give them new meaning and broader application. First, under the amendment, it must be established to the satisfaction of the Tariff Commission that the increased imports are attributable in whole or in part to concessions under trade agreements. Second, it must also be established that the increased imports have been the predominant factor in causing, or threatening to cause, serious injury to a firm, or unemployment or underemployment of a group of workers.

Increased imports would be the predominant factor in those cases where the Tariff Commission finds that they are a more important factor than any other single cause. It will not be necessary that they be more important than all the other factors combined.

Mr. President, the relief provided by this amendment is not available where industry petitions are involved. A determination of injury on an industry petition would trigger adjustment assistance for firms and workers throughout the industry, when, in fact, many of them may not be injured because of imports. For this reason, I believe it is preferable at this time to make these more generous tests for adjustment assistance available only on a case-by-case basis. That is what my amendment provides.

It has been urged that to make adjustment assistance available to injured firms and unemployed workers we should abandon the present procedure under which the Tariff Commission makes the determination of injury or unemployment. It has been urged that we should substitute statutory standards under which adjustment assistance would automatically become available when certain conditions occur.

My bill does not do this. I do not believe it would be wise to provide any statutory formula. To do so would make adjustment assistance available where the alleged injury was more apparent than real.

We all know that in our complex society the rises and falls in the fortunes of business often have many contributing causes. Strikes may be one. Automation another. A new product to compete against may be a third. Secret business agreements to fix prices, divide markets, or similarly avoid open competition may be a fourth. Rising imports may be still another. The list could go on and on.

I do not believe statutory rules could ever properly analyze the cause of particular injury or unemployment and confine adjustment assistance to cases it is intended to help; that is, injury created by imports under trade concessions. To the contrary, I believe injury determinations in all these cases should continue to be handled in the traditional manner—by having the Tariff Commission apply the subjective standards that Congress provides for them.

For this reason, the only changes in the adjustment assistance provisions which my amendment makes relate to the standards to be applied by the Tariff Commission in measuring injury to firms and unemployment of workers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1333) to amend the adjustment assistance provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 with respect to determinations by the Tariff Commission of injury or threatened injury to firms or groups of workers, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

A SELECT COMMITTEE TO SAVE THE DOMESTIC GOLD MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I could not cast my vote in favor of the administration's proposal to remove the 25-percent gold cover from Federal Reserve member bank deposits.

My action was not based upon an inability to erase from my mind the old miner's belief that paper money, without backing in specie, is worth no more than the paper it is printed on—though for years I was a gold miner.

Rather, I could not do so because I do not believe it is either proper public policy or sound economics to continue meeting gold drain with emergency, stopgap measures while, at the same time, allowing our domestic gold mining industry to die an agonizing death, unattended.

THE BANKS OF EUROPE

For too long, Mr. President, we have danced to tunes played by the international bankers of Europe. Our gross national product this year will run in the neighborhood of $660 billion. Our exports are but 5 percent of our gross national product. Exports mean less to our Nation and its economy than they do to any other nation. We are less dependent upon international trade for our welfare than any other nation—including France, Mr. President, including France. Our annual overall balance-of-trade deficit runs between $2 to $3 billion a year; this is but 0.02 percent of our total product. The resultant gold outflow in 1965 has been estimated at somewhere between $500 million and $1 billion. In other words, the total gold outflow this year will be the equivalent of between 0.0008 and 0.0016 of our gross national product. As the Joint Economic Committee told us last year, this is a very small tail, indeed to wag such a very large dog.

It is my conviction, Mr. President, that this tail should not be wagging this dog at all. So far as our economy is concerned, so far as our $660 billion a year economy is concerned, the drain of $500 million of gold a year is reason for concern but no more than that. It should be of far greater concern to the Europeans who must rely on international trade and transactions for their existence. If, through lack of confidence, greediness or xenophobia, the Europeans destroy the dollar as an international means of exchange, they have far more than we to lose and only themselves to blame. No, Mr. President, it is my conviction that national economic, monetary and mining policy should be determined with reference to national objectives and national interest—not the pleasures of the old men in the big banks of Europe.

"FREE" GOLD AND TRADE SURPLUSES

As the Senate knows, the Federal Reserve Act has required that each of the member banks of the Federal Reserve System maintain no less than 25 percent of its deposits in gold certificates. The act also has required that a 25 percent reserve be maintained against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation.

With the tremendous expansion of the Nation's economy after the war and with the resultant increase of notes in circulation and in bank deposits, this reserve requirement has severely limited the extent of our gold holdings available for use in international transactions.

At the end of 1963, the United States held $15.6 billion in gold, 35 percent of the world's reserves. But, of this amount, only $2.6 billion was "free" and thus available for the defense of the dollar abroad. Without the removal of the reserve requirements it is probable, well nigh inevitable, that the United States will run out of its "free" gold within the next several years. The removal of this reserve requirement by freeing more of our gold stocks for use in international transactions will give us a breathing space of a few years more. It does not, however, cure anything at all.

If the reserve requirement is to be removed, it is better to do it now by act of

Congress, before a crisis, in a calm and measured manner, rather than to do it administratively—as the Federal Reserve is authorized to do in time of need. Hasty administrative action in an aura of crisis would not contribute to faith in the dollar in the minds of those of the international financial community.

Removing the reserve requirement is tantamount to taking aspirin for a cold. The aspirin relieves the symptoms but it does not cure the illness. Our Nation's illness is a continuing and serious deficit in our balance of payments and it will not be cured by fiddling with reserve requirements. It will be cured only by an adjustment of our basic imbalance.

This year, as in all recent years, our exports are running substantially ahead of our imports—in 1963 almost $5 billion a year ahead. Our annual private oversea investment is less than the annual return on our capital already invested overseas. As a nation we have $88 billion in public and private claims against foreigners while foreigners have only $37 billion in claims against us.

As these things are traditionally calculated, we are a surplus rather than a deficit nation in our trade balance and we are surplus by a good and healthy margin. Our present deficit in our overall balance is not a normal deficit, it is abnormal. It is a deficit caused by our Government's vast oversea commitments—in foreign aid and development assistance, in the maintenance of our military strength across the world, and in our ever-burgeoning oversea tourist trade. This deficit will not be reduced until we reduce our commitments overseas or increase our exports to a major degree. With the realities of the cold war world and with the zooming pressures of international competition, it is difficult to see how we can achieve either objective at least in the short run. In the long run it is difficult to believe that the restrictive monetary policies and the potentially dangerous military retrenchment which would be necessary for a basic adjustment of our deficits could be in our national interests.

The recent drop in our gold reserves appears to be even more dramatic than it really is because of the abnormally high levels of gold which were held in this country during and after the last World War. We then held virtually all of the free world's gold.

The figures tell the story. In 1932 we held $3,919 million of gold. This climbed until 1949 when we held $24,466 million of gold. From 1949 to 1964 our gold stocks have dropped by $9 billion to $15,461 million, a level which is still almost four times greater than that of 1932.

Although the growth in our gold reserve from 1932 has been substantial, it pales to insignificance when it is viewed in the perspective of the growth of our national economy. In 1932 our gross national product was $58.5 billion per year; 15 times greater than our gold reserves. In 1949, after the war and before the Korean conflict, our national product had risen to $258.1 billion. Last year, in 1964, our product topped $622 billion, a $40 billion growth from 1963, a $132 billion growth since President Kennedy came to office, a tenfold increase since 1932 and approximately 40 times greater than our current gold stocks. Our economy is now growing at the rate of 5 percent per year. Our gold stocks are declining.

The destruction of the European economy by the Second World War left the United States the only great and growing economy left in the world. And as a result, dollars which for years had been an international currency became the international currency. The world considered dollars to be as good as gold not only because they were backed by gold but because they were backed by the only strong nation left in the world. It was far safer for oversea nations to hold their reserves—such as they might be—in dollars and to leave gold safe on American shores. So unbalanced a situation was this that during the war at one point our reserve ratio reached 90 percent against the notes in circulation and member bank deposits.

Aside from the abnormal conditions attendant with the war and its aftermath, the strength of the dollar has not necessarily been dependent upon the size of our gold reserves. In relation to our national product, in recent history our gold stocks have been highest at the time when our economy was at its lowest—in 1932 our reserves stood at 57.6 percent of deposits and currency. In 1949 they were at the 54.6-percent level. In 1964 they stood at 29.7 percent. Over the 32 years from 1932 to 1964, as our gross national product increased tenfold, the number of Federal Reserve notes in circulation increased over tenfold while our gold stocks increased by only fourfold. And yet the dollar today is far, far stronger, even if it has less gold backing, than it was in the grim days of the depression.

A FIXED PRICE AND A DISAPPEARING INDUSTRY

Our economy grows, Mr. President. The demands of world trade become ever greater as a result and yet the system for handling international transactions remains inadequate and rigid. This system based on the free convertability of gold and dollars is straining the world's gold resources almost to the breaking point. For too long the domestic gold mining industry has suffered from its rigid, and, in appearance, irrevocable tie with the dollar. A tie no better for the dollar than for gold.

In 1934, when the world's currencies were being devalued, President Roosevelt set the price of gold at $35 an ounce and announced that in transactions with foreign governments or central banks, the United States would sell to all buyers at that price and would buy from all sellers at that price. For 30 years our Nation has held to this commitment. Over this period prices have gone up, wages have gone up, taxes have gone up but the price of gold has not. The result has been a disaster for the American domestic gold mining industry. In 1934 the industry produced $108 million of newly mined gold. In 1940 it produced $210 million; in 1949, $67 million; in 1964, $51.1 million.

Alaska, my State, historically the third largest producer of gold in the United States, has seen the virtual death of this important industry: In 1955 Alaska mines produced 249,300 ounces valued at $8.7 million. Last year Alaska mines produced only 62,500 ounces valued at $2.2 million.

While American mining declined, South Africa mining did not. In 1963 the South Africans produced 28.9 million ounces of gold compared with the 11.9 million ounces mined in 1953, 10 years before. South Africa with its lower labor costs has been able to keep producing although recent reports indicate that even the South Africans are finding it more and more difficult to operate at a profit.

Curious anomalies have grown up as, for over 30 years, we have clung irrationally to a totally inflexible gold policy. The United States has substantial unmined gold deposits. The mining States of the West and the State of Alaska, having lost one of their major industries, now have large areas of substantial and persistent unemployment. Alaska, a prime example, is classified across the entire State as an area of high unemployment.

The demand for gold in international transactions continues to grow and grow but the price for the product does not. There is far less incentive for the miner to dig his gold today than there was in 1934. High costs, high wages have, in fact, reduced the incentive to produce. This wretched impasse is perhaps best illustrated by the fact that in the last 10 years world exports have increased by 70 percent, while world gold production has risen only 29 percent. At a time when the demand for gold is greater than ever before, its low price has discouraged its production.

Let me put it as clearly as I am able:

Gold is depressed. It does not pay to mine it.

Gold is in short supply. Gold's value in exchange is artificially pegged to the dollar and is freely exchangeable with it at a guaranteed ratio. Gold's price is frozen. This makes production uneconomical, discourages adequate exploitation of the resource and exacerbates an exacerbated problem.

A PROPOSAL TO WHICH THE TREASURY CANNOT OBJECT

An inordinate fear of the international bankers has for too long kept us from giving our domestic mining industry the help which it so desperately needs. For too long the Congress has accepted without question the position of the Treasury that nothing can be done to assist domestic mining without causing the dollar irrevocable harm. This is patent nonsense.

The time has come for Congress to look at the problems of the gold mining industry in terms of mining, not solely in terms of finance. Over the years various proposals have been advanced to help the industry: A subsidy for the cost of production, various forms of tax depreciation and writeoffs, an increase

in the nonmonetary price of gold. Precisely how to assist the industry is a complicated question for Congress and experts in the fields of mining, economics, and finance to discuss, to weigh, and to decide.

Because I believe that it is time for these discussions, time for these decisions, I introduce today a resolution to establish a Senate Select Committee on Domestic Gold Production.

The committee would consist of three members from each of the three Senate committees which have, over the years, concerned themselves with gold, its relationship to international finance, its production, and its effects upon the domestic economy: The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and the Senate Commerce Committee. The committee would be charged with the responsibility for conducting a comprehensive study of all aspects of domestic gold production.

A professional staff would be provided with sufficient money to retain the servics of trained specialists. These people would assist members of the committee in studying the history of domestic gold production, existing deposits to the extent that they can reasonably be determined, the economics and present state of the industry and the present sources of, and markets for, gold.

In addition, the committee would study possible techniques for making existing production more efficient, including electronic and chemical means for detecting the location of new deposits. In earlier hearings by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee some of these techniques were described.

The committee would concern itself with questions of international finance or monetary policy only to the extent that these subjects bear upon the state and future prospects of the domestic gold production industry.

The committee would prepare its study and any legislative recommendations it might have by the end of the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

Mr. President, I have for years—first as a delegate to Congress from the Territory of Alaska and more recently as a Senator from the 49th State—prepared many different gold bills. Sometimes I have urged these proposals on my own. Sometimes I have supported those of my western colleagues. Each of these proposals has been for some sort of specific legislation. And each time the Treasury Department has taken the position that the legislation is ill advised.

While professing that they have the most profound concern for the adverse effects that Treasury policies have had upon the domestic gold mining industry, representatives of the Treasury have repeatedly stated that they have no solution to offer. For example, in July 1963, a Treasury spokesman testified before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on a bill to pay a subsidy for the domestic mining of gold. A portion of his testimony at that time capsulizes Treasury's curious attitude toward the domestic gold mining industry:

> The Treasury is not unmindful of the human and economic problems caused by the closing of gold mines. We realize that it may seem unconstructive for this Department to recommend against legislative attempts to assist the gold industry when other businesses of various kinds are subsidized in our country and gold mining is subsidized in a number of countries abroad. In our view, however, this is the inevitable result of the unique link between gold and the dollar.

I ask the Senate, Mr. President, whether that is "the inevitable result" it desires. The reply surely must be a ringing "No."

Rather, is it not possible that a more dispassionate view, taken by a select committee of the Senate, might produce some more acceptable recommendations for curing the present sickness affecting the domestic gold mining industry? The Senate cannot sit idly by and watch the disappearance of a once great—and still potentially prosperous—industry without more justification than that given by the Department of the Treasury.

It is because the disappearance of the domestic gold mining industry must not be the "inevitable result of the unique link between gold and the dollar" that I submit at this time my proposed resolution for the establishment of the Senate Select Committee on Domestic Gold Production and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD. Because I believe that others of my colleagues may want to join with me in this proposal, I also ask unanimous consent that it remain on the table for a period of 10 days.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

The resolution (S. Res. 83) was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby established a select committee of the Senate to be known as the Select Committee on Domestic Gold Production (referred to hereinafter as the "Select Committee") which shall study the extent to which gold production in the United States is related to the national interest, the extent and character of gold production activity both actual and potential and the relationship of domestic gold production to the balance of international payments of the United States and the international money market, to the end that such studies and recommendations based thereon may be available to the Senate in considering domestic gold production policies for the future.

SEC. 2. (a) The Select Committee shall be composed of nine Members of the Senate designated by the President of the Senate of whom three shall be selected from members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, three shall be selected from members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and three shall be selected from members of the Committee on Commerce. Of the three members of the Select Committee chosen from members of each such standing committee, two shall be members of the majority party and one shall be a member of the minority party. The President of the Senate shall designate one Senator to serve as chairman of the Select Committee from those Senators appointed from the majority party.

(b) Any vacancy in the membership of the Select Committee shall not affect its powers, and any vacancy in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner as provided for determining the original membership.

(c) Five members of the Select Committee shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of business, except that the Select Committee may fix a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

(d) The Select Committee shall cease to exist at the close of business on December 31, 1966.

SEC. 3. The Select Committee shall, without limiting the scope of the study hereby authorized, direct its attention to the following matters:

(a) The current state of domestic gold production, the extent of gold deposits, the state of gold production technology and the nature of existing markets for gold.

(b) The nature of the industries utilizing gold and the nature of international gold transactions.

(c) The character of legislation that may revive and encourage domestic gold production and the alternatives available to Congress in this respect.

SEC. 4. The Select Committee shall transmit to the Senate not later than December 31, 1966, the results of the study herein authorized together with such recommendations as may at that time be found desirable.

SEC. 5. In the conduct of this study full use shall be made of the experience, knowledge, and advice of private organizations, schools, institutions, and individuals. The Select Committee may divide the work among such groups and institutions as it may deem appropriate and may enter into contracts for this purpose. Full use shall be made of studies and plans prepared by any department or agency of the executive branch of the Government, and any such department or agency is requested to give the Select Committee or any of its authorized study groups or consultants such assistance as may be required.

SEC. 6. (a) For the purpose of this resolution, the Select Committee is authorized to employ on a temporary basis through December 31, 1966, such technical, clerical, or other assistants, experts and consultants as it deems desirable. The expenses of the Select Committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $_____, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Select Committee. The chairman may designate one or more members who may act for him for the purpose of this resolution.

(b) For the purposes of this resolution, the Select Committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems desirable.

DEVELOPMENT OF A MODERN PASSENGER RAIL TRANSPORTATION SERVICE IN THE NORTHEASTERN SEABOARD AREA—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 46)

Mr. JAVITS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the

bill (S. 1234) to encourage the preservation and development of a modern and efficient passenger rail transportation service in the northeastern seaboard area by granting the consent and approval of Congress to the States of New York and Connecticut to negotiate and enter into a compact to create their own New York-Connecticut Rail Authority, and by guaranteeing certain bonds of, and furnishing certain assistance to, such authority, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

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

Authority of February 10, 1965:

S. 1109. A bill to preserve and protect the constitutional rights of the mentally ill: Mr. FONG.

Authority of February 17, 1965:

S. 1130. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees: Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. TOWER.

Authority of February 18, 1965:

S. 1200. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions: Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

Authority of February 23, 1965:

S. 1256. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, providing assistance to schools in federally impacted areas, in order to provide for a more gradual reduction of payments pursuant thereto as a result of termination of activities of the Department of Defense: Mr. CARLSON.

S. 1257. A bill to extend for 5 years Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, relating to Federal assistance to education in federally impacted areas: Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. LONG of Missouri.

BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS HEARINGS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] about the balance-of-payments hearings he will be holding next week.

In his statement, Senator MUSKIE expressed his thanks for the help and cooperation given by the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee [Mr. ROBERTSON] in connection with these hearings, which are the outgrowth of the gold reserve requirements bill which Senator ROBERTSON recently handled.

I want to join the Senator from Maine in these comments. Senator ROBERTSON has helped the administration and the leadership greatly by his able handling of the bill, and he is to be congratulated on the way in which he and Senator MUSKIE are cooperating in the balance-of-payments study.

There being no objection, the statement of Mr. MUSKIE was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS HEARINGS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I should like to announce the list of witnesses who are scheduled to appear before the International Finance Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee on March 9, 10, and 11. I believe we have an outstanding group of witnesses who will be able to present the problem in all of its aspects clearly and completely. They will be able to explain the trends and developments of our exports and imports of commodities and services, the movements of long- and short-term capital, governmental expenditures abroad, military and civilian, and the changes in official gold and foreign-exchange reserves. Through their testimony we will get a picture of how and why the problem has arisen and what the prospects for the future are as they see them. They will also be able to explain clearly for us the way the President's program fits into the balance-of-payments background and show what each of the agencies will do under the President's program.

Following these witnesses, we expect, as I announced yesterday, to hear from representatives of major industry groups, from individual businesses, and from economists and others with a special knowledge or interest in the field.

The chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee [Mr. ROBERTSON] and I have agreed that we should make a thorough and complete study of the matter, taking advantage of all previous hearings and studies which have been made in the field. The chairman and I have also agreed that it is incumbent upon us to come up with some definite affirmative recommendations for prompt and effective action to eliminate our balance-of-payments deficits.

I should like to express my appreciation for the help and cooperation which the chairman has given in scheduling and arranging for these hearings.

The list of witnesses to which I referred is as follows:

BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS HEARINGS

Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, Subcommittee on International Finance:

Tuesday, March 9, 1965: 10 a.m., Hon. C. Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury; 2:30 p.m., Hon. David E. Bell, Administrator, AID.

Wednesday, March 10, 1965: 10 a.m., Hon. William McC. Martin, Jr., Chairman, Federal Reserve Board; 2:30 p.m., Hon. Charles J. Hitch, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller).

Thursday, March 11, 1965: 10 a.m., Hon. John T. Connor, Secretary of Commerce; 2:30 p.m., Hon. Harold F. Linder, Chairman, Export-Import Bank.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary: Richard L. McVeigh, of Alaska, to be U.S. attorney, district of Alaska, for a term of 4 years; Vice Warren C. Colver, resigned.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Monday, March 8, 1965, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 45) to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PATMAN, Mr. MULTER, Mr. BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. FINO, and Mr. HALPERN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

A statement in support of the fundraising appeal by the National Council of Christ in the U.S.A. the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and the United Jewish Appeal.

TRIBUTE TO JUSTICE FRANKFURTER

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Little Justice," written by Joseph Alsop and published in the Washington Post of February 26. As one who was in law school under Professor Frankfurter and who enjoyed the friendship of Mr. Justice Frankfurter during the years I have been here in Washington, I believe that Mr. Alsop's article well expresses the feelings of so many of us toward Felix Frankfurter.

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

MATTER OF FACT: THE LITTLE JUSTICE

(By Joseph Alsop)

Too often, tears for friends now lost are chiefly shed for youth long gone. Too often, regrets for past times were chiefly voiced from an unspoken sense of the bitterness of the advancing years.

But what has been, and hereafter will be, said and written about Felix Frankfurter is bound to be largely free of these mixed motives. For he was a human creature so unique, so vigorously idiosyncratic, so intensely singular that the sheer absorbing interest of the man himself is bound to dominate any discussion of him.

"The Little Justice," his countless younger friends called him, half in affectionate mockery, half in bewildered wonder that so much zest and energy and love of life, so much gaiety and intellectual curiosity and largeness of heart and mind, could be miraculously

compressed into that small, brisk human frame.

Yet little he never was, except in inches. By every other test, he was one of the small company of truly big men of his era. For his impact on the law, one must accept the lawyers' judgment. But his impact on men and on events was greater still. Herein lies the mystery of Felix Frankfurter.

In brief, he wielded very great power from his green youth to his extreme old age, yet he never at any time held any position in which this kind of power naturally inhered. How then was this power achieved?

Asking this question, mind you, is quite different from asking how his outward success was achieved. His outward success was achieved by a wonderful combination of courage and intellect, application and "chutzpah"—to use a word of his people that he sometimes liked to use himself.

These were the qualities that made his career the kind of poor immigrant child's success story that is one of the justifications of this Republic before the judgment seat of history. And there perhaps, almost by indirection, one has also stumbled on the secret of his power.

For he was not uninfluenced by the fact that America gave him his chance, the fact that he could start so low and rise so high, the fact that he walked and sat among the great with neither wealth, nor high connections, nor any other thing to aid him. For what America gave him, he gave in return. And his answering gift was an incomparably noble idea of America.

It was this vision of Felix Frankfurter's, of what America had been, and was, and ought to become, that set the standards by which he judged all public questions and, one must add, all public men. If the man seemed unworthy, if the answer to the question did not seem to measure up, both were ruthlessly condemned.

But the fact that Felix Frankfurter's standards were singularly stern, especially for one with such unbounded warmth of heart, was not what really mattered. What mattered, rather, was that he not only cherished an idea of America that was very special and very noble, he also possessed an astonishing ability to infect others with the same idea.

From the time of Theodore Roosevelt to the time of John F. Kennedy, those who deserved well of this Republic for the service they rendered, or the burdens they bore, or the new departures that they sponsored, were also those who held Felix Frankfurter in special honor and respect.

They turned to him, moreover. He did not seek them out. And they turned to him, one may guess, precisely because that idea of America which shone through all his acts and all his talk was to them an inspiration and a refreshment. They cared what he thought of them because they were stirred by the standard that he set for this country of ours, and therefore for their service to our country.

Read the roll. The first Roosevelt and the second—Henry L. Stimson and George C. Marshall (those granite statues of antique virtue)—the great Holmes and the mighty Brandeis—all the brilliant figures of the years when the young New Dealers were called "Frankfurter's boys"—Jean Monnet, Dean G. Acheson and the other leaders in the heroic time when, as the President put it, "Mr. New Deal became Mr. Win the War"—these were the Frankfurter circle.

They loved him, and they looked to him. Now he is gone. But their names alone, with his among them, are enough to make us proud and grateful.

POLITICAL SLURS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in this morning's issue of the Washington Post there appeared an article by William S. White entitled "Political Slurs: KUCHEL's Stand Praised." Those of us who are in public life must receive not only the congratulations, but also the criticisms that go with our responsibility. We know that. But we also know that when those criticisms are unfair, unjust, and slanderous, we have an extremely difficult decision to make as to what to do about them.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD because it expresses so well the difficult decision that the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] had to make and his courage in making the decision in the way that he did to press indictments against those who slandered him so very unfairly and unwisely. Mr. White's article expresses my feelings on the subject very clearly.

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

POLITICAL SLURS: KUCHEL'S STAND PRAISED

(By William S. White)

Politicians everywhere are watching with the most painful intentness the rare course taken by one of their number in going straight to the criminal courts against smears going beyond even the very relaxed limits to which the profession is accustomed.

Like his fellow politicians generally, Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, of California, the assistant Republican leader of the Senate, is accustomed to being called some pretty ugly things and simply shaking his head and proceeding about his business.

There is a tradition in the trade that it is both bad form and bad luck to try to run down every slander; that the public expects the politician to suffer in silence. His skin is presumed to be far thicker than that of other men; and because it is so presumed by so many it must in actual fact be far thicker, if the poor fellow is to live at all.

Still, even the normally mild and amiable KUCHEL—the most powerful Republican in California and quite possibly a man destined one day for national office—has had enough. Last fall, there appeared in California and on various far rightwing mailing lists across the country a document concerning him which was so nasty as to offend the very sewers into which all decent people receiving it should straightaway have dropped it.

It falsely accused KUCHEL, on the basis of an alleged police arrest that never even happened, of drunkenness and immorality of a peculiarly revolting kind. He faced, then, the keenest of problems. Should he help spread this evil rubbish by going to the authorities and demanding an official investigation? Would it not be the safer and more discreet course simply to try to ignore it all, on the uphappily sound theory that he who touches pitch, even if involuntarily, is to some extent himself defiled?

To his great credit, KUCHEL came to the conclusion that he owed it to his profession and to his country—and of course also to himself—to take up the challenge. For if character destruction of this kind were allowed to run free, an immensely vicious precedent could be set: It would be like saying to the well poisoners of our time that the sky was the limit; that anything whatever could go in politics.

So he went to the district attorney and grand jury in Los Angeles and asked an independent investigation. The grand jury has found, in the words of District Attorney Evelle Younger, that the accusations against KUCHEL were "false, reckless, malicious and vicious." Certain persons have been indicted for conspiracy to libel. Their guilt or innocence is not any part of the business of this column, but only of the courts.

KUCHEL himself believes it was all an exceptionally bitter rightwing plot, since he is what is commonly called a liberal Republican and has long been in the bad books of ultraconservatives in and outside California. Perhaps so; perhaps not. Again it is the job of the court to sort out guilt or innocence and motivation and all that.

Moreover, it is not the aim of this columnist to criticize honorable attacks, however tough, upon any politician or officeholder, nor to suggest that only rightwing people can ambush the character of others. Some of the lefties can be very mean, too.

It is, however, definitely the aim to salute KUCHEL for standing up like a man against the filth flung at him and for taking a long-needed pilot-model step in public hygiene against a sick form of political attack that is becoming all too common in our national life.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of a statement issued several days ago by Members of the Senate, the House of Representatives, and a number of Governors of States in connection with the grave and important problem of civil rights and the urgent need for new voter registration laws be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

The attached statement was issued last night by the following Republicans: Govs. John Chaffee, of Rhode Island; George Romney, of Michigan; William Scranton, of Pennsylvania; Robert E. Smylie, of Idaho; John Volpe, of Massachusetts; Senators GORDON ALLOTT, of Colorado; JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York; THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California; HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania; Representatives WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, of Michigan; SILVIO O. CONTE, of Massachusetts; FLORENCE P. DWYER, of New Jersey; ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, of Kansas; PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey; JAMES G. FULTON, of Pennsylvania; SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York; JAMES HARVEY, of Michigan; FRANK J. HORTON, of New York; JOHN V. LINDSAY, of New York; JOSEPH M. MCDADE, of Pennsylvania; WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, of California; CLARK MACGREGOR, of Minnesota; CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR., of Maryland; F. BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts; OGDEN R. REID, of New York; DONALD RUMSFELD, of Illinois; RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, of Pennsylvania; JOHN W. WYDLER, of New York; ALPHONZO BELL, of California; ALBERT H. QUIE, of Minnesota; and WILLIAM STANTON, of Ohio.

STATEMENT

Of principal concern today is securing for all Americans the fundamental right to vote. It has always been our chief security against tyranny. In man's history, we doubt that there has ever been a more perfect mating of a cherished right with an accepted responsibility than in the American experience.

What is the Johnson administration doing to meet the following problems?

1. The need for new voter registration laws, as pointed up so dramatically by the Reverend Martin Luther King's crusade in Selma, Ala.

2. Carrying out the intention of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by appointing Commissioners to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. It is the objective of this Commission to supervise the orderly transition of social change throughout the Nation, and to insure economic equality. But to

date, not a single Commissioner has been appointed.

3. Filling the vacancy in the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

The fifth circuit vacancy was created last April, nearly a year ago, when one of the members of the fifth circuit died. The circuit has a huge workload. In the last report on Federal judicial business, the Administrative Office of the U.S. courts said the fifth circuit was "literally overwhelmed." The absence of one judge slows down the pace of the court because with only eight judges, the circuit can work in only two panels rather than three.

The fifth circuit includes Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Georgia, Florida, and Texas, areas where racial problems and denial of rights are particularly acute.

We call on President Johnson to fill this vacancy promptly so that consideration of the cases pending in the Fifth Circuit can be accelerated. But above all, the President should recommend an individual whose record clearly shows that he will uphold the constitutional rights of citizens.

The Supreme Court's historic one-man, one-vote principle has created a great national upheaval. To comply with the rulings of the courts, virtually every State with a bicameral legislature is in the throes of adjusting to that principle by wholesale reapportionment. In some States, the courts have held that one of every two persons is unfairly represented in the State legislature.

But in Dallas County, Ala., only 1 Negro in 35 has even the right to vote, let alone have that vote count fairly in the election of his representatives.

If the statistic of 1 out of 2 requires, in the court's view, the most drastic reapportionment action, what can be said of a situation where only 1 of 35 Negroes has any representation at all?

In Dallas County, Ala., just a few months ago, there were 29,515 persons of voting age. Of these 14,400 were white and 15,115 Negro. Of the 14,400 white persons, 9,542 were registered to vote. Of the 15,115 Negroes, only 335 were registered to vote. Thus, in Dallas County, 70 percent of the whites were registered and 2 percent of the Negroes.

How long will Congress and the American people be asked to wait while this administration studies and restudies Dr. King's request for new Federal legislation? The need is apparent. The time is now.

Republicans have introduced legislation for a system of Federal voting registrars, either presidentially appointed or court appointed.

Despite abuse, threats and beatings, Dr. King and his people walk the streets of Selma in protest.

Republicans march with them. Their cause is just. The administration must move and move promptly to remove the cause of their protests.

For our history has shown time and time again, the exercise of the ballot and freedom go hand in hand; that the ability of Americans to live in harmony coincides with the right freely to choose among policies and systems by which we would be governed.

THE CHOICE IS YOURS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KUCHEL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a week ago, I had the honor to spend 2 delightfully stimulating days on the campus of Yale University. On the evening of Tuesday, February 23, I was invited to speak before the Yale Political Union. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my comments on that occasion be set forth in full in the RECORD.

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

THE CHOICE IS YOURS

(Partial text of the remarks by U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL before the Yale Political Union, Yale University, New Haven, Conn., Tuesday, February 23, 1965)

Nineteen hundred and sixty-four might well go down in the history of the Republican Party not merely as its year of suicidal tragedy, but also as its year of newly recognized challenge. For the Republican Party, like our Nation, stands at another threshold. It is the threshold of a new era—an era of youth and urbanism, of greater educational and skilled job opportunities, and of cultural and racial enlightenment. It is an era of unresolved problems both at home and abroad. Across the seas new and smaller nations struggle for identity and progress. And in every hemisphere, totalitarian communism continues its struggle to engulf mankind.

In 1964, Republicans lost because they did not keep faith with their basic principles or with the programs which the overwhelming majority of elected Republicans and rank-and-file Republicans supported. Thus, overwhelming Senate Republican support for the mutual security program, for the United Nations loan, for a limited nuclear test ban treaty, for civil rights legislation, for measures to support educational opportunity and manpower retraining, to name but a few, were quickly forgotten. And the Nation, and the party, watched in immobilized fascination as a small, zealous and willful handful slowly captured the mechanism of a great political party.

The results of November 3 were not so much support for the present administration as the repudiation of a party which temporarily seemed to have forgotten its heritage.

With the exceptions that take place when men do political combat with each other over time, by and large the Republican Party since its founding in the explosive decade before the Civil War has stood consistently for certain broad principles and themes of public policy. With Abraham Lincoln, early Republicans fought for a preservation of the Union—for a nation rather than for separate States—for internal improvements to bind together a growing America, and for freemen.

It was Lincoln, in a speech in Springfield, 6 years prior to his election in 1860, who provided Republicans with a criterion as applicable today as it was then as we seek to determine what programs are appropriate and inappropriate for government to undertake. Said the first Republican President:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or so well do for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

It was for succeeding generations to determine the community to be served and the level of government most appropriate to meet those needs. It was for succeeding generations to determine whether particular needs of society might most appropriately be met by the public or the private sectors of our economy or by a combination of the two. Thus have ensued the struggle and the challenge of federalism and of a free economy regulated in the public interest. It has been the Republican Party, whether led by Theodore Roosevelt, Robert A. Taft, or Dwight D. Eisenhower, which has attempted to strike the correct balance between the demands of a few and the welfare of the many. Antitrust regulation, conservation of our natural resources, equitable labor-management relations, and incentive for the States and the private economy to solve specific problems have all been Republican initiatives.

Serious problems confront our Nation in the jungles of South Vietnam, in the weakened NATO alliance, in the financing of the United Nations, and in the growing probability of proliferating nuclear nations. Millions of fellow human beings suffer from ill health and malnutrition. Is it too much to expect to put some of the finest minds in the country, who are Republicans, to work on these problems. Perhaps, as in science, a breakthrough is in order by leapfrogging ahead of the inertia of ideas and practice which often builds up in the governmental mechanism.

In international affairs, the Republican Party has never been like the proverbial ostrich with its head in the sand despite the outcries one hears from a few "againers" in our party, who would abandon the United Nations, repeal the income tax, repudiate mutual security and junk the theory of collective security alliances such as NATO. This small handful, a throwback to isolation, sees no good abroad and very little good at home. They label, automatically, as Communist-inspired almost any proposal for progress.

It was Republican James G. Blaine, who as Secretary of State conceived of the Pan-American Union. It was Republican William McKinley, who stated clearly that America had a responsibility to educate backward peoples and to help bring them into the 20th century. It was Republican Theodore Roosevelt who used the office of the Presidency to promote peace between warring nations such as Russia and Japan. It was Republicans, such as Wendell Willkie, Henry L. Stimson, and Herbert Hoover, who clearly stated America's responsibilities in combating foreign dictatorships whether of the left or of the right. It was Republican Christian Herter, as chairman of a special committee in the Republican controlled 80th Congress, who recommended, along with another Republican, the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg, that stricken Western Europe, the victors and the vanquished, be resuscitated, and that we agree with the Atlantic nations to stand together in defense of the freedom of each of us.

Republicans in the U.S. Senate during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations have worked to strengthen the President's hand in Cuba, in Berlin, in mutual security, and in South Vietnam. We gave leadership to Senate ratification of the nuclear treaty.

As an American, I hope that the foreign policy of the Johnson administration may be successful. All free men must work to advance the cause of peace and freedom. As a Republican, I am concerned that abstract piety not be a substitute for calm and courage. Republicans, under Eisenhower, squarely faced the tensions and the threats and demonstrated, I think, a unity and determination in such crises as Guatemala, Berlin, Suez, Lebanon, and the Formosa Straits. Americans, under a Democratic administration, deserve no less. The times demand candor in stating for the American people why we must continue to sacrifice in far-away and inconvenient places if we are to prevent the inevitable encroachment upon free peoples which seems to be the appetite of totalitarian states.

When the Republican Party has welcomed to its ranks men and women of good will from all walks of life, from all faiths, and from all races it has been successful in National, State and local elections. When it has not, a national political tragedy such as 1964 was inevitable.

I believe that freedom has been best preserved and human well-being best advanced in the American society by two vigorous, competitive political parties, each creatively seeking to devise methods by which decently

to gain the confidence of a majority of people and go on to win. Yet, only once since 1932, has a Republican captured the Presidency, the highest prize of American politics. Only twice since 1932, have Republicans controlled Congress. Public opinion polls show that nationally but a quarter of the American people identify themselves with the Republican Party, while the remainder consider themselves as Democrats or independents.

A persistent imbalance in political power in favor of a single political party poses considerable of a peril to our system, even though the laws provide a paper opportunity at regular intervals for potential change. A persistent partisan imbalance in any level of our government is conducive to political autocracy, and a little wheeling and dealing, or worse. There is one less check or balance. And to the habitual losers, there is frustration, despair, and occasional irresponsibility.

Such an imbalance may well continue in a society of apparent plenty. Over time, a lack of change and a lack of dynamic political exertions may indicate some superficial comfort. Comfort breeds habit. Yet, with habit comes inertia, and inertia produces a sterility of the mind.

Such a society lives too near to danger. All the procedures of a well-established written constitution and all the armaments that a scientific elite can devise cannot avert danger for such a society. Sterility of the mind means that men all too easily accept appearance for reality, imagery for content, public relations for public programs. Such sterility of the mind can mean a paper settlement at Geneva instead of actual political stability in southeast Asia. It can mean a continued nibbling at the edges of poverty and unemployment rather than facing the hard decisions required, the moral awakening involved, and the sacrifice needed to expand educational, health, and job opportunities for young and old alike.

Nowhere is such mental sterility more apparent than in our cities, which continue to be clogged with slums, with traffic, and with crime. Racial tensions remain. All the urban renewal and public housing in the world will not mean a better America unless we work to aid people in becoming better. Houses alone do not cure the problem. Money alone, no matter how bountifully expended, does not make for morality. Legislation alone cannot guarantee solutions.

The need is for dedication, for thought, for a decent consecration by our people to the public interest and to public affairs. Who can provide this leadership? Who can fill the vacuum which now exists in this land and in the Republican Party? You can, and so must the rest of young America if we are to protect what we have, and to go about improving our lot and discharging our duty to mankind.

The birth rate of the Second World War has provided the Republican Party with a new opportunity which, regrettably, it was not able to provide for itself. Next year 1 million more young Americans will reach age 18 than have this year. The average yearly increase in America's teenage labor force in the 1960's will be almost six times the average yearly increase in the 1950's. By the next presidential election, the age of the average American will have dropped from 33 years of age in 1960 to 25 or less.

You and your companions enter American life with a clean slate. For you, the political battles of the 1930's have faded and receded into history. You are entering a society where our philosophy must be one of ever-expanding horizons for all, rather than merely dividing up what exists between the haves and the have-nots. You are entering a society where all the slogans and imagery of the past, "New Frontier," "Fair Deal," or "New Deal" will not solve the problems of an urbanized America and a deeply troubled world.

Without the rigor of thought and the enthusiasm for ideas which an education such as yours should provide; without the self-discipline to face a variety of challenges; without the will to deal with reality rather than appearances, this Republic could decay. Yours is a historic opportunity to strengthen the Nation by bringing your own energy and your zeal to the service of the Republic through the Republican Party.

Our system of two strong political parties was not ordained in the Scriptures or the Constitution, yet it must survive, it must remain, if our unique American free society is to continue. Make no mistake about it. If the grand old Republican Party were to become a shriveled, shrunken, impotent political haven for an anachronistic few, then vast changes, and not for the good, either, would enter our way of life. This country urgently needs a viable, forward-looking, national Republican Party, to participate in affairs of Government and to win elections. And the Republican Party urgently needs you. Thus the choice is yours to make.

APPOINTMENT OF KENNETH E. BELIEU AS UNDER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY WELL EARNED

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, all Senators are delighted that the President has appointed Hon. Kenneth E. BeLieu Under Secretary of the Navy. We in this Chamber are well acquainted with the high sense of honor, integrity, and devotion to the public trust which it has been Secretary BeLieu's splendid duty to discharge to his country, both in uniform and now as a peacetime civilian servant of the U.S. Navy. The San Diego Union, the other day, commented on the appointment of Mr. BeLieu to be Under Secretary of the Navy. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial in that California newspaper appearing February 11, be printed in the RECORD.

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

PROMOTION EARNED

The appointment of Kenneth E. BeLieu as Under Secretary of the Navy is a well-earned promotion for him and good news for the national security.

Mr. BeLieu brings stature and a wealth of military experience to his new position. He has been decorated for service in two armed conflicts and held top-level executive positions, including Assistant Secretary of the Navy for installations and logistics.

As an administrator, Mr. BeLieu showed a broad understanding of problems and established rapport with career officers and men in all branches of the Armed Forces. Much of the understanding came from personal visits to installations, including San Diego.

In our opinion the choice of Mr. BeLieu for the second ranking civilian in the Navy Department shows an awareness of the President of the importance of strengthening the sinews of seapower.

SENATOR KUCHEL'S COMMENTS ON THE SITUATION IN INDOCHINA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on Friday, February 19, in the city of San Francisco, I had the honor to speak to the 19th Annual Convention of the Western States Meatpackers Association. A portion of my comments were devoted to the tragedy and travail which the free world now faces in far off Indochina. I ask unanimous consent that the partial text of my remarks on that occasion, entitled "Challenge to Freedom," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

CHALLENGE TO FREEDOM

(Partial text of remarks by U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL before the Western States Meatpackers Association, Inc., 19th Annual Convention, Sheraton-Palace Hotel, San Francisco, Calif., Friday, February 19, 1965)

These are fateful and dangerous days for our country and for the West. The freedom we know is not ours simply for the asking. It is ours to protect and to defend, as well as to cherish and enjoy. Freedom is challenged today all around the world and in every hemisphere. That is nothing new. Such a challenge has faced mankind throughout its existence. There have always been bullies and tyrants intent upon overrunning their neighbors.

In our lifetime, yours and mine, the Western democracies have stood together in two world wars to vanquish aggression. Then came the Korean conflict. With Soviet and Red Chinese assistance, North Korea crossed the 38th parallel in June 1950 to attack free South Korea. The United Nations Security Council forthrightly condemned the Communists as aggressors, and the United Nations came to the aid of the free Koreans. Our own country bore the burden of that defense far more than any other nation. We suffered 157,000 casualties and spent $18 billions in that frightful struggle.

In time of adversity, when the gravest kind of peril has come near, the West has united. But as adversity began to recede, Western unity relaxed, and our allies, or, at any rate, some of them, began to go their separate ways.

Who are our adversaries? Tyranny and slavery are our foes, and always will be, no matter whether they appear under the tawdry banner of international communism or dictatorship in any form. We believe in freedom. We believe in justice. We believe in peace. That is our creed. But safety does not come from putting one's head in the sand. You do not avoid trouble by turning away or running away from it.

A war rages in Indochina today, and the events of the last few weeks heighten its danger. Like it or not, the United States is there and participating in it. It is too late to debate the question whether the United States should have responded in 1954 to a cry for help from a new country and a small country seeking to preserve its newly found independence. The fact remains that we joined in an agreement to defend southeast Asia against aggression, and South Vietnam, by protocol, was a state to be protected.

On October 1, 1954, General Eisenhower announced our policy as one of assisting Vietnam "in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means."

Five years later General Eisenhower said: "Unassisted, Vietnam cannot at this time produce and support the military formations essential to it or, equally important, the morale—the hope, the confidence, the pride—necessary to meet the dual threat of aggression from without and subversion within its borders.

"Strategically, South Vietnam's capture by the Communists would bring their power several hundred miles into a hitherto free region. The remaining countries in southeast Asia would be menaced by a great flanking movement. * * * The loss of South Vietnam would set in motion a crumbling process that could, as it progressed, have grave consequences for us and for freedom."

Through the administration of the late President Kennedy and now in the administration of President Johnson, Red communism has continued, indeed, has intensified its campaign of infiltration, subversion, and aggression against South Vietnam. Last year, to make crystal clear before the world the unity of the American people with respect to our policy in Indochina, a congressional resolution was adopted on August 7 which said in part:

"The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. Consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom."

Our goals are immutable. They will not and must not change. America continues to seek peace. We believe in peace. We abhor aggression. We have no territorial aims nor desire to establish a colony in southeast Asia or any place else. It is entirely the other way around. It is communism which desires to impose its will upon free peoples, and, one by one, to further its goals toward complete subjugation of the globe. We seek an end to Communist attacks on South Vietnam. Peace can be attained simply by a cessation of all the Red raids and sneak attacks on the South Vietnamese. The Geneva Conference Agreements of 1954, to cease hostilities in Vietnam can, even now, be respected. There is yet time for the Communists to fulfill their promise, but the hour is growing late.

We search for ways to help the South Vietnamese people achieve stability in their government and in their economy. We earnestly wish to help them to preserve their own independence. If North Vietnam would let their non-Communist neighbors live in peace, and if the barbaric Marxist regime in Red China would stop pushing and prodding the Vietcong, trouble would immediately abate.

Must not all Americans demonstrate a solidarity of purpose behind our President? I believe we must and I believe we do. Communism must not misunderstand us.

And peace loving nations in Asia and elsewhere must see, clearly, that when America pledges aid to those in danger, her pledge has no hollow ring. When communism attacks her neighbor, and cruelly massacres South Vietnamese and our fellow citizens, our joint retaliation must be swift and sure—and sufficient.

Let South Vietnam fall, let Laos crumble completely away, and you undermine Cambodia and leave Thailand a quarry, ready for the taking. Burma and India could easily be swept into the vortex. Malaysia's danger from Indonesia would mount. Freedom in southeast Asia, and beyond, would face a beckoning doom.

The cause of man's freedom everywhere is very deeply concerned with the potential loss of freedom anywhere, in this vastly shrunken planet. Let our country stand, firm and resolute, for the decent right of man to live his own life, or, in Kipling's words, "Leave to live by no man's leave underneath the law."

CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE CANYON DAM ON THE LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, earlier, I requested the Department of the Interior to comment on questions raised by sundry constituents of mine with respect to the proposed construction of Bridge Canyon Dam as a part of the Lower Colorado River Basin development project. I have received an answer from Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Kenneth Holum, who discusses in detail the position of the Department of the Interior on the matter. I ask unanimous consent that that letter be set forth in full in the RECORD.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., February 17, 1965.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: This letter is in response to your January 13 referral of the letter dated January 7 from Mr. Peter Carey of Piedmont, Calif. In response to your request, we have listed below information in regard to the proposed Bridge Canyon Dam for your use in reply to the 12 points raised in the letter.

1. There is no evidence to support a claim that construction of Bridge Canyon Dam would have any material effect on salinity of the Colorado River. The geologic or physical formations in Bridge Canyon are not expected to contribute to water quality deterioration. As has been observed at Lake Mead, we would expect some saline materials to precipitate and thus offset the slight adverse effect of evaporation.

2. The increased evaporation at Bridge Canyon Reservoir, estimated to be about 85,000 acre-feet annually, would decrease the flow of the Colorado River. This could not significantly affect the plant and animal life on the banks of Lake Mead, which is located immediately below the Bridge Canyon site, or that on the banks of the Colorado River below Lake Mead.

3. As stated above, the increased evaporation due to Bridge Canyon is estimated to be 85,000 acre-feet annually, which is about 1 percent of the regulated average riverflow at this point. This is a significant amount of water in an area as dry as the Pacific Southwest. However, it is nowise near the 200 million acre-feet claimed in the letter which is more than 20 times greater than the entire regulated flow of the river at this point.

4 and 5. It is, of course, a fact that the Colorado River carries a relatively large sediment load. The magnitude of this load has been measured at various locations by our Geological Survey, beginning in 1925. We now know that early estimates of the rate at which Lake Mead will entrap sediment were extremely liberal and, from analysis of sedimentation data obtained over the years, the expected life of this man-made reservoir has been increased manifold. In 1948–49, surveys made jointly by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Geological Survey, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Department of the Navy revealed that Lake Mead would have a useful life of 400 to 500 years without upstream silt control. Completion of Glen Canyon Dam is expected to prolong the life of Lake Mead indefinitely. Coconino Dam and Reservoir on the Little Colorado River in Arizona, which is planned as a part of the Bridge Canyon project, would reduce the sediment load of the Colorado still further. Additional surveys of Lake Mead were begun in the spring of last year by the Coast and Geodetic Survey to reappraise the effect of siltation since the original study was made and to establish a base condition following the construction of Glen Canyon Dam. It is not true that Bridge Canyon Reservoir, which would be located immediately above Lake Mead, would have a useful life of less than 50 years.

6. Creation of a barren ring of sludge and muck, about 20 feet wide, around the lake's perimeter appears highly unlikely, particularly in view of the fact that much of the perimeter is composed of nearly vertical walls and also in view of the fact that the fluctuation of the reservoir would be largely restricted to the upper 4 feet of the reservoir.

7. Bridge Canyon Reservoir would inundate 93 miles of a stretch of the Colorado River that has been extremely difficult to reach. Although the inundated area would be impaired as far as zoological and botanical research is concerned, areas hitherto unvisited will be readily accessible for these purposes, as in the case of Lake Powell.

8 and 9. The Bridge Canyon Reservoir was never intended as a water preserve. Its principal function will be to provide needed peaking power and the revenues that are essential to achieve required levels of operation of the Pacific Southwest water plan. Atomic and fossil fuels are best adapted to produce what is called baseload energy and are most efficient only when their units are producing energy at a nearly uniform rate. The so-called peaking-type energy can be most economically produced by hydroelectric generation such as the powerplant proposed at Bridge Canyon Dam. The integration of these two resources is necessary to produce the total electrical product to meet the pattern of demand.

10 and 11. We are not aware of any promise, particularly as far as the Department of the Interior is concerned, that no other dams would be built in the canyon of the Colorado River for many years. The act of February 26, 1919 (40 Stat. 1175), creating Grand Canyon National Park, contains a reservation contemplating possible need in the future for a narrow infringement, such as would be herein involved, to accommodate reclamation developments. In view of this reservation, the Bridge Canyon proposal is consistent with existing law. The need, long contemplated as possible, is now here.

12. Secretary Udall has recommended the construction of Bridge Canyon Dam, even though he recognizes that in terms of well-established national park principles the creation of a manmade lake on a 13-mile stretch of the national park would "impair the scenic beauty" of the Grand Canyon National Park. He has noted, however, that such a reservoir invasion would be a peripheral one which would occur in the most remote and inaccessible area of the park. He has stated that if there were any other site for a major dam which did not carry with it even the slight impairment of the park values resulting from a high dam at Bridge Canyon, he would not recommend that high dam. However, it is his view that the urgency of the need for water in the Pacific Southwest and the requirement for the revenues from the high dam under presently applicable feasibility standards far outweigh the slight impairment of the park values which Congress anticipated might result from the water development proposed in the Pacific Southwest water plan.

We appreciate your interest in the Pacific Southwest water plan. Mr. Carey's letter is enclosed as you requested.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH HOLUM,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

RECHANNELING A 16-MILE STRETCH OF THE LOWER COLORADO RIVER

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Department of the Interior is engaged in a program which is expected to extend over a 4 or 5 year period in rechanneling

a 16-mile stretch of the meandering channels of the lower Colorado River.

Many of the fine citizens of the State of California have expressed concern and alarm that the channelization program may be detrimental to the use of the river for fish and wildlife and recreation.

I have expressed this concern to the Department of the Interior and have received in reply a letter from Commissioner Floyd E. Dominy of the Bureau of Reclamation which concludes that the work being done will actually tend to improve the recreational advantages of the area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the letter received from Commissioner Dominy, together with a copy of the press release of the Department of the Interior, dated February 6, 1965, and an article entitled "Dredging the Braided Colorado," by Paul A. Oliver, regional river control engineer, Boulder City, Nev., appearing in the February 1965 edition of the Reclamation Era, and an article entitled "Reclamation in the Rio Grande Area Aided by Watershed Work," by Herbert I. Jones.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D.C., January 27, 1965.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: This is in response to your letter of January 13, 1965, concerning the Bureau of Reclamation's channelization program on the lower Colorado River.

The channelization program on the lower Colorado River is a carefully planned development designed to reduce the suspended sediment load in the river and to salvage badly needed water now being used nonbeneficially by phreatophytes. In many reaches the river will be converted from wide-braided channels to a single, controlled channel. Those areas in which the channel is overwide, in poor alinement, or has a combination of these defects will be consolidated into an improved channel by constructing jetties and other training structures. Banks which are subject to cutting will be stabilized by shaping and applying a blanket of riprap.

Although the primary purposes of our channelization program are water salvage and reduction of sediment, the interests of wildlife and recreational groups have been thoroughly considered in the overall planning. The lower Colorado River land use plan recently initiated by the Department will improve the recreational advantages of the entire lower Colorado River. In addition the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge, recently established in Cibola Valley by the Secretary of the Interior, will provide substantial benefits to the wildlife program in that particular area. In recent weeks representatives of our regional office in Boulder City, Nev., have had numerous meetings with local groups all along the lower Colorado River to discuss the coordination of recreation and fish and wildlife interests with our channelization program.

A gradual decline in the water level in the Topock Swamp has been taking place for a number of years as a result of the degradation of the Colorado River channel in the downstream Topock Gorge. As a result of this gradual lowering of the water level together with channel aggradation near the entrance to the swamp waterways, access to the swamp from the river by boat has been somewhat limited, particularly during low water periods. This condition would be further aggravated upon completion of the Bureau's planned channelization work in the gorge. Since the Topock Swamp is a part of the Lake Havasu National Wildlife Refuge, we plan to dredge out an entrance to the swamp and to the boating access channels. This work plus other minor improvements will make available an improved access to the waterways of the swamp and thus should tend to improve the recreational advantages of the area.

We trust that the above information will be of value to you in replying to inquiries from your constituents regarding this program. However, should you need further information, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely yours,

FLOYD E. DOMINY,
Commissioner.

INTERIOR AGENCIES REACH AGREEMENT ON STABILIZING TOPOCK MARSH AREA ON LOWER COLORADO RIVER

Secretary Stewart L. Udall said today that Department of the Interior officials have reached agreement on measures for stabilizing water levels in the Topock Marsh on the lower Colorado River near Needles, Calif., to maintain recreation and fish and wildlife values in connection with the channel rectification program now in progress.

The agreement was reached at a conference in Washington, D.C., attended by members of Secretary Udall's administrative and legal staffs, and officials of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Secretary Udall said the Bureau of Reclamation will construct a dike at the lower end of the Topock Marsh and an inlet channel from the Colorado River into the upper end of the marsh, in order to raise and stabilize water levels within a large portion of the marsh which is highly valued by fishermen and as a feeding and nesting area for waterfowl. The size and exact location of the dike, spoil areas for dumping dredged material from the river channel, and other details will be worked out by Reclamation and Fish and Wildlife Service field staffs, Secretary Udall added. State and local officials will also be consulted on the measures to be taken.

"These measures will raise the water level in a large area of the Topock Marsh by 2 or 3 feet," Secretary Udall said, "and remove any possible threat to fish and wildlife values that would be caused by the natural channel degradation now taking place."

Secretary Udall added that a series of similar meetings will be held in the field to coordinate recreation, fish and wildlife, and water conservation activities on other reaches of the lower Colorado River. Discussions will include Reclamation's planned channelization and water salvage work on the lower river which are estimated to be capable of conserving an average of 256,000 acre-feet of water every year for beneficial uses.

[From the Reclamation Era, February 1965]

DREDGING THE BRAIDED COLORADO

(By Paul A. Oliver, regional river control engineer)

In a work program expected to extend over 4 to 5 years, a 16-mile stretch of the interlacing and meandering channels of the lower Colorado River in Cibola Valley will be rechanneled into a canal-like section which promises to repay work costs in salvaged water.

The *Colorado*, a 20-inch, hydraulic, cutterhead dredge, is named after the river. It sits on the waters of the braided Colorado River and tirelessly churns and pumps—dredging up silt and sand to salvage water. This patient creature, and two smaller ones of almost the same design, can be found at work on the California-Arizona border part of the river for the next several years. The work they do will salvage a lot of water which can be put to practical use in water-short areas.

Credit goes to the *Colorado* for rechanneling 30 miles of the Colorado River, completed 4 years ago near Needles, Calif. By that correction work, water tables were lowered and drainage improved, resulting in 60,000 acre-feet of water salvaged per year.

Work started this year in the Cibola Valley south of Blythe will save approximately 36,000 acre-feet a year. In fact, the total river improvement program, conservatively estimated, is expected to recover annually some 190,000 acre-feet of water now being lost to evaporation and transpiration from the 240 miles of river between Davis Dam and the border of Mexico. It will also reduce erosion and sediment which have been detrimental to downstream irrigation facilities.

The probability of summer floods up to the maximum level is always considered in the designing of water developments.

Although construction of upstream dams on the lower Colorado has reduced floods to some extent, a floodflow of 80,000 cubic feet per second could be expected from the drainage basin below Parker Dam and above the Cibola Valley project area. Seven major tributary washes having a total drainage area of 5,200 square miles terminate in this river reach.

As a result of the construction of levees along each side, the channel will contain the floodflows which probably will occur seasonally.

In order to protect the fish and wildlife habitat of Cibola Valley from possible damaging effects of the project, several improvements and modifications in the designs recommended by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife were included in the planning report. Additions to the program will include facilities for regulation of impounded water level in bypassed reaches of the river, building boat ramps, construction of inlet works for freshening flows to bypassed areas and relinement of levees. State fish and game agencies will be on hand to assure maximum enhancement of wildlife habitat in the channelization program.

NEW CHANNEL BANKS

While the program will involve dredging in excess of 10 million cubic yards of material, other work will assure permanence of the channel. It is estimated that a total of 250,000 cubic yards of riprap stone will be placed along the new channel banks to resist river erosion. Over 50 miles of road will be constructed or regraded for access from quarries and gravel pits. Two timber bridges will be constructed over the river to provide access for operations and to relieve severance problems resulting from a major shift in the channel.

Because of the scope of the improvement work along the 240 miles of river, two additional dredges in the 12-inch size have been acquired, and a fourth dredge—which is expected to be a 16-inch machine—is programed for acquisition. The size of a hydraulic dredge is determined by the diameter of its discharge pipeline. The Bureau operates the two 12-inch machines at widely separate points on the river in operations which intercept the sediment load carried by the Colorado River.

One of the 12-inch dredges, *Little Colorado*, is stationed on the new channel near Needles. Until fiscal year 1966, it has a job to do there in a settling basin. This basin is an overwide section of dredged channel that collects the finer material which the river is sorting out from bottom material upstream. As the Topock Swamp area adjacent to the settling basin provides ample disposal area, it is possible for the dredge

to intercept the transported material and deposit it in the swamp before it reaches the headwaters of Lake Havasu. To allow continued deposition in the upper lake area, would not only cause aggradation in the lower reach of the dredged channel, but also would aggravate the already severe disposal problem facing the Bureau in its planned dredging in Topock Gorge.

SIXTY THOUSAND MORE

The Topock Gorge dredging operation using *Little Colorado* will help drain a large part of Topock Swamp and recover annually thereby approximately 60,000 acre-feet of water—almost two-thirds of the amount now being lost through evaporation and transpiration.

The other 12-inch machine, the *Gila*, is presently excavating in a swamp area downstream, between Imperial Dam and Laguna Dam. Though the dredging of settling basin and channels here is done to solve the same problem prevailing upstream, the existing and planned upriver improvements are tackling the problem at its source by the reduction of bank erosion and sediment transport.

Not all channel control work on the southern part of the Colorado River is accomplished through dredging. There are stretches where the natural channel is well entrenched and in reasonably good alinement, the bed material being of a size to provide a natural armor. In some reaches, control effort is directed toward consolidation of split channels into a single channel, correction of misalinements, and reduction of bank erosion. These objectives are accomplished by construction of jetties, training dikes of gravel faced with riprap, or by placing gravel and riprap stabilizing material along the natural banks.

For the past 3 years a river bank-line stabilization program has been in progress in the 28-mile southerly reach below Palo Verde Dam. Farther north, a similar program is proposed for the 16-mile reach of river below Parker, Ariz.

Fish and wildlife agency review of the proposed study program for the river reach between Parker and Palo Verde Dam have been completed. In order to obtain maximum benefits in the total development effort, results of the studies will be incorporated with the Bureau's channel improvement plans directed toward salvaging several additional thousands of acre-feet of Colorado River water.

RECLAMATION IN THE RIO GRANDE AREA AIDED BY WATERSHED WORK

(By Herbert I. Jones, Soil Conservation Service, Denver, Colo.)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This article by Mr. Jones describes the Soil Conservation Service effort and controlling hand on nature's wrestling with water and soil—so meaningful to the security of the farmers and urban residents in three of New Mexico's southern counties. The Bureau of Reclamation's Rio Grande project area totals 196,538 acres, of which 102,100 are in these valley lands in New Mexico. Water users in the area benefit substantially by the contributions of SCS control of sediment, erosion, and flooding of project lands. SCS developments are on tributary arroyos and creeks adjacent to Bureau project lands. In utilizing flows of the river, these Reclamation project facilities produce electricity power for the area and irrigate lands which in 1963 produced crops valued at $25,464,000.)

Along the 100-mile stretch of the Rio Grande in southern New Mexico work is well underway in the protection of valuable reclamation work, farmland, and property from the destructive floods that have cost the rich valley millions of dollars in damages over the years.

The constant threat of floods kept land values down and taxes up, curbed community expansion, and made farming an extremely risky business in the vicinity of arroyos.

All this is changing. And though the start of the change began in the late 1940's as neighbors began pooling efforts to push the work, the big step forward can be traced to 1954 when Congress passed the Watershed Protection and Flood Protection Act (Public Law 566). Through this act Congress authorized the Department of Agriculture to work with local sponsors in the preparation of plans to design and construct flood prevention work on watersheds under 250,000 acres in size. The Soil Conservation Service was charged with administering Federal funds for planning and construction. Sponsors were to take care of easements, maintenance, land treatment, and varying shares of the cost of water management improvements.

The bill was hardly enacted when a flood hit Garfield, N. Mex., a village located along the Rio Grande in northwest Dona Ana County. The banks of the Garfield lateral were washed out delaying water delivery to scores of farms and drowning crops on others. More than 18 inches of water and mud swilled across U.S. Highway 85, into homes and business places.

Directors of the Caballo Soil Conservation District, Garfield folks, and their neighbors farming at the mercy of Velarde, Salem, Reed, Ralph, and Rodey Arroyos applied for Public Law 566 help for what is known as the Hatch Valley Arroyos project. Work on six floodwater dams, one on the Garfield Arroyo, began within a year. The local groups agreed to underwrite nearly one-third of the estimated $185,000 installation cost and to operate and maintain the project for at least 50 years.

The contract for building the $35,000 North Salem floodwater dam became the first in the Nation to be signed, sealed, and delivered under the new program. In all, the Hatch Arroyo structures have more than 1,100 acre-feet of capacity to take the brunt of flash runoff while the controlled release of floodwaters is made through the established drains and wasteways of the Elephant Butte system.

At the same time directors of the Elephant Butte Irrigation District found they could employ law 566 and sponsor projects to safeguard immensely valuable irrigation improvements built over a span of nearly 50 years by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. The board immediately moved to sponsor the Dona Ana Arroyos watershed project located 25 miles downriver from the Hatch project and north of Las Cruces, N. Mex.

This 7,000-acre project was designed to protect 24 farms and improvements. It includes two flood prevention dams close by the Dona Ana lateral and the key Leasburg Canal, with a controlled-water floodway to the Rio Grande. Annual benefits accruing are estimated at over $20,000—not a surprising figure considering crop values in the potential damage area average over $185,000 a year.

Much of the upswing in watershed activity along the Rio Grande is attributed to the progressive directors of the Elephant Butte Irrigation District, headed by president, W. H. Gary, and assisted by district manager, John L. Gregg. Under the guidance of these men a cluster of small watershed projects and individual jobs virtually ring the 100-mile-long valley.

Six authorized projects covering 18 arroyos are either completed or in construction with Public Law 566 funding. At least 24 more projects are in some stage of planning. And the list of applications is perhaps double that figure.

CHANNELS BECAME BLOCKED

Most of the side arroyos causing trouble along the Rio Grande probably once had natural channels emptying directly into the river. Deposits then were conveniently swept away during river floods. But gradual aggradation of the river blocked the channels so that virtually all tributary runoff now floods cultivated land.

The six arroyos making up the Hatch project are probably prime examples. At least once every 4 years severe damages occurred in their vicinity following late summer and fall thunderstorms. About 750 acres were hurt as water ponded up to 3 feet in depth. Almost always the Garfield lateral or Hatch drainage ditch banks eventually broke to release part of the water. But some damages could occur on as many as 2,000 acres. Railroads, highways, fences, buildings and equipment, and stored crops were subject to damage. Livestock invariably suffered.

A second category of arroyos being treated are those that interfere with irrigation and create expenses by their direct access to the river in contrast to those with no outlet to the river.

The Rio Grande channel through the Hatch-Mesilla Valley is maintained by the U.S. International Boundary and Water Commission as part of our treaty responsibilities with Mexico. Canalization work begun in the thirties prevents the river's wandering to and fro, losing water at every turn to phreatophytes and sand strata as it once did. But the straightening has intensified the need for side arroyo control in some special places. Debris deposits from these tributaries can do severe damage directing the riverflow against a levee, by checking the channel and by forcing sediments into the Elephant Butte irrigation system.

Removal of the nuisance material is getting more and more expensive. And there are fewer places for spoil banks as land use in the valley becomes more intense. Recently it was necessary to rent considerable acreage for waste material from one reach of the river. Costs of trucking to off-river dumps is prohibitive, but it must be done where material can no longer be profitably used.

How well arroyo watershed projects have done their job of keeping debris from choking the canalized river is evidenced by the IBWC's willingness to fund planning. The agency has agreed to help with 11 arroyo plans and will contribute about $10,000 toward each. Commission officials are convinced that their work is sufficiently protected to allow the Commission also to help with maintenance.

If John Gregg, secretary-manager of the Elephant Butte Irrigation District, has a favorite among the two dozen projects he is helping to develop, it is probably the Tortugas watershed.

This problem watershed originates on the mesa slopes east of the New Mexico State University campus, runs hard by the college airstrip and in its old ways took a wandering course to spread floodwater this way and that, seemingly never making any real attempt to reach the river.

As late as 1962, the "distributary" covered several hundred acres—a tangle of mesquite and salt bush hummocks. The area would have been bigger if the banks of the Las Cruces lateral canal would have held. But these washed out regularly to drain silt-burdened water through the irrigation system that serves some of the most productive land in the Mesilla Valley. At least once every 2 years and occasionally twice a year, 1,000 feet or more of the lateral would be filled with sediment and debris.

With the lateral out and 16 farms flooded, 1,700 acres down the ditch were without water until emergency repairs could be made.

Mr. Gregg pointed out recently an innocent enough looking ditch south of Las Cruces. He explained this was the channel for the controlled release water of the earthfill Tortugas Dam. The dam was barely visible 2 miles to the east where it blended in with the semidesert shrubland that makes up the 15,584-acre watershed.

TRAPS FLASH FLOODS

The 41-foot-high structure traps around 1,300 acre-feet of flash runoff, and through its always-open concrete spillway, meters out floodwater slowly enough to allow safe delivery through the constructed channel. Over 405,000 cubic yards of earthfill went into the construction of the dam.

One interesting facet of watershed construction on the Tortugas arroyo is the way the project has freed New Mexico State University from the encroaching urban development of Las Cruces by providing access to an area east of the campus. Increased values of land now available to the university for use and development is estimated to be double the more than one-third-million-dollar cost of the project.

So long as the Tortugas was apt to run uncontrolled it was not practical to expand university developments to the south.

John Gregg says, "Tortugas paid for itself the day it was finished by enhancing the land values between the detention dam, the university campus, Interstate Highway 10, and the valley cropland." According to Gregg, upward of 600 acres of cresote bush range jumped from a $50-an-acre value to not less than $500 an acre.

One important role of the watershed dams is in timing released floodwater to the river. Prolonging runoff and peak riverflows results in water credits for the Elephant Butte project. The slowed, anticipated water is useful to the Texas irrigators. But uncontrolled flood runoff with extreme and short-lived peaks is not counted as water delivery below the dam and on the Texas side of the State line.

The structures are also contributing some other interesting side benefits. One is the safety provided the Santa Fe Railroad at low arroyo bridges. Over the years clearance at these was reduced by accumulated rock from the desert pavement so that water-activated signal lights were needed along the tracks at danger points to warn traincrews of flood dangers.

Santa Fe officials were among the first to see the potentials of Public Law 566 arroyo control. To start things off, the railroad contributed $3,000 toward the Hatch project.

Planners working on Interstate Highway 25 visited SCS and EBID officials numerous times to locate routes that would avoid completed watershed structures and construction sites.

The projects, though they help the irrigation district, the university, railroads, highways, business, industry, municipal development, and whole communities, come in for highest praise from individuals they aid.

Watershed project work has given some landowners an opportunity to build better farms and perhaps stay in business in the face of stiff competition.

Some of these men who have found themselves with less than efficient units considering the ability of modern equipment and methods have actually enlarged their farms and their abilities by soil swapping. Under this scheme they have taken old sand-choked channels, not needed after watershed construction or river canalization, and added heavy soil from other parts of the farm—backhauling sand to the too heavy land.

The crops one farmer grew the first year after he "swapped" brought in a thousand dollars more than the job cost. More important in the longrun conservation effort, was the economic water distribution which reshaping is permitting.

High grade leveling, benching, ditch lining, pipelines, and other improvements are now practical on many farms. The result is a saving and better use of irrigation water, supplies, and labor where once the danger of flooding precluded these improvements.

The same enthusiasm for arroyo protection carries downriver beyond the city of El Paso, Tex., to the Diablo Canyon and Camp Rice projects that were among the earliest small watersheds treated in Texas with Public Law 566 help. One special benefit of these projects beyond the protection of agriculture and water resources is that afforded to highways and the Southern Pacific Railroad. So critical was the railroad's need that officials readily agreed to move 5 miles of mainline trackage to permit the building of one dam.

Recently an engineer representing the Texas State Highway Department reported cost of Interstate Highway 10 bridges across the Alamo and Diablo Arroyos was half what it would have been without the floodwater detention structures.

Cities are not immune, either. A leading attorney in El Paso drowned in an arroyo near his home when his car was stalled and then swept away by a sudden flood of runoff across a residential street.

El Paso, taking a tip from some of the smaller communities, began long-range watershed protection and flood control in 1960, with $2,149,000 of construction work. Commissioner Joseph Friedkin of the IBW commission was chairman of the mayor's advisory public works committee.

Floods in the city are spectacular, affect many people simultaneously, and are costly to correct. The cost of flooding in areas like the Hatch-Mesilla Valley can run into millions of dollars each year and affect thousands of people. There is still time for landowners in the farming areas to do something to help correct their flood problems. In the Rio Grande Valley, citizens aided by Public Law 566 are sharing the costs and shouldering the burdens of doing just that.

PEACE CORPS ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, 4 years ago today, President Kennedy signed the Executive order which established the Peace Corps as a pilot project, pending the enactment legislation. On that March 1, in 1961, a new American idea, an American invention, became part of a tangible effort to strengthen our relationship with the free nations around the world.

There have been many great inventions in this country. These patentable ideas, these inventions, which have changed our mode of living and improved our lives in so many ways, have helped to place us in a position of strength and leadership among nations.

As a new social invention, the Peace Corps has done much to improve lives abroad and at home, and it has enhanced our position in the world community. As well, through the volunteers we have acquired a new insight and understanding of the ways of life and the hopes of peoples of other lands. These 4 years have shown that the Peace Corps can work for the common good, that it can make a real contribution.

It is amazing to me how the Peace Corps idea has caught on. I see that there are now nearly 10,000 American volunteers at work abroad, in over 3,000 locations. The volunteers are in programs on 4 continents, in 46 countries. The requests for more volunteers and more programs continue to come from these countries. We are receiving requests from the governments of additional nations for volunteers and the Peace Corps programs. The types of programs in effect now vary from basic teaching, to forest management, to public health, to city planning. There are over 300 different types of skills being utilized now in the Peace Corps. Few Members of the Congress anticipated such a response, or hoped for such success, when the Peace Corps was born 4 years ago.

The idea is catching on in other ways, too. Many of the nations in which we provided our first Peace Corps teams now have or are about to have programs of volunteers at work in their own country at work helping their fellow countrymen. El Salvador, Peru, and India are good examples of this. Other nations—Denmark, Norway, and West Germany, to point to a few—have caught the spirit and worth of the Peace Corps and now have volunteers in oversea programs of many types, with their own innovations.

There is every indication that the worth of the Peace Corps idea will be realized by needy people here at home, in the United States. Many of you noticed that last Friday in Florida the first group of VISTA volunteers completed their training in what is the initial stage of a far-reaching helping program for the underprivileged citizens of our country. The results of this new effort will be as successful as our oversea efforts, I am sure.

The Peace Corps' success, in part, can be attributed to one of the most valued resources we have in the United States: the sincere desire of our citizens, of all ages and all walks of life, to use their acquired and natural abilities to help others help themselves. These earnest citizens leave the comforts of their homes in this prosperous country to offer their many talents and skills to those who request it. It is a sacrifice to most, but they seem to thrive on it.

The volunteers' lists of accomplishments include many tangible contributions for the communities in which they have worked. But this is not the sole product of their efforts. They have also taken with them the ability to communicate to their neighbors the desires of the American people to foster peace and good will. In many areas, the first Americans to be seen are the volunteers. They are living and working with the citizens of lands who have heard of the American way, but until the volunteers came, these people have not had a chance to see it at work. This is a fundamental worth of the Peace Corps idea.

I note also that last Friday President Johnson transmitted legislation to the Congress which will increase the capability of the Peace Corps. The President advises us that at the end of August of this year there will be 15,000 volunteers in training at home and in service abroad. He is asking for the necessary appropriation to expand this number to 17,000 by the end of August 1966. The legislation sought deserves our sincerest

consideration, and our prompt action upon it.

In this, the anniversary week of the Peace Corps, a conference is to be held here in Washington at which some of the 3,500 returned volunteers can exchange ideas with leaders of business, education, labor, and local, State, and Federal Government. This conference represents the completion of the first full cycle of the Peace Corps in its 4 years of existence. The conference has been called by the Vice President to make certain that the fullest possible use is being made of these returned volunteers who represent such a valuable talent source after their unique experience. I look forward to reading the record and recommendations that are to come from this conference.

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION TRYING TO DEFEAT KING-ANDERSON BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the American Medical Association is now engaged in a frantic desperate effort to defeat the King-Anderson bill.

The medicrats are trying to obscure the obviously necessary King-Anderson proposal with a hastily raised smokescreen they call eldercare.

Curiously enough, the political medicinemen waited until after the elections of last November before suddenly realizing that a new program was needed. Those elections had, of course, revealed overwhelming popular support for a social security-financed hospital insurance plan. Apparently, the American Medical Association's great fear is that the American people might get what the American people want.

Mr. President, the AMA's well-huckstered plan is nothing more than a patently phony paper proposal. The medicrats are spending millions of dollars in an effort to convince Americans that their eldercare plan is a medical millennium. In fact, what the autocrats of the examining table are offering is a slicked-up Kerr-Mills. It is the public assistance, welfare, relief approach all over again.

The Congress will not be deceived by the lies, distortions, and half-truths of the paranoid power structure of organized medicine.

The February 22 issue of the Democrat, official publication of the Democratic National Committee, contains an article which in succinct and direct fashion demolishes and exposes the AMA's proposal. I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "AMA's Eldercare Plan Costly and Impractical" be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

AMA'S ELDERCARE PLAN COSTLY AND IMPRACTICAL

The American Medical Association, in an 11th hour attempt to sidetrack the Johnson administration's medicare plan, has proposed its own eldercare program.

What are the differences between the AMA's hastily prepared program and the medicare proposal, long studied and with strong national support?

Here are the facts and promises:

AMA eldercare empty promise: Less cost to the taxpayer.

Eldercare fact: The eldercare bill would provide Federal grants to the States to be matched by State funds. Most States have not been able to provide sufficient matching funds to finance adequately the medical assistance for the aged programs that already exist. They can hardly be expected to appropriate the even greater sums required to finance the expanded program contemplated by the eldercare bill. Furthermore, since commercial insurance carriers could be utilized under this program, there would be no protection against heavy acquisition costs, and exorbitant profits on the part of the insurers.

If all promised benefits were actually provided, the cost to the taxpayer would be many times the cost of the King-Anderson bill.

King-Anderson: People would contribute an average of less than 50 cents a week while they are working toward paid-up insurance when their retire. Employers would pay a matching amount. Benefits for persons not eligible under social security would be paid out of general revenues.

AMA eldercare empty promise: Eldercare would provide a wide range of hospital and medical services for the elderly—much more than medicare.

Eldercare fact: Eldercare authorizes a wide range of benefits. Actual benefits would be determined by the States, and limited by the availability of State funds. The requirement of the bill that both institutional and noninstitutional care be covered could be met by the provision of one hospital day and one physician visit per year.

King-Anderson: King-Anderson provides protection against the greatest burden of health expenditures in old age—those related to hospitalized illness. Every eligible person regardless of which of the 50 States he lives in would be entitled to: 60 days of hospital benefits; 60 days of posthospital extended care; 240 home health visits; outpatient diagnostic services.

AMA eldercare empty promise: Eldercare lets people over 65 qualify for benefits before illness strikes—without a welfare type investigation.

Eldercare fact: Benefits under eldercare would be available only to those persons over 65 who (1) live in a State which is willing and able to participate in the program, and (2) can prove their incomes are below an amount specified by the State in which they reside, or can pay the required monthly premium after they have retired.

King-Anderson: Eligibility at age 65 would be automatic.

FEDERAL ROLE IN THE COMMUTER RAILROAD CRISIS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, finally, I call attention to the continuing crisis affecting the area around New York, where 200,000 passengers a day go into the city on six major railroads, also affecting other cities.

The critical problem of commuter transportation in the Northeast has up until now received a minimum of Federal attention. Most unfortunately, several of the six commuter railroads in the New York area which carry a total of about 200,000 commuters a day from their homes in the 17 counties of the region outside the city limits to their jobs in New York and elsewhere in the New York metropolitan area are in serious financial condition. The biggest rail commuter operation to New York, the Long Island Rail Road, has ended the past year with a deficit of $2,146,350. At the same time the operating cash funds of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co. were reduced from $8.5 million at the end of 1963 to $6.2 million at the end of 1964, a loss of $2.3 million for the year. An additional $1.7 million is owed by the railroad for a retroactive wage increase. The trustees of the New Haven estimate that the operating cash fund will have dwindled to $4.4 million—less than 1 month's payroll—by July 1. An unexpected snowstorm or disruption of passenger and freight services of the type which cost the railroad $3.9 million in February of 1961, would substantially reduce this estimate.

We are now witnessing the opening of a new era which has highlighted the need for Federal assistance in continuing commuter transportation. The Federal Government has spent millions of dollars in aiding other competing forms of transportation including ship and highway construction programs, airlines, helicopter services. The Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Maritime Commission, and the Bureau of Public Roads have requested billions of dollars and Congress has appropriated huge sums of money to assist essential national transportation systems. It would certainly be false economy if the Federal Government were to overlook the needs of the commuter rail services and were forced to spend many times this amount in highway construction programs to meet the demands of commuter travel.

The extent of additional Federal help in highway construction which would be needed if the New Haven terminates its commuter services was indicated in one survey by the American Transit Association which stated that the loss of the four tracks of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad would require the construction of 80 added highway lanes at a prohibitive cost.

On a Federal level, the Interstate Commerce Commission has guaranteed $8 million of trust certificates sold by the New Haven trustees to provide operating cash and now stands behind an additional $4.5 million of unissued certificates. The ICC is also presently considering the inclusion of the New Haven Railroad in the pending Pennsylvania-New York Central merger. I have favored such a merger in the public interest to include the New Haven. This merger may well provide a long-term solution to some of the New Haven's problems. I have, together with Congressman OGDEN REID, of New York, introduced legislation to create a New York-Connecticut Rail Authority which could be quickly organized to operate commuter services in the two-State area. The authority could be expanded to include other Northeastern States. The measure also provides for a Federal-State matching grant program to provide funds to meet the operating deficits of commuter railroads.

Last Saturday, Governor Rockefeller, of New York, and Governor Dempsey, of Connecticut, agreed to explore the possibility of a commuter service contract between the States to operate the New Haven Railroad. The States would act

through a proposed New York State Metropolitan Commuter Transportation Authority and the existing Connecticut Transportation Authority. This action is a significant breakthrough and a fine example of joint cooperative efforts in coming to terms with the urgent commuter problem.

It is now clear that the Federal Government should and must join the States to maintain commuter transportation to large cities in order to solve present and future problems in this field. I hope very much that the Commerce Committee's hearings on this subject starting tomorrow may determine upon the proper role of the Federal Government in helping to keep commuter rail services in operation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article on the city's commuting crisis, printed in Newsday for Thursday, February 25, 1965.

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

THE CITY'S COMMUTING CRISIS

(By Si Radiloff)

The years upon years of mounting troubles for the railroads that carry New York commuters have added up to a crisis stage now that appears to be worse than ever in spite of a wide assortment of piecemeal aid and planning, private, and public.

Only in the past few years has the idea taken hold that the problems of the six commuter railroads are tied together as a part of the bigger problems of the entire 8,000-square-mile New York region, including parts of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. On that basis—the regional concept—the Federal Government has now stepped into the troubled transit picture and shows signs of injecting big doses of appropriations.

The big help theme was stated by President Johnson in his state of the Union message last month when he acknowledged the choked-up state of urban areas, saying, "The first step is to break old patterns—to begin to think, work, and plan for the development of entire metropolitan areas. We will take this step with new programs of help for basic community facilities * * *." In the message he also said that he will press for express rail service between cities, singling out the Boston-New York-Washington "megalopolis" area for a starter.

Whether or not Federal funds on top of continuing fare hikes and interstate, State, city, county, and village aid, planning and experimenting will put the lines back on their feet nobody can say with any certainty today. Nobody in a position of any pertinent authority doubts that they require Government help or that a viable mass-transit system is in the public interest. Whether or not they will get the right help in time to save them is the question now.

All six lines say they are losing money. The New Haven Railroad is fighting desperately in court to abandon all its commuter service. New Jersey's Erie-Lackawanna has threatened to ask permission to abandon its commuter service. The Long Island Railroad faces the loss of its special protected status under the special State redevelopment act which expires in 1966. The New Jersey Central, Pennsylvania, and New York Central commuter services are shaky deficit operations but their managements are battling to get them into the black.

Those six lines carry a total of about 200,000 commuters a day from homes in the 17 counties of the region outside the city limits to jobs in New York 5 days a week. Those 200,000 faithful riders during the morning and evening rush hours constitute about 70 to 80 percent of all the passengers carried on the commuter lines. The passenger load is at or close to its lowest point since the end of World War II when the decline started.

The tristate region, with a tenth of the Nation's population, over 17 million, experienced its entire population increase in the past 10 years in its outlying areas. The New York City population, except Queens, actually declined. Why commuter railroads that serve those burgeoning outlying counties have continued to lose passengers and millions of dollars annually is a big part of the enigma that keeps a horde of experts busy.

A basic picture of the pattern of travel into New York's central business district, Manhattan below Central Park, was presented in a Port of New York Authority study of persons entering that district, from areas including Manhattan itself, on a typical business day in 1960. It showed a total by all modes of travel of 3,349,000 persons broken down into rapid transit (subways), 1,913,000; commuter railroad, 203,000; bus, 243,000; nonrailroad ferry passengers, 36,000; auto and taxi, 866,000; driving or riding in trucks, 88,000. Though no comparable figures for earlier years are readily available, statisticians consider it obvious that while the railroads' share has been declining the travel by bus and auto has grown phenomenally year by year.

Here are some basic problems of the region's rail lines:

1. Peaking: With about 75 percent of passengers riding during 20 peak hours a week, the morning and evening rush hours, the lines are burdened with idle workers and equipment the rest of the time to maintain the peak-time facilities. Incidentally, the LIRR's daily passenger load of 85,000 commuters jumps to as many as 200,000 during snowstorms that make highways unusable. Fogged-in highways also crowd the New Jersey trains. Commuters traditionally get the cheapest fare rates in commutation tickets, too, while the offpeak hour riders that all the lines are trying to attract are charged relatively high single-trip fares, making rail travel less attractive, and encouraging travelers to use their own cars in periods when the highways, too, are not as crowded.

2. Equipment: It is expensive and it ages. The older it gets the less it attracts riders and the more expensive it is to maintain. The lines haven't been able to finance the huge capital outlays needed to replace trains and tracks during the long decline of income. About 80 percent of the cars in the region's commuter service now are more than 30 years old.

3. Location. Terminals, stations, and tracks are where they were installed 100 years ago. Drift and dispersion of business and residences have largely left the rails behind. The railroad corporations don't build spur lines in their profitless condition. The terminals leave no choice for the commuter—some lines have only East Side Manhattan stations, others just West Side ones. If the commuter works on the other side of town, he's in for a traffic problem.

4. Single ends. Related to peaking and location is the general problem of the city-bound bulk of the passenger load, requiring pulling empty cars along until they are needed. There has been some increase in "wrong direction" passengers during the rush hours, workers going to plants that have moved to the suburbs, but not enough to be a major factor in the lines' economic picture.

NOTHING MATCHES RAIL CAPACITY

But from the public service point of view, nothing in mass transit yet matches the passenger-carrying capability of railroads, according to the Port of New York Authority which gives these figures on theoretical capability in number of people each hour: city street, 1,300; six-lane expressway, 10,000; buses on a fully reserved expressway lane with other special requirements—10,000; one pair of railway tracks (everybody seated)—43,200; railway with standees—60,000.

A small but growing army of people is at work on commuter rail problems, including railroad and business executives, village, county, State and Federal agencies by the dozen, universities, private agencies like the Regional Plan Association and semipublic agencies, including the port authority. Probably the focal agency, toward which most of the experts at all levels look for transit problem solutions for the New York region, is the Tri-State Transportation Committee, formed by the Governors of New York, Connecticut, and New Jersey in 1961 and now spending about $3,500,000 a year on all its projects. As of now it is scheduled to make its final reports in 1968.

Tri-State's chairman is William J. Ronan, Governor Rockefeller's chief aid. Significantly, he also heads the committee appointed by Rockefeller to come up with a permanent plan for the Long Island Rail Road. It was due today. There is speculation that the LIRR plan may include giving some kind of permanent authority to Tri-State. There are several moves afoot to establish Tri-State in overall charge of the region's transit.

Tri-State is analyzing financial records of the six commuter lines, has inventoried all their equipment, is studying and experimenting with passenger transfers, including a feeder bus service from Rockland County, across the Tappan Zee Bridge, to the Tarrytown station of the New York Central. It is trying out automated ticked and fare collecting at the LIRR's Forest Hills and Kew Gardens stations, has increased railroad-station parking facilities for cars to see if that helps rail travel in Westchester and has installed a model "park and ride" service on the Pennsy main line, with a new station it built about a mile and a half from the old New Brunswick, N.J., station in that city's business center. The concept differs from that of the average station parking lot which frequently is added as an afterthought. In this case, the convenience of driving commuters was a prime consideration in deciding where to build the station.

The welter of State-and-local financial aid the commuter lines have been getting has been in three areas: (1) outright subsidies, (2) tax relief, and (3) maintenance. From 1960 to 1963 New Jersey gave its railroads $6 million a year outright, divided according to the number of passengers they carried, in return for a contract to continue to operate without substantial lowering of their services. Last year the amount went up to $7,400,000. New York State gives tax relief amounting to $26 million annually to railroads throughout the State ($1 million a year for the LIRR), reimbursing local governments for their loss of the taxes on the lines' capital or property value. Connecticut tax and other relief to the brink-of-extinction New Haven amount to about $1,700,000 a year. Communities and county governments in New York and Connecticut pay for station maintenance.

But all that aid is only temporary and helps the lines only with current operating costs. New Jersey Gov. Richard J. Hughes just last month proposed that State's first big capital-aid program, an offer to buy new commuter cars for the Pennsy, only if the line would give up its subsidy. New York has a State car-replacement program whereby the Port Authority leases new cars to commuter lines with State financial backing.

Federal aid, which dates back to the original land grants that built the Nation's rail

network, has been slight since World War II. While multibillion-dollar sums were going in recent years to highway projects and airplane and airport development, relatively small amounts of aid were made available to railroads, mostly for studies, like those of Tri-State. By comparison, the Mass Transit Act passed last year by Congress looked big. It provides $375 million to be spent throughout the Nation over 3 years in direct grants of cash, direct loans and loan guarantees on urban transit systems, including city subway and bus systems, as well as commuter railroads.

The Mass Transit Act promises solutions, however, because it requires matching expenditures by State and local governments and makes practical regional planning a prerequisite for the money. With Johnson's concentration on the urban areas' needs, it probably also presages bigger money bills.

A broad principle being widely applied to new aid to the railroads, sometimes called "equalization" instead of subsidy, assumes that the plan is to give the commuter lines a more equal footing with truckers and buses using public roads and with airlines using public airports so that they can compete for rides on their privately owned rights-of-way. Opponents of the Mass Transit Act in Congress argued that it would eventually require $10 billion nationwide to carry out the equalization. Some proponents said that the Federal highway construction plan cost more than $5 billion in the New York region alone over the past several years.

Big studies and big spending, however, all depend in the end on the commuters and their habits. Tri-State's automated ticket project at the Forest Hills and Kew Gardens stations of the LIRR resulted in a strange finding. The experimenters discovered that the number of riders from those stations declined when the station machines went in. They dug out this reason: many commuters had been riding free in rush hours because the conductors couldn't check all tickets before the trains get to Penn Station.

The troubles on the commuter lines come in all sizes.

HERE'S WHERE THE TROUBLED LINES STAND

Here's a rundown of the current status of the New York regions' six commuter railroads:

New Haven Railroad: In a decision handed down recently, U.S. Circuit Court Judge Robert P. Anderson granted the railroad permission to seek the approval of Government agencies to curtail and eventually abandon passenger service. The New Haven said it would file plans with the Interstate Commerce Commission very soon to end commuter service between New York and Mount Vernon, Pelham and New Rochelle. The decision also cleared the way for the railroad's eventual discontinuation of all its passenger service in New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts. The line carries 25,000 daily rush-hour commuters on its 122 route miles of track. The trustees say its freight service could be brought up to a paying status—and the New York Central has offered to take that operation over—but the commuter service is responsible for $5,500,000 of the line's current $12 million operating deficit.

New York Central: The 32,000 commuters it carries daily on 87.8 route miles of region track are just a fraction of this huge line's passenger and freight business. Though the commuter operation is "not entirely self-supporting," the line says it may become profitable if Government aid keeps coming and it keeps on making changes. It put 100 new cars on commuter service by its own financing in 1951 and this month gets the first of 87 more to be delivered within 3 years under the Port of New York Authority replacement program. The line has sold some of its passenger stations, put in a zone-fare system (with a fare raise) a year ago and this month starts collecting tickets at stations instead of on trains—all aimed at cost cutting. It has abandoned the Weehawken Ferry and passenger service on its west-shore Hudson line as well as another unprofitable branch to Putnam, N.Y. Tri-State is working on a bus project for the west shore line, which still carries freight, in addition to its Tappan Zee Bridge bus-connection project to serve former west shore customers. The port authority operation involving the Hudson and Manhattan tubes has absorbed most former ferry riders.

Erie-Lackawanna: A threat to abandon its 240 miles of deficit commuter service, which carries 28,400 rush-hour riders, was made by the line in December but New Jersey officials consider it only one of many maneuvers to get increased State aid. With about 240 route miles, almost entirely in the northernmost counties of New Jersey, it is currently trying to get a fare raise approved by the State, to add to a 1959 increase.

New Jersey Central: The east-west New Jersey line with 66 miles of commuter track carries 12,200 rush-hour commuters. It will be the beneficiary of a current $5 million State-financed construction project, known as the Aldene Plan, to connect its lines to those of the noncommuter Lehigh Valley Railroad and allow its commuters to ride through to the Newark station of the Pennsylvania Railroad. There they will be able to make connection with Hudson tube trains and the Jersey Central will discontinue its expensive Bayonne ferry service.

Pennsylvania Railroad: The vast Pennsy carries about 11,500 rush-hour commuters approximately 106 commuter route miles daily on a New Jersey shore line and main and branch lines in a southwesterly part of the New Jersey area of the region, about 106 commuter route miles. That's just a drop in the bucket of 200,000 passengers a day that use its Pennsylvania Station in New York. Pennsy reports its commuter operation runs at a heavy deficit but has shown no sign of trying to drop it.

Long Island Rail Road: The biggest rail commuter operation to New York, with 85,000 rush-hour commuters, is, characteristically, in the worst financial shape. Under a special State law it has been a ward of the Long Island Rail Road Redevelopment Corp. since 1954. Under the aegis of the act it has received enough fare increases and other aid to about break even on operating costs, without paying anything on the Pennsy's long-standing $180 million interest on its 212.4 route miles. A report was to be released today from a committee appointed by Governor Rockefeller to recommend what's to become of the line when the redevelopment act runs out next year. The LIRR disclosed recently that it had ended 1964 with a $2,146,350 deficit, the worst in a decade. However, the railroad said that it was more than covered by $3,315,000 in additional revenue raised through a 4.9-percent fare hike in November.

BANKERS ANNOUNCE FORMATION OF COUNCIL FOR LATIN AMERICA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a news release issued by the Council for Latin America and an article from the February 6 issue of the New York Times concerning an announcement by Mr. David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and George S. Moore, president of the First National City Bank, of the merger of three U.S. business organizations concerned with Latin America into the new Council for Latin America. Till now the three organizations have carried on separate activities. The purpose of the new Council will be to coordinate and strengthen economic, community, and cultural relations within the Western Hemisphere.

The merger of these organizations into a single unit is laudable and should help in the further strengthening of U.S. business activity in the broader fields of economic, social, and community development which are so essential in creating a favorable atmosphere for the growth of a viable private sector in Latin America.

There being no objection, the release and the article from the New York Times was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS FOR LATIN AMERICA ANNOUNCE MERGER AIMED AT IMPROVING HEMISPHERE RELATIONS

(Release from the Council for Latin America)

The Nation's three major business groups concerned with Latin American affairs today announced a merger aimed at strengthening economic, community, and cultural relations within the hemisphere.

The new organization will be known as the Council for Latin America and will include in its membership some 175 U.S. corporations. Its chairman will be David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank.

The merged unit will be headquartered in New York and will embrace the varied activities of these three groups:

1. The Business Group for Latin America (BGLA), an organization of U.S. business executives which was formed last year under the chairmanship of Mr. Rockefeller. It has served in an informal advisory capacity to Government officials and others concerned with Latin America, and has maintained close relations with Latin American business leaders.

2. The United States Inter-American Council (USIAC), a 22-year-old organization of U.S. corporations with interests in Latin America. USIAC is the North American section of the Inter-American Council of Commerce and Production, known in Latin America by the initials of its Spanish name, CICYP. It is a hemisphere-wide confederation of business firms and business organizations with headquarters in Montevideo, Uruguay. George S. Moore, president of the First National City Bank of New York, is president of CICYP.

3. The Latin American Information Committee (LAIC), which engages in educational and community activities in the Latin American countries.

The merger has been under discussion by the three groups for several months. The first formal step was taken at the annual membership meeting of USIAC in December when the merger was voted and Mr. Rockefeller was elected chairman of USIAC, succeeding John D. J. Moore, vice president of W. R. Grace & Co. The merger was ratified by the Business Group for Latin America and the Latin American Information Committee at special meetings held in New York yesterday.

In announcing the establishment of the new organization, Mr. Rockefeller said:

"The Council for Latin America is the culmination of a long period of planning and work by a number of outstanding persons. It is a clear indication of the U.S. business community's steadfast belief and stanch interest in the future of Latin America. Over the past few years, much has been accomplished through the private sector in dealing with Latin America, but now the results can be immeasurably enhanced.

"By welding together the principal private organizations concerned solely with Latin

America, we have achieved for the first time one center of management and program direction, one center of fundraising and budget allocation, and one center of consultation with government and international organizations.

"Not only does this consolidation have an important meaning for us in American business but it carries equal significance for our colleagues in Latin America and for those in the U.S. administration who have long sought a unified private group with which to work. In the areas where the three organizations have been effective separately, we can now speak with one voice and act with even greater strength in support of the economic and social objectives of the Alliance for Progress."

John F. Gallagher, vice president of Sears, Roebuck & Co., has been chosen as senior vice chairman of the new Council for Latin America. The following vice chairmen were elected: H. W. Balgooyen, executive vice president, American & Foreign Power Co., Inc.; William Barlow, president, Vision, Inc.; Fred C. Foy, chairman, Koppers Co., Inc.; George S. Moore, president, First National City Bank of New York; John D. J. Moore, vice president, W. R. Grace & Co.; John R. White, director, Standard Oil Co. (N.J.); and William S. Youngman, Jr., chairman, American International Underwriters Corp.

The executive vice presidents are John T. Smithies and Enno Hobbing. Mr. Smithies will be in charge of administration and its public relations activities. Mr. Hobbing will direct the council's educational and community relations programs. Richard T. Turner is executive director.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 6, 1965]

BANKERS ANNOUNCE THE MERGER OF THREE LATIN AMERICAN AID UNITS

Two leading New York bankers announced here yesterday the formation of a group of 175 top U.S. corporations to coordinate and strengthen economics, community and cultural relations within the hemisphere.

David Rockefeller, president of Chase Manhattan Bank, and George S. Moore, president of the First National City Bank, told a press conference that the growing interest in the problems and opportunities in Latin America had prompted the move.

The new unit will be known as the Council for Latin America, and will have Mr. Rockefeller as its chairman and Mr. Moore as a vice chairman. In effect, Mr. Moore and Mr. Rockefeller said, the new organization, which presently maintains offices at 201 Park Avenue South, will be born of the merger of three existing groups.

These are the Business Group for Latin America, an executive group formed last year; the United States Inter-American Council, a 22-year-old business group, and the Latin American Information Committee.

"I'm convinced that the business community in Latin America is waking up to the fact that it has social and economic responsibilities beyond its own businesses," Mr. Rockefeller said.

Sitting beside him at Chase Manhattan's headquarters, Mr. Moore observed: "There has been real growth in most Latin American lands last year * * * even Brazil, with a rate of inflation of nearly 100 percent, had a net growth of 1 percent."

Mr. Rockefeller, who recently returned from a visit to Peru, Colombia, and Chile, said: "It was my first visit to these countries in 7 years. Not only did I find progress, but also nothing but friendliness toward North Americans."

CHILEAN GAINS NOTED

He was encouraged by the trends in Chile. "After meeting with President Eduardo Frei Montalva, I am confident that his copper program will succeed once the congressional elections are out of the way in March," he said. "Mr. Frei also expects to cut the rate of inflation in Chile over a 5-year period."

Mr. Moore noted that inflation there was at the rate of 30 percent last year.

Besides Mr. Rockefeller as chairman and Forrest D. Murden, as his special assistant, John F. Gallagher, vice president of Sears, Roebuck & Co., was chosen as senior vice chairman of the new council.

OTHER OFFICERS

Other vice chairmen elected were H. W. Balgooyen, executive vice president of the American & Foreign Power Co., Inc.; William Barlow, president of Vision, Inc.; Fred C. Foy, chairman of the Koppers Co., Inc.; John D. J. Moore, vice president of W. R. Grace & Co.; John B. White, director, the Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey); and William S. Youngman, Jr., chairman of American International Underwriters Corp.

Mr. Rockefeller went on to say he had the impression that Chile may eventually sell its proposed stake in the copper industry to the private sector over a period of time.

During the hour-long informal session, Chase Manhattan's president said inflation was an important problem in most Latin countries. Next to this he cited the need to diversify industry and to build exports.

Touching on Brazil, Mr. Rockefeller said that after the revolt there last year he invited seven leading Brazilian business leaders to meet with important executives here. "We organized an all-day meeting. They told us that the revolt was not merely a military exercise. The plans they had for their country then are now being carried out."

Mr. Moore said an important meeting to "energize the Latin American Free Trade Association beyond just speechmaking" will be held in Buenos Aires early next month. The president of the First National City Bank commented that "politicians can blueprint plans, but only businessmen can implement them."

He added: "We are optimistic that this year will see progress—not solutions, mind you—but real continued progress in Latin America."

JEWISH CASE FOR EXTENDING NAZI PROSECUTIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, February 28, 1965, by Morris Abram, president of the American Jewish Committee, making the case for extending the statute of limitations on prosecution of Nazi criminals in the German Federal Republic. The West German Cabinet has recently indicated its willingness to support extension of the period of limitations. This is a world problem of justice, and not just a German problem, and I am very confident that the Bundestag will vote for extension when the issue comes before it next week.

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

JEWISH CASE FOR EXTENDING NAZI PROSECUTIONS

(West Germany's statute of limitations, as now interpreted, will make it impossible to start new prosecutions of Nazi war criminals after May 8. Last November, the West German Cabinet took the position that it would be legally impossible to extend the deadline. Reaction across the world stunned the West Germans. Last week, the West German Cabinet voted unanimously to support legislation to extend the deadline. The Bundestag is to debate such a measure on March 10. Morris B. Abram, president of the American Jewish Committee, met with the German Minister of Justice and gave him a memorandum on how he believes prosecutions can continue without doing violence to the law. This is his memorandum.)

I have had the benefit of reading a translation of your article on the subject in the official Bulletin of the Federal Press Service on January 8, 1965.

I respect your views: We have regained freedom to live in accordance with law and order and we are no longer exposed to arbitrariness, including changing laws retroactively as the Nazi legislation liked to do.

As you, I believe deeply in the rule of law as the precondition of justice and civic peace. Therefore, I do not ask you to adopt special German legislation of an ex post facto nature to deal with the problem.

You yourself have seemed to recognize the widely accepted view that German basic law against ex post facto legislation, article 103, paragraph 2, applies only to substantive law.

You grant that some others feel that the statute of limitations is only a procedural rule and that an extension of its term would on that account not violate your article 103, paragraph 2, as ex post facto legislation. However, I am willing to accept your view that the statute of limitations contains both substantive and procedural elements and that an enlargement of the period would be constitutionally prohibited.

Finally, I have not overlooked, as you point out others have constantly, particularly those abroad, the fact that prosecutions in any case will after May 8, 1965, proceed in individual cases wherein some judicial action has been taken before that date.

On the other hand, I have noted with interest and concern your own recent statement in Tunis recognizing that a very small number may escape.

(Moreover, your further statement in Tunis that it is in the spirit of a statute of limitations that some criminals escape justice could cause considerable anxiety if misinterpreted.)

Again, despite the revulsion I share with the civilized world on the contemplation of Nazi crimes, I both respect and accept your adherence to the principle of the rule of law and I have predicated this memorandum on this premise.

You are prosecuting Nazi criminals under a German criminal law dating from 1871. Admittedly, this law covers these crimes, but these crimes are so gross as to extend far beyond the contemplation of the legislators of 1871.

Other states operating under a rule of law, such as France and Belgium, have recognized the inappropriateness of ordinary criminal statutes for Nazi crimes, and have treated them distinctly with different statutes of limitation.

Also, the Legal Committee of the Legislative Assembly of the Council of Europe has recommended consideration of what basically has been the French and Belgian approach to this problem. Your nation is affiliated with the Council and no doubt you are aware of the statement attributed to the chairman of the Legal Committee, Mr. Hermond Lanning, of Denmark, on December 18, 1964:

"He specified that this recommendation was particularly aimed at the Bonn government but by politeness it would be aimed at all European governments."

It could be argued that the rule of law, developed by an international consensus, therefore not only permit but requires that Nazi crimes against humanity be treated other than as a simple domestic law violation. The view of the French National Assembly expressed on December 17, 1964, that applying the doctrine of the Nuremberg Tribunals, such crimes are not of an exclusively national character and therefore without a statute of limitations, is entitled to serious respect.

Certainly, if the Nazi "crimes against humanity" as defined by the United Nations resolution of February 13, 1946, and by the International Tribunal at Nuremberg, are so accepted as crimes under international law, they may be considered outside your 1871 code. Your constitution, article 25, appears to give ample support to the supremacy of such laws, providing that such take "precedence over the (domestic) laws and directly create rights and duties for the inhabitants of the Federal territory."

From the above it would seem that prosecutions of Nazi crimes could proceed under law other than the code of 1871, without the impediment of the Statute of Limitations provided in that code. Nothing exceptional would be required with respect to the 1871 code, merely a recognition that it is not the exclusive source for trial and punishment of Nazi crimes against humanity.

I somehow feel that the legislators in the relatively humane days of 1871 would not be surprised by such a determination.

But now I turn to a point which requires no speculation, no legal imagination or inventiveness, but only a rigorous and accurate application of the German Code of 1871.

If you should continue to hold the view that Nazi crimes against humanity must be prosecuted exclusively under the code of 1871, then I respectfully beseech you to reexamine the date you have chosen for the commencement of the 20-year period of the statute of limitations.

The 1871 code directs that the time limitations runs from the day of the commission of the deed, unless prosecution was impossible.

Admittedly, you have been commencing prosecution for several years of persons charged with Nazi crimes committed more than 20 years previously. Your basis for such actions is that until May 8, 1945, such prosecutions were impossible.

Thus you have extended the 20-year period of the statute by a discretionary determination of the date on which prosecution became possible.

You might within reason and on the basis of fact have chosen a variety of such dates, but May 8, 1945 (V–E Day) is not a defensible selection.

In short, you have recognized the principle that the statute did not commence running until the date prosecution became possible, but you have chosen the wrong date.

On V–E Day there was no German Government to enforce its 1871 code. On V–E Day the German state had collapsed. It was weeks, and months, before the Allied Powers were themselves able to restore a minimum of the ordinary processes of government beyond mere police power and subsistence rations.

To contend that any sovereignty and competence existed on V–E Day to ferret out all Nazi criminals is simply absurd. In point of fact, the Allies, preoccupied with the gathering of evidence for the prosecution of Goering, et al., at Nuremberg, had great difficulty in the months that followed in obtaining the evidence in those limited cases.

Nor did the Allies ever pretend to do the complete task of bringing to justice all those Nazis whose acts were clearly subject to the 1871 code as well as other laws.

From my own limited experience on the staff of the International Military Tribunal, I know where attention was rightly focused and realizes the limits of the resources of the occupying powers to bring all criminals to justice.

I recognize that up to now you have chosen to interpret the 1871 statute to mean that the 20-year period runs from the date any sovereignty, including the occupying powers, had the competence to prosecute. However, I submit that this is not the intention of the statute.

If you chose to employ a German domestic statute as the exclusive source of prosecution, consistency requires you read that statute as referring to the German Government's possibility of commencing prosecution. Surely in 1871 the German legislature did not have in mind the circumstance of prosecution of Germans by English or Americans, and (1 year after the Franco-Prussian War) certainly not by the French. Thus the possibility of prosecution contemplated by the statute means possibility of prosecution by German authority.

On May 8, 1945, German authority did not exist. Nor did German authority and competence to commence prosecutions come into being for years.

There was no Ministry of Justice until 1949. There was no limited sovereignty until 1951. Not until that year did you have a Foreign Minister communicating with other powers in whose hands rested many records and witnesses necessary for prosecution. Final German sovereignty was not regained until the Bonn Conventions came into effect on May 5, 1955.

During this entire period, the records which a normal state accumulates and collates were understandably in a state of disarray. These records are the requisite of effective prosecutions. Even now many of these essential records are in the hands of other nations, a principal one of which (the U.S.S.R.) has been most uncooperative with your efforts to bring these criminals to justice.

It was not until 1958 that the Ministers of Justice of the various laender agreed to create a central office for the coordination of information and investigation of Nazi crimes at Ludwigsburg. As late as December 1964 it was announced that the Ludwigsburg staff would have to be increased to aid this work. Thus it is clear that until fairly recent times, prosecution has not been completely possible.

In this connection we must remember that the 1871 statute means not that prosecutions in general became possible, but that a prosecution of an individual is possible. I happen to believe that if this had been so in any particular case, you would have prosecuted. It follows, therefore, that the failure to prosecute a Nazi criminal means that due to the disorganization of the state for a long period it was impossible to have commenced such.

I therefore conclude that applying your own domestic law, the statute of limitations should run for 20 years from the date prosecution became in fact possible.

The facts that I have asserted here have been recognized by no less an authority than the German Ambassador to the United States. In "News From the German Embassy," vol. IX, No. 1, dated January 5, 1965, Ambassador Heinrich Knappstein stated:

"As I know from my own activity in the denazification process, German courts during the early postwar years were not able—or only to a very limited degree—to try Nazi criminals, because the Allies reserved these cases almost entirely for themselves. Only with the establishment of the Federal Republic and the conclusion of the Bonn Conventions of 1954 was German judicature able to take on fully the prosecution of Nazi criminals. This was particularly difficult in the beginning as the most important documents were still in Allied hands, and because it was especially difficult, during those first tubulent years, to reach surviving witnesses who were essential for such trials."

In the same publication, vol. VIII, No. 8, dated May 28, 1964, the Embassy published an interview with a senior prosecuting attorney, stating the following:

"Question. How is it that the Auschwitz and similar legal proceedings were started so late?

"Answer. There are many reasons for this. It has only been since 1956 that the Federal Republic of Germany has enjoyed full sovereignty in this as well as other areas. Beyond this the Allies conducted the Nuremberg trials from 1945 to 1948, and in concluding them in 1948 did not call the attention of German judicial authorities to the documents that remained and that despite Allied efforts all perpetrators of crimes had not been brought to justice. The documents necessary to prosecute such criminal actions were scattered throughout archives around the world. It took time to find out where they were and to get possession of these documents. There is a substantial body of documents in the East bloc states which remain inaccessible to use even today."

You have been candid enough to agree with me that some date after May 8, 1945, could reasonably be selected as a beginning point without violating your constitution or the rule of law as you see it. I very much hope you will now search for, select, adopt, and announce a date consistent with the facts and fair to society, both German and international, which suffered so much from the Nazi horrors.

I believe the date 1955—the date when complete German sovereignty was regained—would be an appropriate date. This would extend prosecutions until 1975.

I recognize that your Ministry has been requested "to report to the Bundestag not later than March 1, 1965, whether in all pertinent murder cases investigations have been conducted and whether action has been taken to insure interruption of the statute of limitations."

I gathered from my conversations in Bonn that should your reply to the above question be in the negative, there would be a strong disposition in many German quarters, and perhaps in your Government to extend by direct legislation the statute of limitations if (to use the words of the Bundestag resolution of December 9, 1964) "the criminal prosecution of such murders cannot be insured in any other way."

While many have argued that "ultimate justice" demands that such crimes should be punished even if special and exceptional domestic legislation is required, you have personally been understood to reject this view on the ground that the desired end does not justify such means.

However, may I submit, that the decision to ask for such legislation cannot on your stated principles, rest on any estimate as to the number of criminals who will escape trial and justice if the time for prosecution expires on May 8, 1965. Therefore, I believe it is preferable not to wait until such a survey and estimate is made before announcing clearly and firmly that the time does not expire on May 8, 1965. An announcement to that effect predicated on the terms of the code of 1871, with a realistic finding of the date on which prosecution became possible, would do justice to society and honor to the rule of law.

HIGH-PROTEIN FLOUR

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I would like to invite the Members of the U.S. Senate, their staffs, and the Kansas congressional delegation to be my guests on Tuesday, March 2, from 8 a.m. to 10 a.m., in the visitors' cafeteria, New Senate Office Building, to taste the world's finest protein flour pancakes that will be served with a variety of sauces. All members of the press are also invited to attend the breakfast in honor of the 15th annual International Pancake Day Race.

The breakfast will be sponsored by the Liberal Junior Chamber of Commerce, Liberal, Kans.

This day is set aside in Kansas as Liberal's International Pancake Day, the day before the beginning of Lent, Shrove Tuesday. On this day the ladies of Liberal, Kans., run an annual footrace with the ladies of Olney, England, each runner holding a skillet in which she must flip a pancake three times while covering the course. The wives of Olney have been pancake racing since the year 1445. Liberal challenged the women of Olney in 1950 and the vicar of Olney, Rev. R. C. Collins, accepted.

On Shrove Tuesday, in England, it was customary for the housewives to stop their work and run to the church to be "shriven" of their sins when the church bells tolled. In 1445, a housewife heard the bells ring, but was caught in the middle of baking pancakes. She raced to the church carrying her griddle and pancakes with her. This was the beginning of the annual sporting event.

Be sure to join me for the world's finest pancakes.

ADDRESS BY MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT VISTA GRADUATION CEREMONY

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson our gracious First Lady, who has always taken such a deep and abiding interest in the problems of our country, and particularly in the needs of our less fortunate citizens, made an excellent address on Friday, February 26, 1965, on the occasion of the VISTA graduation ceremonies in St. Petersburg, Fla.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks by Mrs. Johnson on this forward-looking and progressive program, which gives and will continue to give many of our concerned citizens opportunities for the discipline of service to others, be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, VISTA GRADUATION, ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.

I am delighted to be in St. Petersburg today to join in a program which is surely an exciting landmark in the history of our Nation.

One of the most interesting things about the program to me is the name itself—Volunteers in Service to America—VISTA which says in one word what the program is.

You know, at our particular point of history, as we look back, this is a natural follow-up to successive periods when our country confronted great human problems. In the early and middle 19th century we proved that, whatever diversities existed among us, we could function as one Nation. In the later 19th century, we forged ahead an economic system strong and flexible enough to support an ever-rising standard of living. In the 20th century we recognized that we are, ineluctably, part of a complex and churning world, and swung our energies toward making that role a force for freedom.

Now we are boldly taking hold of an aspiration which men have known as long as there have been human beings—the eradication of the bleak winter of poverty from the climate of a whole society.

Of all the economic opportunity programs being launched, none better expresses the spirit of the entire war against poverty than the VISTA operation.

I am pleased to meet you VISTA graduates in person and to see you at work—as I will later in the day. You have already made your mark here in St. Petersburg. The petition of the people of Ridgecrest and Old Baskin's Crossing asking for you to stay is evidence of your success.

That—in this brief time—must be a special source of satisfaction. You men and women of all ages, from all parts of the country, from a variety of occupations, have chosen to interrupt your careers and sacrifice economic gain or give up the well-earned leisure of later years in order to help others.

American is many things. But above all—more than any nation in the history of man—ever since the first frontiersman picked up his musket to help protect a neighbor—we have been a nation of volunteers. We have been a land in which the individual says—"My neighbor needs me. I will do something."

You are graduating today into a stirring tradition. You are making glow again the word of that most American of poets, Walt Whitman, who wrote for us: "Behold, I do not give lectures or a little charity when I give myself."

And I cannot think of a more appropriate place for this first VISTA graduation than here in the prosperous city of St. Petersburg.

The poor are not an island. Their needs toll out to the whole community.

The very fact that a man is poor means that he needs the help of others—that he probably lacks the education and often the hopefulness to lift himself unaided. Changing his lot is a decidedly practical matter for everyone. Millions of the impoverished place a heavy drag on the whole society, cutting down the ability to purchase what we produce, diminishing tax revenues—easy prey to delinquency and crime.

The intense interest of thriving St. Petersburg in the VISTA program is a heartening symbol of what is happening across the Nation, where all of us are realizing that all the poor are the responsibility of all America.

I am struck, too, by the way the VISTA program has been working out in this community. Too often well-meaning people have approached a social problem with the assumption—let Washington draw up the perfect blueprint, complete down to the last comma.

But if the American experience has taught us any one fundamental lesson, it is this: There is no such thing as instant utopia—especially when the better world is conceived miles away from where it must take practical form.

Here in the St. Petersburg area, for some 7 years—long before we in Washington talked about a war on poverty—you have been at work to broaden economic opportunity.

Your many progressive educational institutions have been deeply involved. At Ridgecrest you have created a laboratory for healthy social change. You have proceeded on the only sensible assumption—that the national war against poverty must be fought in a thousand local battles—in the slums of individual cities, on wornout farms, in the hollows of Appalachia, in isolated Indian reservations—wherever human beings stand with their noses pressed against the windows of our general affluence.

The result of your local progress is that VISTA has been able to function here as it should function everywhere in America. It has learned as much as it has taught. Its role has been not to bring full-blown answers but to join with others, tentatively, questingly, on the road to a workable solution.

So we begin here, begin superbly, I believe, with this VISTA graduating class. I am proud to have been asked to give out your diplomas. I am privileged to share the rush of feelings that must be going through you.

Much has been said about the difficulties you will encounter. But you and I know that you also have before you the richest experience of your lives. To be at the forefront of a great national effort is an opportunity which comes to few in a generation, and the personal satisfaction it brings is deep and lasting.

For many of you this experience will be transforming. You will be confirming, in the most personal way, the wondrous truth which too often is a mere phrase. You will know, as nothing else could make you know, that we are all of us brothers, every one of us to every one of us.

You and the thousands who will follow you will have another privilege. In some countries, and in our own too, voices have been raised to say that a land as rich as ours can only produce a mink-lined civilization, marked by a moral deadening and the frenetic pursuit of push-button luxuries, a split-level, and a sports car. By what you are doing, you make those voices just so many hollow noises.

You are reliving the fundamentals on which the Nation was founded and by which it has grown great: That success is an imperative to service, not an invitation to apathy; that democracy means a human spirit which sweeps beyond mere laws; that the United States is blessed not so much by its roaring furnaces, not so much by its abundant fields of grain, not even by space ships aloft, but by the national vision which calls upon us to use our resources so that every American can walk with head high in the tonic air of self-respect.

To all of you VISTA graduates, pioneers in a long and proud line to come, may I express my congratulations, my warmest best wishes, and—let me add—more than a bit of envy.

BISHOP GEORGE THEODORE BOILEAU

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, sad news from Alaska reached me over the weekend when I learned that one of the great citizens of my State, the Most Reverend George Theodore Boileau, coadjutor bishop of Alaska, died suddenly of a heart attack.

Bishop Boileau—and I have always, since his consecration last July, had difficulty in not referring to him as Father Boileau, because of his long service in the Jesuit order as parish priest at Fairbanks, Alaska—was not only one of the best known, but also one of the best loved, members of the Catholic clergy in Alaska.

I had known this wonderful man since he first came to Alaska, in 1950, to serve as assistant pastor at the Immaculate Conception Church in Fairbanks. After his outstanding service as pastor, he was appointed superintendent of all Catholic schools in the diocese of Alaska, in 1958.

Mr. President, Bishop Boileau combined admirably activities as a man of God and those of a man deeply immersed in civic responsibilities with his fellow men. He served as chairman of the Employment Security Commission of the Territory of Alaska, before statehood. He was active as a Boy Scout official throughout his career in Alaska.

Last September, Bishop Boileau traveled to Rome, to participate in the Ecumenical Council of the Roman Catholic Church. In assuming the office of coadjutor bishop, in ceremonies presided over by Francis Cardinal Spellman at the Copper Valley School, near Glennallen, Alaska, last July, Bishop Boileau announced humbly that he planned to travel to the Jesuit schools, churches, and

missions in the far-flung Alaska diocese in the same way he did as a priest "by dog team, plane, and sno-go."

I know I speak for all of Alaska in saluting the service of this dedicated man to the people of my State. His untimely death at the age of 52 is a sad blow to us all. May his great soul rest in peace.

U THANT'S VIEW ON VIETNAM

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in the February 26th issue of the Washington Post appeared an article, written by William S. White, under the title: "Negotiation?—U Thant's View on Vietnam."

In the article Mr. White points out very clearly and pointedly the error of Mr. U Thant's judgment in condemning the United States for its action in South Vietnam, while remaining completely silent on the series of wrongs committed by the North Vietnamese Communists against the South Vietnamese people and Government.

Mr. U Thant obviously has forgotten the existence of the Geneva pact; if he remembers it and fails to give recognition to its provisions, he clearly reflects an unwarranted and unpardonable disregard for the sanctity of compacts entered into by different nations of the world.

The North Vietnamese Communists are in violation not only of the Geneva accord, but also of the 1962 pact creating a coalition government in Laos. The borders of both these nations have been methodically and systematically violated by the Communists. Yet, Mr. U Thant sees fit to disregard these hostile belligerent violations of nations' rights, and goes out of his way to condemn the United States, whose objective in South Vietnam has been, and is, to protect the people of that nation against the wrongs that have been perpetrated upon them by their neighbor—the Communists of North Vietnam.

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

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

NEGOTIATION?: U THANT'S VIEW ON VIETNAM

(By William S. White)

With a rarely matched twisting of the truth, but at least with a certain insolent candor, Secretary General U Thant of the United Nations has now openly become an apologist and propagandist for Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

U Thant has now trumpeted as revealed truth, and without hesitation or qualification, the whole basic Communist line that the war in South Vietnam was only a little homegrown contest involving two sets of local boys until dreadful old Uncle Sam intervened to assist the anti-Communist government of that country. He has called upon us to negotiate and to withdraw ourselves as soon as possible.

In the process, he has rewritten 10 years of history, annulling 10 years in which the Communist government of North Vietnam has undeniably and consistently directed and supplied and commanded a tireless and savage invasion of South Vietnam in endless violation of agreements made in 1954 at just such negotiations as are now being so pressed upon us.

Thus, with U Thant's now unhidden recruitment to them, those forces seeking to blackmail or persuade the United States into abandoning its commitments in South Vietnam and to cut and run are at last complete. And what a pretty company they make for any American to travel with.

Thant, the Soviet Union, and Charles de Gaulle of France—this is the splendid trinity that, whatever the intention in individual cases, is taking actions to remove the American presence in Asia, to sully an American effort against pillage and murder of signal honor and decency, and to open all southeast Asia to the faceless hordes of Communist China.

And it would all be done under definitions that only Thant and the Communists can understand: If Communist forces invade or infiltrate a country, the resulting fighting is only "local" and nobody is intruding anywhere. If anti-Communist forces respond to an independent country's appeal for help against marauders, then this is not only intervention but also quite unacceptable intervention.

Even the precious little band of Democratic Senators that has been crying for weeks for "negotiation"—even though it is perfectly plain that negotiation at this stage would be outright surrender to aggression—may find itself a bit unhappy with the international associates it now has.

When the Soviet Union pushes us toward negotiation—again, at this stage, before we could possibly negotiate from strength in South Vietnam—is it really likely that this would be in the interests of the United States? When Charles de Gaulle of France pushes us toward negotiation, is it really likely that this would be in the interests of the United States, considering that Charles de Gaulle for years has been attempting to break down American influence all over the world?

Is it not odd that U Thant should feel free to interfere in this matter anyhow, since neither North Vietnam, the aggressor state here, nor Communist China, its master, is even a member of the organization for which he speaks?

And does the Democratic splinter in the Senate know that, according to word to me from a distinguished Allied Ambassador, it has already succeeded in convincing the diplomatic community here that the majority party of this country is not behind the President in Vietnam? The fact that this estimate is absurdly wrong and that a vast majority of both parties backs the President does not cure the measureless harm that has been done to American interests by the Democratic splinter.

For the President is going to take whatever measures are necessary to defend our troops and our position in Vietnam. If the solemn determination of this Government continues to be belittled on our own side of the world by men who have chosen to follow the irresponsible leadership of such a person as Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, the Chinese may fatally underestimate our resolve and bring on major war.

PROBLEMS OF COLLEGE EDUCATION—MORE CONTACTS WITH PROFESSORS NEEDED

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the Washington Evening Star there appeared an article entitled "It's Time to Return to 'Old Main'." The article was written by Jenkin Lloyd Jones, who very effectively demonstrates weaknesses that have developed in our institutions of higher learning because of the chasm that separates the members of the student body from true contact with the professors.

I wish to quote a few of the pertinent statements that Mr. Jones made in his discussion of this important subject:

A college is not a factory or a supermarket, and college bigness doesn't bring down the cost per student. The Federal Government and the great foundation should quit enticing professors away from teaching by the lavish and idiotic business of offering research grants to almost any applicant. In most of the great universities the actual teaching is being done by graduate students who are only slightly more acquainted with the subjects than their pupils.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article by Mr. Jones be printed in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, in connecion with the article by Mr. Jones, an article entitled "Jet-Age Professors," written by Leonard Gross.

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

IT'S TIME TO RETURN TO "OLD MAIN"

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

On most university campuses of any antiquity in the United States there remains the original building from which the school, amebalike, has divided and grown. Usually they call it old main.

Old main is almost invariably ugly, a belfried Victorian pile of narrow windows, creaky floors, uncertain heat and roller shades. And in spite of its central location it is getting harder to find.

Dominating and dwarfing old main now are the modern classroom buildings, the super new laboratories, the conference center, the student union—and farther out, the fieldhouse, the stadium and the high rise dormitories.

Yet old main is loved. Its picture appears most often on the cover of the alumni magazine. It represents the vanished day when students knew their professors and professors their students. It is a wistful reminder of the age when the institution had what the cheerleaders used to call spirit, a collective personality with which both faculty and students could identify themselves with pride.

It doesn't do to grow too sentimental about old main. It didn't represent any golden age of knowledge. It dates back to frock-coated professors and a rigid diet of Greek, Latin, rhetoric, logic, and a shotgun course in philosophy that included such sciences as there were. But when the entire graduating class could assemble in their wide cravats and stiff collars on the steps of old main for their final photograph there was no doubt that alma mater was a mother to them all.

Following the recent student riots at the University of California at Berkeley, which are, perhaps, to be expected under any administration that seems to be uncertain about who's running the school, there has been considerable inquiry into the origins of the unrest. And one theory advanced is that students at Berkeley are sick of being nonentities in a giant learning machine.

With 25,000 students that university has ceased to be a personality. As its capacity to inspire loyalty among its charges has diminished, so has its ability to maintain discipline. Alma mater has died and her place has been taken by a bewildering and amorphous city of classrooms in which the immature and recently arrived citizens can neither identify themselves with any traditions nor feel any kinship with the powers in city hall.

The time is overdue when we must consider how to rehumanize our colleges and universities.

Our first job is to handle the problem of bigness. Ten years ago there were 2.25 million college students in America. Now there are 4.5 million. University presidents have been deep in the business of empire building, aided by heavy Federal grants. In the meantime, many privately endowed colleges, with good academic standards, have been starved as the income tax has dried up sources of gifts. Everywhere there are lean little junior colleges and miserable teachers colleges that haven't had the favor of State legislatures.

What we ought to do is stop the physical expansion of the great State universities. This can be done easily by cutting the undergraduate enrollments by stiff entrance requirements so that these schools may concentrate on graduate work.

Then we must reequip and upgrade the smaller schools and build a lot more of them. This would not be more expensive. A college is not a factory or a supermarket and college bigness doesn't bring down the cost per student. The ideal should be a top enrollment of 5,000. The football teams might not be so hot, but students would begin to belong to something again.

Then the Federal Government and the great foundations should quit enticing professors away from teaching by the lavish and idiotic business of offering research grants to almost any applicant.

In a recent article in the New York Times, Peter Schrag, secretary of Amherst College, quotes one college administrator as follows:

"It's so easy to get grants that a fellow's dedication to teaching declines. Why labor in the vineyards when you can get a Fulbright or some other grant that enables you to study or work at what you want? The old publish-or-perish becomes travel-and-triumph while enjoying life more fully instead of plugging away at the old routine."

The "old routine," of course, is the business of teaching young people, which is what professoring used to be about. But no more. In most of the great universities the actual teaching is being done by graduate students who are only slightly more acquainted with the subjects than their pupils. It is ridiculous to let brilliant lecturers amuse themselves in private research, writing complicated treatises of interest only to other advanced scholars. Let's get them back to the rostrum and the blackboard.

The United States should not be appalled by the flood of young people now hammering at the college gates. We should be delighted. But at no greater cost than academic megalopolises we can have undergraduate schools small enough to have personality and esprit, where students can once again have contact with professors.

Old main must rise again.

JET-AGE PROFESSORS

After a century of ridicule and neglect, the American university professor has come upon sweet times. Everyone wants the benefit of his brain—government, industry, foundations and, of course, universities. Their blandishments are glittery: expensive tools, extensive time, intensive travel, and excellent pay. Yesterday's tower-bound professor often moonlighted to make ends meet. The jet-age professor, if he's good, can write his own ticket. One who is and does is pictured here.

George Maslach, dean of Berkeley's College of Engineering, is a professor of aeronautical engineering. A colleague calls him "the outstanding experimentalist in the world" in his field, rarefied-gas dynamics. Twice recently, Maslach has turned down "$50,000 kind of things" from industry because life as he now lives it is too exciting. It's 3 minutes from his campus office, where he supervises the education of an inordinate number of the Nation's better engineering students, to his contemporary home in the hills above, where, from his balcony, the entire bay area spreads before him. During the school year, he averages at least one trip a month East as a consultant, and turns another down. During summers and sabbaticals, he jets with his wife and three children to Europe, where he serves on a NATO advisory board. Whatever can be gained from life among the academic elite, George Maslach is getting.

But are students getting what they should from professors like George Maslach? The question dominates academic debate today. Critical educators charge that many professors find research grants and consulting fees so seductive they have all but abandoned teaching. If it's not the professor, it's his university, which, mindful of its reputation, demands that he "publish or perish." Either way, the argument holds, the student loses out. Teaching is frequently shunted to assistants and graduate students. Many undergraduates have only passing contact with the best faculty minds. Students are all but forgotten, says a recent Carnegie Foundation report, in the "headlong search for more and better grants, fatter fees, higher salaries, higher rank." And because Cal's faculty is rated among the top four nationally, the Berkeley campus is invariably cited as the villainous prototype of a "university on the make."

Such abuses dismay Maslach and George Pimentel, the restless, committed chemistry professor. At Berkeley, it is a matter of policy that even the most venerated faculty stars teach undergraduate courses in addition to graduate seminars. It is a matter of honor that professors not let outside work interfere with their teaching, and not accept work that doesn't enhance it. Neither honor nor policy is violated nearly so often as charged, Maslach and Pimentel agree, but each would like to see such violators as do exist sent packing.

Both men make conscious efforts to work with undergraduates. Says Maslach: "If any student thinks enough of me to ask me to advise him, I, by God, am going to respond, even if it takes hours." Pimentel never locks his office door. His students revere him. Says one: "With him, you're a colleague rather than an underling." The author of a popular high school chemistry textbook, Pimentel learned a few years ago that high school teachers were counseling their better students to avoid Berkeley, lest they be lost in the bigness. Pimentel organized a freshman science honors program designed to stimulate talented minds through close faculty-student contact.

In one vital respect, however, both professors find the current criticism specious. To them, there is no choice between research and teaching. The only choice is between mediocrity and excellence. There are few good teachers who don't do research, they contend; most research translates into good teaching. Maslach: "Research and teaching are synonymous words. If you don't do research, you're going to be a trade school." Pimentel: "Research and teaching are like sin and confession. If you don't do any of the former, you don't have anything to talk about in the latter."

Beneath the heat are questions that American universities, already splitting at the seams, must confront at once: What is a university for? Who should study there? The vision of men like Maslach and Pimentel is as new as the future, as old as medieval Oxford. A university is, above all, for scholarship, and for students with the potential to be scholars. Says Pimentel: "The primary obligation of the university is to make sure there is a place for the very best student. If we don't do it, nobody else will."

The average student? This year, Maslach predicts, Berkeley will suggest to its 20,000 applicants that many of them might learn more and be happier at one of California's many good 4-year colleges. Given the demands of the jet age, such a solution may be unavoidable. "We want a growing percentage of our population to be going to the university," says George Pimentel, "but we don't want the caliber of their education to decline."

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most tragic events of this or any other century was the subjection of most of Eastern Europe to Russian domination. The ruthless regimes that now claim to be the representatives of the people are, in reality, directed from Moscow. They have systematically thwarted, by force when other methods failed, the legitimate aspirations of the peoples of Eastern Europe for national independence.

The United States has consistently refused to admit that the governments now dedicated to the Communist ideology are the legitimate representatives of the people of these countries. On the contrary, we are sure that a truly free election would once and for all eliminate Communist influence from this area of the world. Our strategy is a simple one. By recognizing the dreams of these people, we are supporting their ideals, and are holding out to them a hope for the future. The captive nations of Europe will not be captive for long, for such subjugation is contrary to the basic desires of the people.

One of the smallest of these nations is Estonia. Last Thursday, February 24, she celebrated her independence from Russia which was proclaimed on February 24, 1918. Russia invaded the land of this brave people in the early part of World War II, and again in 1944, subjecting them once more to Russian imperialism and control.

Yet no people has held more tenaciously to the idea that their subjection is only temporary. Estonian history teaches that the dedication to liberty and independence in that country is strong and enduring. In America, the Estonian National Committee has been doing superior work to alert all Americans to the necessity of supporting our friends in Eastern Europe.

America is dedicated to the idea that all men ought to be able to choose their own government. In commemoration of this special day, we rededicate ourselves to this ideal, and extend to the Estonian people our hopes for a better world in the near future. They have not been forgotten, nor will they be. Even though the Estonians themselves cannot celebrate Estonian Independence Day, we in this country can. By doing so, we show to the entire world that we deeply believe that communistic imperialism is doomed to destruction. Tyranny of one group of rulers over another people has never been successful, and never can be permanent.

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to express my respect for the Americans of Estonian descent who continue to work for the day when Estonia will once again be free.

GEORGE WASHINGTON, THE FATHER OF OUR COUNTRY

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, each year on February 22, radio station KDBS, in Alexandria, La., broadcasts a commentary on the life of George Washington and the great importance his influence held for the birth of our Nation. Station KDBS is owned and operated by Mr. Irving Ward-Steinman, of Alexandria, a longtime friend of mine. Mr. Ward-Steinman has always interested himself in civic service to his city, State, and Nation, and he has had this eloquent commentary on George Washington printed for distribution to all interested persons. I believe it is worthy of inclusion in the RECORD; and, as a matter of fact, I am forwarding a copy of it home, for the benefit of my 13 grandchildren. It is not very long, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

FEBRUARY 22, 1732

His father was rich. He had inherited much. By the time his son was born, the father owned a thousand-acre estate. This was in 1732. Quite a few years ago. The father was by inheritance and diligence a large landowner. He was also a tobacco grower and an iron miner. Even then, his home was a Tudor brick plantation home.

Into this home was born the man we are thinking about—today, some 230 years later.

Born into wealth, into luxury, into comfort. Born without the necessity of proving his right to anything. It was ready made. All he had to do was to sit in the lap of destiny and enjoy the fruits of his father's diligence and inheritance.

Like his father who had inherited a tremendous land estate, he was in line for this preprepared estate. No work—no worry—no want. All this young man had to do was to pass his days pleasantly; enjoy his nights, and arise for the following day's round of enjoyment and good fellowship.

If this was all—we would not know about our young man. If the story ended where it began, with wealth and ease and plenty, this would not be a memorial.

We can go further. We can make a stark statement. If this young man had not been born, would there be a United States of America.

What is there in the spark known as destiny, that glow which creates history, which selects one person and to that person points an eternal finger and whispers: "Your country needs you."

Ever since that memorable day, on February 22, 1732, the nobility inherent in man has outraced the pitiful apathy of unthinking man.

The wealth this young man inherited came from another source. The real wealth he contained came, not from his earthly father, but from his heavenly father—God.

He had a belief in God. He felt his responsibility to man and mankind. Not confined by the realisms of having to make a living, he devoted his resources, both temporal, and spiritual, to building a nation under God. He represented a steadfast leadership. There was hostility. His country—his native land, now ours, was under a foreign power.

There were injustices. Instinctively, he rejected foreign domination. God had given man an instrument to think with, a heart to act under, and a forum to place into operation the combined results.

To this person, an opportunity to serve is a mandate from on high. Nothing is by accident. He counted his blessings and acquired skills. Throughout all these learning processes, he retained a humility. Why had his forebears come to this wild and undisciplined land.

There was work to do. Every child of God, of every age, has a task to perform; a work to execute; a job to complete.

And this man of destiny went to work.

The land had to be surveyed, farms laid out, crops planted, trees grown, communities organized, leaders selected, scools established, roads laid out, policy created, government achieved.

One obstacle remained. Absentee ownership, foreign rule, external control—these were alien to the ideals of justice and self-government. No foreign entanglements and what had been had to be severed. The umbilical attaching the child to the mother had to be cut. The child was growing—with all its pains.

Disagreement was inevitable. Disagreement between one who claimed ownership by a false theory—the false thinking of the past centuries, the scourge of self-realization; the thinking that by inheritance, or luck, or politics, there was such a valid thing as the divine right of kings. The divine right to own and to rule and to legislate and to control—a body of people, thousands of miles away; a carryover from the darker ages of man's history which gave to the world for centuries the dangerous doctrine that "might is right."

The era of reckoning had to come and it did. War. The simple protest of a simple people against an absent landlord. Some call this revolution; others call it anarchy. But these people called it independence. Books refer to the protest as "The War for Independence."

There were hardships. The melting pot known as new citizens from foreign lands represented many types of culture—including the absence of same. These people had few if any guns or firearms. There was no such thing as uniform arms or ammunition. Each group made its own bullets. They were unorganized as a military unit.

But they had "something" which took the place of the lack of these military armaments. That "something" was a burning idealism. God from on high had given them intelligence. He had given them a vision. They would not perish. They had a task to perform. A mission to execute.

And now there was work to do. Communities were organized, resources were pooled, town forums and citizen's meetings were held. Every man, woman, and child attended. The future of their independence was in danger. Was this land of theirs to be a new land—a new land of hope, or just a finger of a foreign power.

And into this confusion of many stratas of customs and habits brought from foreign shores, was the steady hand of leadership. Made steady by the forearm of God. This was to be a nation under God; a people belonging to God. A free people making a home for others seeking a land free from the tyrannies of absent landlords and kings and empires and governments.

A new land. Liberty comes high—very high. The countless graves, the numberless mounds, are mute testimony that with every worthy cause the worthy people are inspired. How they died and for what purpose, is what makes any nation great. And it is what has made this Nation of ours a great one.

These were the times in which liberty and freedom were worth every price. The price of losing wealth and property and lands—and even life. It was not a case of being safe. The folks we are thinking about could have moved into the interior. The known area of land had just been barely pricked by the ploy. Relative safety was in the interior. But these folks were not running from anything. To them, their liberty and independence were worth staying, fighting, working—and dying, to accomplish.

Without intending such, these were the times which gave birth to our heritage of nobility. From these trying efforts stem and branch forth the tree of our country. All that we have been, and are, comes from this era.

Americanism was being born. The standards and guides and examples of government were being firmed into the pattern of our national birth. There was no compromise with truth or justice. "Might was no longer right." The power of the people, under the idea of "justice to all" was being born. Errors and mistakes were to creep in. And they did. But just as they happened in, they were escorted out.

This was the scene into which was born, and the background of what ensued, of our subject who made his debut February 22, 1732.

Disregarding his wealth, and using the same for his country, he was legislator, leader, military strategist, farmer-planner, and finally, yielding to the urgent demands of the times, he accepted public office.

Bringing all of the wealth of his prayerful life into the Government he headed, he guided our Nation. This was to be a nation under God; a people living and dying for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. A country which all people were created to equally enjoy the blessings as nature endowed them with the capacity to receive, understand, and appreciate. The lessons learned were set forth as guides for the future.

The birthpains having passed, the growing into graceful maturity, was envisioned. There were to be no foreign entanglements. The material blessings were valuable only to the extent they were spiritually used. Decisions must be wisely made—for the benefit of all peoples—and not for just the few. With the opportunity to govern was given the privilege to vote. The conditions under which freedom can exist were proved. A firm foundation had been laid. There was to be no tampering with the foundation.

Nothing was guaranteed—neither life nor security nor happiness; only the right to pursue the same, to look for it—and the duty to die, if necessary, for it. But the opportunity idea was new. This was something never before vouchsafed to man. Life and security and happiness, until now, were for a select few—by inheritance. Now—everyone was entitled to join in the process. The banners of new hope and new freedom were flying. Here were nurtured and developed the ideals of our country—vision, humility, heroism, convictions, faith, tolerance. The American way of life was in the making. Being tried, tested, and trued. Only the future could show the results.

This time there was a difference. The difference was God. This was a nation under God. In God we trust. And just as God works in wonderful ways his magnificence to portray, in His plans was February 22, 1732. For on that day was born George Washington. Into the whirlpool of activity, much of it without purpose, we make this necessary and needful pause. To recognize a great man; a fine soul; a humble person—and to draw from his life and living the inspiration and drive to remember and to emulate and to keep the faith—just as he did. So to the first President of these United States, we say, publicly and reverently: Thanks, for being the Father of our country.

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on February 8 of this year, Marion S. Monk, Jr., president of the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, addressed the association's national convention, at Portland, Oreg. Mr. Monk is a native of Batchelor, La., and

he and I have been associated for a number of years in soil and water conservation work. His speech at the annual convention provides a short history of the growth of soil and water conservation districts in America and of the Government's role in soil and water conservation, in general.

From the text of his address, I note that Mr. Monk quoted a statement by President Johnson, as follows:

It is our task to hold the rich heritage of our land in trust for future generations. What we do with it now will determine its productivity for generations to come.

This reflects my own attitude toward soil and water conservation, for our stewardship of the land is more important to the generations yet unborn than it is to our own.

Mr. Monk also stated the position of the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts on the recommendation that a revolving fund be established to finance, in part, the cost of technical services provided to soil conservation districts and cooperating landowners. For the benefit of other interested Senators, I ask that the text of his address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

VISIONS

Mr. Chairman, fellow conservationists, honored guests, I know I speak for each of you when I say it is a real pleasure to be here in the great Northwest. We are proud to be in Portland, the City of Roses, for this the 19th annual convention of the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts.

Much has been said these past few weeks about scenic beauty, beautiful America, and beautiful countryside. The great Northwest certainly has its share of the beauties of nature. There have been times this year when the elements have conspired to hamper preparations for this convention. We have all sympathized with the personal trials and tribulations of you people in this area. From our hearts we thank you for making this wonderful meeting possible. We know the road wasn't easy.

Three decades ago, the magnitude and urgency of the conservation job began to impress itself on our Nation. The primary concern at that time was with erosion on agricultural lands. With so much at stake the temptation was to use the power of the State and Federal Governments to compel the control of erosion and to put a halt to excessive waste and misuse of soil and water. But in all parts of the country there were farmers, ranchers, and landowners who said that they were both willing and able to take on the job of resource conservation. Thus was born the Federal, State, and local partnership; conservation efforts channeled through local self-government groups known as districts.

This is a vision which has come true through the efforts of a free people with talent, energy, and a sense of social responsibility; a people willing to give freely of their time and personal resources to counsel and lead others in conservation work.

The urgency of the soil conservation district concept was made more apparent by the mounting pyramid of erosion, floods, and land damage, topped by the monstrous dust storms of the thirties.

Another vision born of necessity has been Public Law 566, Watershed and Flood Prevention Act. Still another vision that has become in reality an active and vigorous program channeled through Districts is the Great Plains program. More recently we have had visions of reality in community action programs. Thus, not only is America growing, but our society is changing. New demands are being made daily on our resources. Growing demands are being made on our food, water, recreational areas, and our forests. These project for us, you and I, in conservation work new quantitative and qualitative demands on our resources.

Faced with a new America, an America that poses new challenges, an America that is changing before our eyes, an America whose patterns of economic growth are rapidly transforming our institutions, styles of life, and even our concepts of thought—what will be our vision for the future?

You, district officials, have accomplished much in the past quarter century. Your record has been impressive. The capability for service of districts has far outstripped the greatest expectations and vision of those who originated this venture in community action.

Today in every region of our Nation demands for district services exceed the capacity to fulfill them. The benefits of district services are many; economic gain to the community and the landowner; economic savings to the community, thus, preservation and protection of resources and works of improvement; improved water supplies and water quality; establishing new recreational facilities; and greater freedom from flood damage. There are still greater values not so readily measured, intangible values, the national beauty of the countryside, green belts around urban areas, fish, game, and wildlife. Orderly growth of communities as opposed to haphazard and wasteful sprawl, a well managed landscape symbolizing harmony between man and his environment; all of these have value above dollars and cents. These may be called the esthetic and amenity values of conservation.

This past year has once again been a year of great progress in conservation and resource development. Last year in Kansas City we started this year of work with great zest and ambitions for the future. I commend you on having played an important part in the development and furtherance of resource conservation. President Johnson, on the occasion of our Kansas City convention, sent his greetings. May I quote from his letter?

"In the last 30 years, we have—through our conservation programs—fought an important and winning struggle to save our Nation's most basic resources: our soil and water. I remember, as do many of you, how desperate was the problem and how long seemed the odds against us when we began. The success we have achieved today is proof of how well we can work together—from the Federal level to the local level—to do the things our Nation needs done for the present and the future.

"I congratulate you all on the work you are leading responsibly at the local level throughout our land. As my heart has been in this vital effort for so many years, so my good wishes continue with you in the work which must be done now."

With these remarks ringing in our ears we were encouraged to set an even faster pace in resource conservation than at any time in history.

The 88th Congress, this past year, received the reputation of a conservation Congress. This, too, encouraged all of us.

Working as a Federal-State-local team, we have developed the finest system known to man for resource conservation. The achievements of this team effort has helped to bring about more benefits for the people, better living conditions and billions of dollars in economic values. As a result of this teamwork and its achievements many nations are copying our design.

In furthering our efforts toward greater results your NACD has operated on many fronts. Ours is a team effort on your behalf. Each of your directors, officers, and especially your staff, is to be commended.

Just a few days after the Kansas City convention, W. A. Williams, Jr., chairman of our public lands committee, appeared before House and Senate subcommittees on appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies. Chairman Williams stated:

"Conservation work on large areas of western public land has fallen so far behind, and the needs are so urgent, that a major recovery effort should be scheduled over the next decade."

In the last week of February Secretary Freeman announced a new program of "rural renewal." This program is designed as a pilot operation and indicates the growing concern about the lack of prosperity at the rural crossroads.

This same week Secretary Udall announced the details of the nationwide outdoor recreation plan. Thus, on two fronts, new programs were announced involving resource development.

About this same time planning work began in 10 projects designed to bring about communitywide economic gains on a base of resource development. These projects are called resource conservation and development projects, and average about 1,700,000 acres each in size.

In March the atmosphere began to get smoky. We learned of a prospective cutback in technical assistance to districts beginning on July 1. Don Williams is to be commended on the manner in which he handled this cutback. By shifting assignments of his top hands and readjusting technical centers, districts did not feel this cut. Reflecting over these events, I can't help but wonder if we should have considered this action as a projection of things to come.

The memory of an old friend, a great leader of this organization, was honored during the month of March by his soil conservation district. The Brazoria-Galveston soil conservation district changed its name to Waters Davis Soil Conservation District.

Milton Fricke, the energetic chairman of your watersheds and water resources committee, told a Senate subcommittee that greater clarity was needed in the rules governing Federal water rights to protect local projects from the overriding assertion of U.S. authority. Milt's appearance preceded our spring directors meeting in Washington. Once again may I say to you, Your officers and directors are a hard-working group. This spring meeting was no exception.

Early in April, Richard Longmire, chairman of your legislation committee, and Milton Fricke, chairman of your watersheds and water resources committee, appeared before the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. In view of the Budget Bureau's proposed cutback in Government support of existing district programs, as well as elimination of SCS technical assistance in new districts, these two NACD spokesmen asked whether there had been a change in the Government's position on districts.

"We believe there is now a serious question," they said, "about whether the Government is to be a reluctant partner or a forthright one."

In the light of current events, many of us today are asking this same question.

The last of April, many of us were in attendance at the 11th National Watershed Congress held in Little Rock, Ark. We were proud of one of the past presidents of this organization who was named watershed man of the year, Nolen Fuqua. Nolen, one of the early advocates of Public Law 566, is a tireless champion of watershed programs throughout the Nation.

Following the watershed congress, a small group representing the Soil Conservation

Society and your NACD spent the better part of 1 day discussing better alinement of our joint efforts on behalf of resource conservation. I know you join with me in the feeling that the conservation job is so big that these two organizations will be taxed in time and ability.

The first week in May was Soil Stewardship Week. Once again, we are all proud of our sponsorship of this program. May I commend Oscar Laper and Ray Shaffer for their leadership in this committee. You might be interested in hearing an excerpt from a statement of President Johnson's commending the observance of Soil Stewardship Week. I quote:

"It is fitting that we set aside a Soil Stewardship Week each year to recognize our stewardship of the land.

"During the last 50 years, the American farmer has increasingly proved himself a good steward of his land. In many places he has taken wornout and eroded land and literally turned it into a bountiful land. For the first time, we are able to produce at low cost an abundance of the food and fiber we need and still provide for many less fortunate.

"It is our task to hold the rich heritage of our land in trust for future generations. What we do with it now will determine its productivity for generations to come. We must make it an instrument for progress and prosperity. If we care for and nurture the land, there is plenty. If we neglect the land, there is poverty. This is the essence of stewardship."

During the middle of May we received good news—the budget cuts to technical assistance and cost-sharing were to be restored by the Congress. A conservation Congress. I wonder if 1965 will see the same balloon "good news" in the Tuesday letter.

This same week we were proud to announce that the SCS and the Bureau of Land Management had issued a memorandum directing field employees to give joint assistance to districts in areas where public lands were intermingled with and used in conjunction with private lands. The memo emphasized the need for uniformity of management and treatment of both classes of land.

Midway of the year, 1964, we were happy to announce the employment of an assistant executive secretary, David Unger. Dave, a replacement for Lee Conahan who resigned, brings to us a wealth of experience in the resource conservation field. I am sure all of you will enjoy knowing Dave.

Ray Shaffer and Dave Unger represented us at the Sixth National Boy Scout Jamboree. More than 52,000 Scouts were in attendance.

The needed acceleration of water resources research was made possible through legislation signed into law on July 17. This program is sorely needed because of our increasing population and rapid economic growth. Water use will double in the next 20 years.

Another interesting water development is the massive water development plan under study for the western half of the North American Continent. This is a proposal to divert excess water from Alaska, Canada's northwestern territories, and the Rocky Mountains, to water-scarce areas of the central plains of Canada, the Western United States, and northern Mexico. A tremendous plan illustrating the importance of water.

June, July, August, and September were months of almost around the clock activity in furthering soil and water conservation. During these months six of the seven area meetings were held. These meetings focused attention on the changing and expanding concept of conservation. Increasingly, the traditional land and water conservation concepts are being enlarged and modified to encompass new public concerns. Many district leaders, professional conservationists, and a growing number of citizens are convinced that the big push of economic expansion in America is destroying the beauty and usefulness of large areas of our countryside. This is a new kind of erosion, that of natural beauty. District leaders, therefore, are taking a hard look at coming problems and the probable new look of districts in the future. We, as district officials, indicated at these area meetings a willingness to tackle the challenges which our changing society is imposing on resource development. We must be ever alert to the Federal trend toward programs and projects which bypass districts. At the same time, our local districts must not be tardy in pushing for wider and more effective operations. Especially we must broaden our enabling acts. In many States the present restrictive nature of these authorities under which districts operate are acting as hobbles. Districts, for example, should be the vehicle with the broad outlook and powers to meet conservation needs in intermingled rural and metropolitan areas. We must have the vision. These are some of the topics you discussed at these area meetings.

During these same months your capable vice president, Sam Studebaker, represented you at the Rivers and Harbors Congress before the Department of Agriculture's budget committee and the Bureau of the Budget. Dave Unger met with the American Country Life Association. Director Lorin Trubschenk represented you at the National Reclamation Association.

The middle of September the conservation field days and plowing matches were held in North Dakota. Over 75,000 people turned out on a rainy day to view conservation and to hear Senators Goldwater and HUMPHREY deliver agricultural speeches. Your fine western program adviser, Bob McClelland, Director Wally Petersen, and your conservation field days chairman, Osborne Galde, were your representatives.

These summer months witnessed summer meetings of two of your most active committees, Great Plains and public lands. The sessions have become most constructive. The members of these committees and their chairmen, Oscar Hippe and Bill Williams, are to be congratulated.

During the first days of October, while many of us were battling a hurricane, Sam Studebaker was a guest speaker before the Farm Equipment Institute. We owe a great deal to this fine organization for their continued support. It is always a pleasure to work with people who understand our problems.

Your officers and directors met in Asheville, N.C., the latter part of October to consider resource issues of major importance. During this meeting Chairman Charles Ladd, of your recreation and wildlife committee, presented for approval the inventory forms for districts' use in collecting and assessing data on local recreational assets. Congratulations, Charlie, on a job well done.

Other topics discussed were a new timber resources review by the U.S. Forest Service, the final reports to be named Timber Trends. Proposals by NACD's education committee headed by David Kistner, of Georgia, reviewed district cooperation in community planning and many other subjects, such as, changing land use patterns, and sites of future conventions.

Early in November your foundation, the Soil and Water Conservation Districts Foundation under the capable leadership of Nolen Fuqua, its executive director, announced publication of the "District Guide Book for 1965." This book is designed to help district officials do their work easier, better, and more efficiently; thus, making district management more effective.

The last area meeting of the year, area VII, examined resource development needs. All areas were in agreement that with the population explosion, rapidly changing technological needs, and social demands, that resources would be taxed to the limit in the future. Our problem is to meet these needs and in time.

These are just a few of the meetings and activities in which we have participated on your behalf during this past year. The year 1964 was a good year in resource conservation and all factors point to greater progress in 1965. In the months ahead the demands on resources will be even greater than in the past. We will need to step up and expand our upstream watershed programs. We will need to coordinate this program with major river basin planning and development activities. Greater efforts are needed to insure that adequate facilities are included in river basin plans to meet the oncoming needs of rural areas and upstream communities.

We must have better liaison and cooperation between districts and local, regional, and State planning agencies. We must have more emphasis on such work as use of soil surveys by planning commissions. We must have more use and emphasis on soil and resource potentials of the community by planning commissions.

We must have more adequate funds at every level of the district movement in order to properly advance conservation programs. Dollars invested by local, State, and Federal Governments in conservation programs are repaid many times in reduction of damages, improved economic activity, more jobs, higher levels of business activity, and greater purchases of equipment, services, and supplies. Conservation pays.

We must continue to accelerate the basic work of planning and applying conservation measures to individual properties. This is a fundamental program of proven merit. More than 70 percent of the lands of this country are privately owned. We were pleased this past year that the Congress appropriated additional funds for technical assistance to districts. But the backlog of requests for assistance is steadily growing. The most recent evaluation of staffing needs completed 60 days ago shows the need of 1,518 more man-years of technical help than is presently available just to keep even with requests for assistance from landowners. This does not cover any applications for assistance not now on file. How many landowners, knowing their requests cannot be filled, have failed to ask for help? How many are discouraged by this lack of help? How many acres will not be treated in 1965 for lack of help? All of these questions should not have to be asked.

We must have adequate financing. Conservation programs cannot be turned on and off each year. Future demands for resources are too great. The work must be continuous; the momentum must be sustained. The partnership of local districts, State, and Federal Government has awakened a national sense of consciousness of conservation imperative on the part of people. They have organized a host of services, facilities, and people into an effective instrument for conservation accomplishment.

Our vision for the future must be how to meet the fantastic demands on natural resources in an efficient, practical, and democratic manner. In order to do this we must:

1. Equip ourselves to meet the demands for orderly resource development in an age of steeply increased requirements for land, water, and space.

2. We must confront the fact that resource programs of the future need to be developed in terms that all of our people, rural and urban alike, can understand and support.

3. We must invent new operating machinery that will not only meet the basic requirements of farmers and landowners, but also satisfy community development needs and provide a framework for greater public participation in resource matters.

4. In the face of progressively mounting requests for assistance from landowners and communities, we must secure and provide the needed technical, financial, and other services necessary to move ahead with the job.

This last cannot be accomplished through revolving funds. Thirty years ago the Congress of the United States began a policy of providing SCS technical assistance without charge to private landowners of this country who were willing to adopt farmwide conservation programs on their properties.

In his budget message to Congress on the 25th of January President Johnson said:

"I will continue to press for other user charges in Government programs where benefits are provided to specific, identifiable individuals and business. Fairness to all taxpayers demands that those who enjoy special benefits should bear a greater share of the costs."

Is this, then, the revolving fund idea; a user fee for using technical services? In their zeal to carry out the President's wishes, did the Bureau of the Budget and its director, Kermit Gordon, forget the true meaning of conservation? Did they forget that the conservation program, in this country, of using a team of local, State, and Federal people, has been the envy of the world? Did they fail to realize what Congress has stated many times—that conservation of soil and water is in the total public interest and is one of the most urgent national needs?

In fact, did the budget boys fail to read or listen to the President's state of the Union message? May I quote?

"Ahead now is a summit where freedom from the wants of the body can help fulfill the needs of the spirit.

"We do not intend to live—in the midst of abundance—isolated from neighbors and nature, confined by blighted cities and bleak suburbs * * *.

"For over three centuries the beauty of America has sustained our spirit and has enlarged our vision. We must act now to preserve this heritage.

"In a fruitful new partnership with the States and cities the next decade should be a conservation milestone. We must make a massive effort to save the countryside and to establish * * * more large and small parks, more seashores and open spaces than have been created during any other period in our national history.

"A new and substantial effort must be made to landscape highways and provide places of relaxation and recreation wherever our roads run.

"We will seek legal power to prevent pollution of our air and water before it happens."

Conservationists saw in the statements of the President an enlarged opportunity to build a better outdoor America. They also saw a challenge to all citizens, through these visions of a better America, to work even more diligently at local and State levels as well as nationally to achieve even greater resource development.

Then came the budget proposal which said a reduction of $20 million is anticipated for 1966 under legislation being proposed to authorize the establishment of a public enterprise revolving fund to finance in part the cost of technical services provided to soil conservation districts and cooperating farmers, ranchers, and other landowners in the design, layout, and installation of planned soil and water conservation practices. The proposed legislation would require that cooperating soil conservation districts or landowners and operators pay to the Soil Conservation Service up to 50 percent of the cost of technical assistance furnished to help install planned practices on their lands.

We have been advised by a reliable source on budget matters that this legislation, if passed, says as follows—to the extent non-Federal contributions fail to reach the planned total of $20 million it will be necessary for the Soil Conservation Service to reduce proportionately its technical staff. This $20 million currently pays the salaries and expenses of over 3,000 man-years of full-time technical employees and temporary local aids.

Faced today with a shortage of 1,518 man-years of technical assistance just to keep the resource conservation job going on 73 percent of the lands of the Nation, are we to be faced tomorrow with a shortage of 4,518 man-years of help?

How will the Great Society live up to the high ideals and visions of the President without this help?

Soil erosion increases flood damages, chokes streams, lakes, and harbors with sediment, and reduces the capability of our land to meet the wide range of demands being placed upon it by our rapidly growing population. This damage is to the resources of America and should be paid for by all the people. The correction of resource damage, the conservation and preservation of our resources, is of benefit to all people. It is not of special benefit to specific, identifiable individuals, but to all people.

The 89th Congress and this administration will not, must not, be the Congress and the administration which turned its back on a grassroots conservation program so constructively undertaken in 1935 by Franklin D. Roosevelt and the leaders of the 1930's. There is nothing that has happened suddenly in 1965 to change this vision.

The years ahead offer us the greatest opportunity we have had in modern times to strengthen the ideal of self-government, and at the same time help achieve vital goals in the care and development of America's natural resources. These resources are our inheritance and they belong equally to all people. I know this convention and its governing body, the council, will act to accept this challenge.

SENATOR DOUGLAS REVIEWS SENATOR KEFAUVER'S BOOK "IN A FEW HANDS"

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, some of the work of our late esteemed and beloved colleague, Estes Kefauver, is recorded in an excellent book which has just appeared. It is entitled "In a Few Hands: Monopoly Power in America," and has been published with the effective collaboration of his associate, Dr. Irene Till. This book deserves wide reading.

The book is admirably reviewed by another of our colleagues, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], a former professor of economics at the University of Chicago, who undoubtedly is the foremost economist in our body. The review furnishes an admirable summary of the contents of Estes Kefauver's book.

I recommend its reading, and I ask unanimous consent that the book review entitled "When Business Gets Too Big," from the current issue of the Saturday Review, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

WHEN BIG BUSINESS GETS TOO BIG

(By PAUL H. DOUGLAS)

Estes Kefauver was at once one of the most useful and least appreciated of modern Senators. He did invaluable work in revealing the many facets of the national crime syndicate, in urging an Atlantic commonwealth, and in exposing the pervasiveness of monopoly and imperfect competition. He had great political virtues but the intellectuals refused to accept him. His coonskin cap, his soft voice, deadpan manners, and undistinguished speech caused most of the political pundits to reject him. Yet, beneath his rural appearance, there lurked one of the best brains in the Senate, unsurpassed persistence, and the proverbial courage of a lion. No one in the country knew more about the evil of monopoly then he, and no one worked harder to reduce them.

Kefauver died with his boots on in the summer of 1963 while trying to prevent a private corporation from taking over the telecommunications industry and operating as a monopoly above and beyond government. For a day the public mourned its champion and then largely forgot the lanky and undemonstrative Tennessean.

It is therefore appropriate that this work, edited and completed by his close associate, Dr. Irene Till, should embody the results of his investigations and those of his staff into the drug, steel, automobile, and baking industries.

In a succinct opening chapter, which discusses the economics of the commercial drug industry, the authors tell how the big companies, by saturation advertising of their brand names, are largely able to lift their products out of competition and, as a result, reap extremely high profits. From 1957 to 1963 these averaged approximately 20 percent after taxes. This was twice the norm for manufacturing as a whole and over a third higher than the rate for such favored industries as the automobile, office machinery, electrical equipment, glass, and industrial chemicals.

Kefauver tried to remove one of the many reasons for these abnormally high rates by requiring that drugs be labeled by their generic, as well as brand names. Since many drugs with dissimilar trade names are fundamentally the same, this reduction to a common terminology would deflate much of the puffy advertising and lead, as in Europe and in the purchases by hospitals and public agencies, to much lower prices for the individual consumer. The Kefauver proposal also called for a licensing, after a brief period, of patents. This aroused the most bitter opposition not only from the drug trade but also from the allied professions of advertising and communications. It was only the thalidomide tragedy, as revealed by two courageous women, Drs. Helen Taussig and Frances Kelsey, that enabled the Senator from Tennessee to save even a portion of his bill. Although final compromise dropped the compulsory licensing feature, it nevertheless required the supplementary use of generic terms, which must be displayed at least half as prominently as the trade names. This has been of real use. The Tennessean won an additional victory in the bill's provision that drugs be effective as well as safe, further that side effects be taken into consideration and, if injurious, stated.

Great powers are therefore given to the Food and Drug Administration. It is important that this Agency, in turn, be closely supervised to see that its authority not be used to protect the big drug firms while discriminating against the small.

While the hearings on drugs were the most sensational in the long inquiry, those on steel, automobiles, and other great industries revealed many facets of monopoly and imperfect competition. Kefauver and his associates proved that there was little or no price competition in steel, that United States Steel and possibly one or two others set the prices, which were so high that most firms would break even when operating at only a third of capacity. The power of the big bread chains to drive small competitors to the wall by regional price cutting, which was supposed to have been outlawed by the Trade

Commission Act of 1914, was demonstrated to be again at work.

Automobiles have witnessed the sharpest movement toward concentration. In 1921 there were 88 firms in the industry; today 4 companies account for 99 percent of the total output. The competition among these four is not in the field of prices but rather in planned obsolescence and style changes, which add billions to auto prices but have little or no function.

Everywhere, indeed, concentration has been proceeding apace. By 1962 the top 20 manufacturing companies had about 25 percent of all manufacturing assets and amassed 38 percent of the net profits after taxes, while the 50 largest held 36 percent of the assets and received 48 percent of the profits. Carrying this analysis still further, the 100 biggest concerns owned 46 percent of the assets and reaped 57 percent of the profits. Finally, the 1,000 largest manufacturing companies owned nearly 75 percent of the assets and obtained 86 percent of all the profits. It is a startling fact that the remaining 419,000 manufacturing companies had only about a quarter of the assets and received a bare 14 percent of the profits, or about two-fifths as much as the 20 giants. Since 1962 this concentration has been increasing still further by the continued wave of mergers. The same process is taking place in other industries such as mining and retailing. Only in the service trades is small business holding on.

This means, of course, that the control of economic activity is becoming concentrated "in a few hands." As the English economist, Joan Robinson, demonstrated 30 years ago in "Economics of Imperfect Competition," this means a scale of prices appreciably higher than that which would prevail under competition, and this in turn means not only a greater concentration of income and wealth but also smaller total production and fewer persons employed.

Monopoly and imperfect competition are, to my mind, the chief causes for the persistence in this country of excessively high levels of unemployment. For, since the sum total of price tags on goods that could be produced under full employment exceeds the sum total of monetary purchasing power in the pockets of consumers, and since the dominant forces in the marketplace refuse to lower prices, the result is unemployment and idle plants. The recent tax cut had as its basic premise the addition of further units of monetary purchasing power to pump consumer demand up to the level of the relatively fixed prices.

This is better than nothing, but the urgent need is for a much greater degree of competition, which would lower prices and bring more goods within the reach of consumers. Indeed, it could be the best antipoverty measure. Kefauver saw this clearly and properly stressed its importance. But it must be confessed that, like others, he was not too helpful in suggesting how it might be effected. The Senator properly pointed out the comparative ineffectiveness of governmental regulation and instead placed his faith in publicity and more accurate information.

As Prof. H. M. Gray of the University of Illinois has graphically shown, probably the very least that Government can do is not to encourage monopoly. Should it not, for example, revise its patent laws and its requirement barring entrance into many fields of economic activity save on proof of "convenience and necessity"? Perhaps some consideration should be given to the suggestion made by Fred Raymond in "The Limitist," namely, that the size of concerns producing more or less identical products be held down to X number of employees. This would retain the benefits of large-scale production inside the factory as well as the advantages flowing from vertical integration. It would place some limitation, however, on horizontal combinations of substantially similar plants. There is a great deal of evidence to indicate that this would actually increase economic efficiency.

Senator Kefauver may not have given us the full prescription, but he was supremely right in his diagnosis, and he worked himself to death in his efforts to reduce the evil. We need others who will assume the heavy burden that he was prematurely compelled to lay down.

THE NEED FOR PUBLIC WORKS NOW

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President in his stirring state of the Union message, to the people of this country, the President discussed our growing economy. He said:

> We seek full employment opportunity for every American.

Sixteen days later, in his inaugural address, the President discussed the Great Society. He said:

> I do not believe that the Great Society is the ordered, changeless, and sterile battalion of the ants.
>
> It is the excitement of becoming—always becoming, trying, probing, falling, resting, and trying again—but always trying and always gaining.

And try we must if we are to have the Great Society. The very essence of such a society includes full employment, educational opportunities, decent housing, and making certain that every citizen has access to these basic necessities.

Full employment is our No. 1 national goal.

Hungry children, jobless fathers, hopeless mothers contribute very little to the Great Society.

We must, therefore, alleviate the immediate need, even as we fight, on a more permanent and lasting scale, the war against poverty.

What is needed is an immediate revival of the accelerated public works program which has exhausted all of its funds.

Nearly $1 billion worth of sound public works projects could be started in depressed areas across the Nation if funds were available.

The immediate value of sound public works projects is recognized by the AFL–CIO executive council. Meeting the past weekend in Miami Beach, Fla., council members called for a $2 billion program of Federal grants to cities, for expansion of public works projects that would create jobs and would build such facilities as water and sewer systems, cultural centers, and civic and public buildings.

I welcome the support of the AFL–CIO for the renewal of the accelerated public works program proposed in my bill, S. 110, which I introduced on January 6, on behalf of the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and myself. The bill increases by $1.5 billion the amount authorized under the accelerated public works program.

Unemployed in this Nation comprise 4.8 percent of the labor force. This worries all of us. It takes but a little nudge to push that percentage beyond 5 percent or further, and then begins the endless spiraling of unemployment and lack of consumer purchasing power which creates recession—or worse.

In March 1963, in the 88th Congress I introduced a bill to provide an equivalent, for accelerated public works, of what would be appropriated and authorized for the foreign aid program. That would have amounted to $3.5 billion. Again today I stress that it is only commonsense to do for our own unemployed what we have done for the unemployed and needy in foreign lands.

The spokesmen for our great labor unions support the accelerated public works program. The AFL–CIO council meeting on March 27, in Florida, noted that this year 3.7 million persons will reach the age of 18 years. The number exceeds that of 1964 by 1 million. We may expect these young men and women to seek jobs. Obviously, production must increase if we are not to increase unemployment.

The council has also called for a comprehensive Federal aid program to redevelop our chronically depressed regions, and for a Federal minimum wage of $2, combined with a 35-hour week, with double time for overtime.

These recommendations are part of a Great Society. They tie in with proposed legislation before Congress which would create a National Humanities Foundation and an accelerated, performing visionary arts program to enable all men to develop these skills, if they wish.

Part of a Great Society is the right to agree or disagree. Thus, as one part seeks the tools with which to provide new jobs, another part may fight against such acquisition. And so did the dialog develop over the weekend when the Chamber of Commerce of the United States urged Congress to cut the President's budget, by eliminating a request of $400 million to fund area redevelopment, by killing his $675 million request for urban renewal, by reducing by nearly three-quarters of a million dollars the amount requested for the Office of Economic Opportunity, and by cutting the military funding request on housing, research and development, and test and evaluation programs.

Such conflicting points of view will, I hope, make our Great Society stronger. I do not concur in these recommendations of the chamber of commerce; but I welcome the interest, and I hope the chamber of commerce soon will discover why accelerated public works, for example, are sound building stones for a Great Society.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD three articles appearing in the New York Times of February 28 and the Washington Post of February 28, 1965.

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

[From the New York Times, Feb. 28, 1965]

LABOR CHIEFS WARN OF LAG IN ECONOMY LATER IN YEAR—AFL–CIO COUNCIL CALLS HIGHER PAY VITAL—URGES FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR PUBLIC WORKS AND DEPRESSED AREAS

(By Damon Stetson)

BAL HARBOUR, FLA., February 27.—Organized labor's top leaders warned today of a

possible slowdown in the Nation's economy later this year. They called for steps in both the private and government sectors to counter such a trend.

A formal statement on the economy was issued by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations. It emphasized that increased wages and fringe benefits were vital if the economy was to expand at the pace required by the spread of automation and the growing labor force.

At the same time, the council urged a $2 billion program of Federal grants to cities for public works to create jobs, a comprehensive Federal program of assistance for redeveloping chronically depressed regions and an increase in the Federal minimum wage from $1.25 to $2 an hour.

The council issued its statement at the Americana Hotel here, where it is holding its annual winter meeting.

Its emphasis on the need for higher wages to expand consumer buying power came as major negotiations were about to be resumed in the steel industry. Bargaining in the can industry was continuing this weekend in New York City in an effort to reach a settlement before tomorrow night, when the current contracts between the can companies and the United Steelworkers of America expire.

Other important negotiations are scheduled in the rubber industry in April and in the aerospace industry in the late spring and through the summer.

The council said that economic expansion was continuing under the impetus of the 1964 tax cut, a high volume of automobile sales and a building of steel inventories.

IMPACT FOUND WANING

However, the statement said, "the beneficial impact of the tax cut on consumers is wearing off; the accumulation of steel inventories will probably end by midyear; homebuilding is leveling off; and there is danger that tight money and higher interest rates may be imposed in a mistaken venture to counter the balance-of-payments deficit."

The rise in sales and production is expected to slow later this year, the council said. With business profits soaring, it said, widespread installation of the newest and most modern plants and machines will substantially increase industry's capacity to produce more goods with fewer workers.

In 1965, the council said, about 3.7 million persons will reach the age of 18 years, a million more than last year, and many of them will seek work.

"In the face of these conditions," it said, "a considerably slower rise of production will generate increasing unemployment."

RISE IN UNEMPLOYMENT FEARED

The council suggested that early congressional approval of President Johnson's program would probably be enough to offset most of the anticipated weakening of economic activities in the second half of the year. But even if all the administration's programs are enacted, it went on, the improvement of the unemployment situation will probably be halted and joblessness may creep up again in the second half of 1965. At present, 4.8 percent of the labor force is unemployed.

A lasting improvement in economic conditions, the council said, requires a much better balance between the economy's rapidly growing capacity to produce and the lagging ability of consumers to buy.

"The lack of balance in the economy," the council continued, "is all too clearly apparent. Between 1961 and 1964, corporate profits after taxes soared 44 percent and dividends rose 30 percent, while total wage and salary payments increased only 19 percent. Since 1953, the cash flow [after-tax profits plus depreciation allowances] to corporations has risen 103 percent—in contrast to an increase in after-tax personal income of only 71 percent."

EMPHASIS ON CONSUMER

Investment income has been rising much faster than income for consumption, and consumer markets have been bolstered by unsustainable sharp increases in installment and mortgage debt, the council said.

"Renewed national emphasis on consumer buying power is overdue," it declared.

In another statement, the council expressed concern about the Nation's deficit in its balance of payments and urged Congress to investigate the outflow of private capital. The balance of payments is the measure of payments into and out of the country.

The council also supported efforts of seagoing, shipyard, and longshore unions to develop programs, through President Johnson's Maritime Advisory Committee, to implement and strengthen American maritime policy.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 28, 1965]

LABOR URGES PRESIDENT TO PUSH JOB PROGRAMS

MIAMI BEACH, February 27.—AFL–CIO leaders gently chided President Johnson today on the ground of not doing enough to reduce unemployment. They warned that jobless totals may creep up later this year even if all of his "Great Society" program gets through Congress.

The mild criticism of the administration's economic policies, the first since Mr. Johnson was elected to a 4-year term with all-out labor support, was leveled by the AFL–CIO executive council.

It was coupled with a renewed demand for "substantial increases" in the wages and fringe benefits to keep the 4-year-old economic expansion rolling throughout 1965.

A council statement said the unemployment rate of 4.8 percent is lower than it has been in years but still higher than the 1953 jobless rate.

When workers who no longer seek jobs and others on part-time work are included, the council said, the true unemployment figure is about 7 percent.

"The present slow pace of progress on putting America back to work is just not good enough," the AFL–CIO leaders said.

"Early adoption by the Congress of President Johnson's programs—presented in his budget and economic messages—will probably be enough to offset most of the anticipated weakening of economic activities in the latter half of the year," the statement said.

"But even if all of the administration's programs are enacted, substantially as presented, the improvement of the unemployment situation will probably be halted and joblessness may creep up again in the second half of 1965."

The union spokesmen said additional measures were needed to keep cutting the unemployment totals in the months ahead when more younger workers would flood into the labor force and automation will continue its advance.

The council called for these specific steps:

A $2 billion program of Federal grants to cities for expansion of public works projects that would create jobs and build such facilities as water and sewer systems, cultural centers, and civic and public buildings.

A comprehensive Federal aid program to redevelop chronically depressed regions such as the Upper Great Lakes and the Ozarks by building of roads and improvement of manpower skills.

A rise in the Federal minimum wage to $2 an hour and a cutback to a 35-hour week with double time for overtime.

The council said that workers have not been sharing fully in the prosperity that has continued since early 1961. Corporate profits and dividends rose nearly twice as much as wage and salary payments, it said.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 28, 1965]

CHAMBER FIGHTS NEW SPENDING

(By John A. Goldsmith)

President Johnson's proposed new budget came under attack yesterday as the Chamber of Commerce of the United States urged Congress to cut $5.7 billion from the administration's request for new spending authority.

The chamber said in a statement that plans for defense, school aid, the war on poverty, urban renewal and depressed areas could be trimmed "without impairing essential services."

The chamber's board of directors, after a study of the proposed Federal budget for the 12 months starting July 1, aimed its attack at Mr. Johnson's request for $112.3 billion in new spending authority.

It stressed it had no quarrel with his $99.7 billion spending plans for the new budget year, but with his requests for new appropriations, which will affect spending beyond fiscal 1966.

The chamber said Congress should:

Eliminate the entire $1.2 billion requested for elementary and secondary school aid. The President's program is loosely written, unfair to poorer States, and possibly unconstitutional, it said.

Reduce the $1.4 billion war on poverty request by $705 million. It said $760 million was authorized for the program last year and it is too early now to know whether more is needed.

Kill the entire $675 million sought for urban renewal. It said the program was a failure and ought to be ended.

Eliminate all $400 million requested to carry on the area redevelopment, or depressed areas, program. This program also had failed and should be allowed to die, it said.

Cut $500 million from the $47.4 billion military request by continuing Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's cost-cutting program and by holding the line on housing, research and development and test and evaluating programs.

TAX RELIEF FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, earlier in this session, I was privileged to join with my friend, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] in cosponsoring a bill to allow a tax credit from income tax to reflect expenses incurred by individuals in providing or securing a higher education. In past Congresses, I have introduced measures of my own to provide an income tax deduction for the costs of higher education. I have supported these measures because I recognize that it is certainly in the national interest that our youth have opened to them the fullest opportunity to obtain the best possible education within a framework of individual or family choice. Such measures to provide income tax relief, I believe, should play a vital role in our total overall approach to providing a college education to all qualified individuals without prejudice to other programs of Government assistance. Since the introduction of this measure, I have received a large number of letters from constituents supporting this approach. Many of these letters describe family economic conditions which point out the desirability of this legisla-

tion. One recent letter struck me as pointing out particularly well the need for such tax relief. Mr. President, I ask that the letter from Mrs. J. H. Evans, Jr. of St. Charles, Mo., be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Hon. EDWARD V. LONG,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LONG: We were very happy to note in your January report that you have a bill before the Senate that proposes tax relief for higher education.

This has seemed to me to be the one big way for help to those of us whose children do not qualify for financial aid to their education in form of scholarships or Federal loans.

Ours is a family very much like millions of other Americans, I believe. We have four children very close in age. The oldest is a senior in high school and is registered at one of the good but "not so expensive" ($1,850 room, board, and tuition) private schools for the fall of 1965. Our oldest son will graduate the following spring and is interested in architecture, which means a minimum of 5 years' college in an out-of-State college, since Missouri has no school of architecture. Washington University in St. Louis would cost $1,800 with the student living at home and cummuting. The second boy will graduate in 1969 and hopefully will continue his interest in a professional school which will probably mean a number of years beyond the usual four. His younger sister will be ready for college in 1970.

My husband is a doctor of veterinary medicine having finished his work in 1950, after 5 years of military service in World War II and was not able to start earning a living until age 32. His income has afforded us a very comfortable living and ranks us in higher middle income bracket. We are fortunate to have made good strides in paying for our modest home and his business property and to continually improve this property. It has not allowed for luxuries in the form of vacations, educational trips, and so forth that we would have liked to have had for our family. Being a professional man we must, as I am sure you know, provide our own fringe benefits that many in similar income brackets may expect from industry.

This is not intended to sound as though we feel underprivileged or depressed or that anyone "owes us anything" but merely, I hope to describe the situation of many others as well as our own.

On a confidential statement that would be required if a student applied for aid to education there would be no consideration after we listed Dr. Evans' and my (registered nurse) combined income.

You can readily see why we would be most grateful for aid in the form of tax relief when we get into the swing of educating four.

Thank you for all your efforts on this bill and for your continued effort.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. J. H. EVANS, Jr.

THE 1965 EASTER SEAL CHILD

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the people of the State of Indiana are extremely proud of 10-year-old Barbara Staten of Indianapolis who has been selected as the Easter Seal Child of 1965 by the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults.

Barbara's personal tragedy involved circumstances that would have been difficult for any of us to bear. Yet this remarkable child, demonstrating inspiring courage, and determination and inner strength, was able to overcome terrible adversity.

Mr. President, Mrs. Bayh and I are privileged to be cochairman of the 1965 Indiana Easter seal campaign. We have had the opportunity to meet a number of children who have been assisted by the facilities and research provided by contributions to Easter seals. We are always warmed by these encounters and thrilled by the spirit of these children who so desperately want to become contributing members of society.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Indianapolis Star which poignantly describes the obstacles that Barbara Staten overcame and the reasons she so well deserves the honor of being the 1965 National Easter Seal Child.

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

INSPIRATION FROM A 10-YEAR-OLD

Ten-year-old Barbara Staten has seen more tragedy in the past few months than most of us are called upon to absorb in a lifetime. And she has endured pain such as few persons will ever know.

This courageous lass lost her parents, brother, and her grandmother in the holocaust at the Fairgrounds Coliseum and she herself suffered burns over 70 percent of her body.

Twenty-four days on the critical list in a hospital ended with the fear that the uncomplaining girl would undoubtedly be a cripple for life. Indeed, at the time she started therapy at the Crossroads Rehabilitation Center, this young lady could not even sit up.

She is a fifth grader today, back in school and studying, among other things, ballet. She walks with a barely perceptible limp. She has undergone surgery several times and more is in the offing.

Last week, for many understandable reasons, this girl was named Easter seal child of the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults.

She will visit President Lyndon B. Johnson in the White House during the spring as part of her official duties with the society.

Indianapolis will never forget that tragic Halloween night at the coliseum when so many useful lives were snuffed out with an instant of blast and flame.

Barbara Staten will be one of our many reminders of that dreadful night. But she must know that the people of Indianapolis and the State as well are rightly proud of her for her magnificent courage and undaunted determination to get well so that she may live a useful life.

It is more rewarding yet that, in Barbara's words, she wants "to help people in pain and trouble." She has known enough of both to have a unique understanding.

A LAWYER REBUKES THE COURT

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, Lewis F. Powell, Jr., of Richmond, Va., is one of the finest lawyers I know. He is highly regarded throughout the legal profession. He is now president of the American Bar Association.

He recently addressed the New York Bar Association; and the Richmond, Va., Times Dispatch, in its edition of February 10, 1965, editorialized on that address. The editorial was entitled "A Lawyer Rebukes the Court."

I think it would be profitable for the greatest possible number of people in the United States to read that editorial. For this reason, I ask that the editorial be made a part of these remarks in the body of the RECORD.

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

A LAWYER REBUKES THE COURT

Lewis F. Powell, Jr., of Richmond, president of the American Bar Association, issued a warning recently that some Supreme Court decisions in criminal cases have tipped the scales of justice too far in favor of the criminal—at the expense of public safety.

His criticism came in the course of a speech addressed to the annual meeting of the New York State Bar Association.

"In a country which is said to stand on the threshold of the Great Society (he said), it is incongruous that in some urban areas law-abiding citizens are unsafe in their homes, and denied the privilege of using the public streets and parks for fear of their personal safety.

"Crimes of violence continue to increase. The single most shocking statistic, documented in FBI reports, is that since 1958 crime has been increasing five times faster than the population growth."

The primary responsibility of government, he went on, is its duty to protect citizens in their persons and property from criminal conduct.

Mr. Powell cautioned that it would be "unproductive and destructive" to criticize the Court itself for seeking to protect the constitutional rights of accused persons against allegedly unlawful acts of law enforcement officers, but, he added:

"The right of society in general, and of each individual in particular, to be protected from crime must never be subordinated to other rights."

The pendulum, he said, may have swung too far in affording rights—which are abused and misused by criminals.

Mr. Powell is to be commended for articulating what the American people as a whole have surmised during the postwar years. Some have attributed the alarming increase in crime to the "moral let-down" which usually occurs in the wake of wars; some put the blame on the influence of violence shown predominating on television programs watched by children and adolescents; but whatever the other contributing causes, excessive leniency percolating downward from the very peak of the judiciary pyramid is certain to be a major cause.

"There are valid reasons," Mr. Powell told his professional audience, "for criminals to think that crime does pay, and that slow and fumbling justice can be evaded."

We agree. The High Court might do well to ponder the late Robert Frost's words of wisdom.

"The opposite of mercy," he said "is justice."

Mercy should temper judicial decisions whenever there is evidence of mitigating circumstances. But in their absence, leniency becomes injustice to society as a whole, which looks to the law enforcement agencies and the courts for protection against criminal aggression.

WORLD DAY OF PRAYER BEING OBSERVED IN CAPITOL ON MARCH 5

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate a

special meditation service that will be held in the Capitol on Friday, March 5, as part of the observance of the World Day of Prayer.

The service will be held in room S–120 of the Capitol, from 11 a.m. to 2 p.m. Although there will be no organized worship at this interdenominational service, Members of Congress and their staffs are invited to come by, any time, for as long as they wish, for prayer and meditation.

This service is sponsored by the United Church Women of the Capitol area, and will be one of a number of such prayer services held in the Washington area and around the world. The Chaplains of both the Senate and the House are cooperating in this service, and both will give brief meditations on Friday. Dr. Harris will speak at 12:15; and Dr. Braskamp, the Chaplain of the House, will speak at 1:15. The chairman of the planning for the Hill service is Mrs. George R. Davis, the wife of the pastor of the National City Christian Church.

GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK ENDORSED BY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the beautiful Guadalupe Mountains of Texas are needed as an addition to the national park system. These beautiful wooded mountains, rising from the hot West Texas plains, are a unique biological and geological area worthy of national park status.

My bill, S. 295, to create the Guadalupe Mountains National Park follows the recommendations of the National Park Advisory Board and the Interior Department, and is widely supported by Texans. Conservation groups and chambers of commerce are joined in unanimous support for the Guadalupe Mountains National Park. As an illustration of the enthusiasm of Texans for this proposal, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a resolution adopted on January 29 of this year by the West Texas Chamber of Commerce.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE WEST TEXAS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments, following its deliberations at its 49th meeting, recommended to the Secretary of the Interior that national park status would provide the most effective means of preserving and interpreting the unique values of the area, known as the Guadalupe Mountains, as a national park; and

Whereas Gov. John B. Connally, of the State of Texas, has assured the Department of Interior that Texas concurs in plans for a national rather than a State park at Guadalupe, explaining that Texas is not in a position to undertake the development of a park at Guadalupe but said he felt that the interests of the people of Texas as well as the rest of the Nation would be served by prompt action on the measure to create Guadalupe Mountains National Park: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce, in quarterly meeting on January 29, 1965, endorse and support S. 295 and H.R. 698.

Attest:

JACK G. SPRINGER,
Executive Vice President.
BEEMAN FISHER,
President.

ARMY TIMES REPORTS NEW CONSIDERATION BEING GIVEN GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, last year the cold war GI bill languished on the Senate Calendar for almost a year and one-half, after being favorably reported from the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. In 1959, when this bill was considered by the Senate, it passed by a vote of 57 to 31, only to die in the House, without being considered.

It seems apparent that this bill has the necessary support to be enacted, and has always had, if consideration is only given to its merits.

In a recent article in the March 3, 1965, Army Times, it is stated that new consideration is being given to this bill by the administration. The previous objection of cost is shortsighted, inasmuch as the bill pays for itself. The objection of luring men out of service is unproven by the Department of Defense. In short, it is hoped that renewed consideration of this bill will be given by its opposition, so that they will discover its merits.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Army Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WHITE HOUSE GIVES GI BILL NEW STUDY

WASHINGTON.—White House staffers are making another review of peacetime GI bill legislation as a result of current hostilities in southeast Asia, House Veterans' Affairs Committee officials disclosed last week.

The administration had considered the peacetime GI bill one of its recommendations for the Great Society but so far—apparently because of cost—has not committed itself in terms of proposed legislation. The administration has turned down every congressional attempt in the past to pass peacetime GI bill legislation.

House Veterans' Committee officials say they have no idea whether the White House review will be completed in time to affect the current round of legislation hearings before the Senate Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee.

Both the Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration are on tap for appearances before the Senate subcommittee, probably February 26. The legislation under study would extend readjustment benefits (education, home, and farm loans assistance) to all veterans who have entered the military service since January 31, 1955—cutoff date for Korea GI bill entitlement.

The administration review is possibly covering all alternatives, including a proposal to limit readjustment benefits to those who serve in areas of the world in which armed conflict or other conditions exist.

In opening hearings, early in February, subcommittee chairman Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, noted that this was the sixth straight year in which cold war GI bill legislation has been before his subcommittee. He pledged "new vigors" in striving to enactment of the legislation.

Opening hearings drew favorable comment from 5 of the 41 Senate cosponsors of the GI bill measure. Hearings were scheduled to resume this week with testimony from the Fleet Reserve Association, National Farmers Union, the AFL–CIO, major veterans groups, and educational associations.

The subcommittee plans to wind up hearings shortly after the administration testimony. DOD, in past testimony, had opposed peacetime GI bill legislation on the grounds that it encourages young men to leave military service in order to take advantage of benefits.

Regardless of the administration's position, the veterans subcommittee hopes to send a measure to the Senate floor by April. Speedy House action is likely in the event the legislation is approved by the full Senate.

Representative OLIN TEAGUE, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, stated recently that the GI bill issue was one of the three most important veterans measures before Congress. He said the other two proposals were an increase in veterans disability compensation rates and the establishment of a Federal court of review for veterans benefit claims.

HARRIS SURVEY SHOWS MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED TO BE MOST SERIOUS PROBLEM FACING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Harris survey appearing in today's Washington Post presents impressive evidence in support of a prepaid program of hospital insurance for the elderly. The poll reported the following findings:

Thirty-two percent of all families have an older member in need of special medical attention.

Fifty-two percent of these families with older members report that the lack of money is a real problem in getting the medical care for the older person.

In 45 percent of these families the older person puts off going to the doctor when he should, and in 65 percent of these cases the reason is that the older person cannot afford to go.

More Americans mentioned medical care for the aged than any other single topic, when asked what they believe are the most serious problems facing them; it is the Nation's No. 1 domestic issue.

I ask unanimous consent that the Harris survey appearing in the Washington Post of March 1, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 1, 1965]

FINANCING OF CARE FOR THE AGED AFFECTS 32 PERCENT OF U.S. FAMILIES

(By Louis Harris)

It is not mere chance that the American public rates the problem of medical care for the aged as the Nation's No. 1 domestic issue. Although only 1 person in 10 is 65 years of age or older, 32 percent of all families have an older member in need of special medical attention.

And more than half—52 percent—of these families with older members report that the lack of money is a real problem in obtaining proper treatment and medicines.

This problem of medical care for the aged affects all sections of the country, all income groups, and small towns and big cities alike.

The following table breaks down the number of families in the population who said

there is some older person in their family requiring special medical attention:

Older person in family requiring medical attention

	Total percent
Total U.S. families	32
By region:	
East	32
Midwest	30
South	37
West	27
By size of place:	
Cities	33
Suburbs	33
Towns	31
Rural	31
By family income:	
Under $5,000	34
$5,000 to $9,000	38
$10,000 and over	34

The results of a special survey of a cross-section of families with older members shows that no more than half of these older people are still living with their husbands or wives. The other half either live alone or with their children.

This condition has led to a feeling of loneliness that is reported as a major problem in society today (17 percent of all Americans say loneliness is a problem for someone "close to me"). Further, living with children has unquestionably heightened the financial problems for both older people and their children.

Perhaps the most poignant result of the entire survey is that 45 percent of the families with older members report that these senior citizens often put off going to a doctor. A 54-year-old woman on Chicago's South Side lives with her father. She told us "he just sits there over in the corner suffering all the time. He don't have the money to pay the doctor. He never had a chance to save any money for that."

A 38-year-old executive in Atchison, Kans., said of his mother and father, "They seem afraid to go lots of the time. My father's afraid they will make an invalid out of him and he's too prideful for that. My mother has always watched their money, and hates to ask us for help." A 68-year-old retired filling station operator in Baltimore admitted he didn't see a doctor when he should because "I'm scared to go. I want to be active and he may make me cut down on what I do. He may put me in a home or something like that."

A 74-year-old grandmother of 23 in Keyport, N.J., said, "I'm hard of hearing and nod off some, too. If I go to the doctor too much, I'll be too big a burden of expense on my children. They might say my mind is gone and put me in an institution. So I do without the medicine."

When all of the reasons for older people putting off visits to a doctor are added up, however, one dominates all others—lack of money:

Reasons older people put off seeing a doctor

	Put off visits (percent)
Can't afford (especially on social security)	65
Afraid of what doctor will say	11
Stubborn, thinks self-care better	7
Won't go for ordinary illness	4
Hospital service poor	3
Just neglect	2
Hates charity	1
Not sure	7

Group by group through the population, the number who put off seeing a doctor parallel the number who report that lack of money is a major deterrent to obtaining proper medical care for the aged members of the family.

The cross section of families with an immediate member in need of special medical care was asked:

"Do you feel that lack of money is a real problem or not in getting the medical care for the older person(s) in your family?" and "Do you feel that an older member(s) of your family goes to the doctor when he should or are there often times when he puts off going?"

Financial problems and medical care

[In percent]

	Lack of money	Puts off visits to doctor
Total families with ill older person	52	45
By family income:		
Under $5,000	64	51
$5,000 to $9,999	48	44
$10,000 and over	39	38

The relationship between lack of money and failure to see a physician when needed is abundantly clear. Obviously, families with lower incomes feel the pinch of medical costs more acutely. But it is significant that even families with incomes of $10,000 and over report that nearly 4 in every 10 sick older people put off going ot the doctor, and an equal number say that lack of money affects the kind of medical care received.

The raging controversy over medical care for older persons, however, is not so much whether or not the need exists, but rather how the money needed should best be obtained. The survey inquired as to how medical care is paid for now:

"Is the medical care paid for mostly by the individual or by other members of the family, or by insurance?"

Who pays for medical care for aged?

[In percent]

	Older person pays	Family pays	Insurance pays
Total ill older people	62	17	21
Live alone	63	22	15
Live with spouse	68	7	25
Live with son or daughter	49	33	18

Clearly the bulk of medical costs today falls on the private means of older people and their families. Since over 60 percent of older people are on their own, and most of them admit that a lack of money keeps them from obtaining proper medical care, the drive for some form of national health insurance program is understandable.

This drive is illustrated by the fact that more Americans mentioned medical care for the aged than any other single topic when asked what they believe are the most serious problems facing them. More than one in four Americans volunteered this topic, slightly more than mentioned governmental taxes and spending.

What the public thinks the Government should be doing about medical care is the subject of next week's Harris survey.

APPALACHIAN VOLUNTEERS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, in recent months, the Nation has seen many public and private organizations respond to different community needs which exist today in different sections of our country. One of the hardest working of these groups, and one which has worked in Kentucky without seeking to publicize its own efforts, is known as the Appalachian Volunteers. The volunteers—largely made up of young men and young women attending college—exemplify the growing number of American students who want to help others to help themselves by contributing something on their own toward the improvement of living, working, and study conditions in areas near their schools and homes. This program, which is at work in Kentucky, has received recognition within my State and beyond, and I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled, "Kentuckians to the Rescue," which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of January 27, 1965, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 27, 1965]

KENTUCKIANS TO THE RESCUE: APPALACHIAN VOLUNTEERS, MAINLY COLLEGIANS, GIVE AN IMPORTANT LIFT TO EASTERN KENTUCKY BY AIDING STUDENTS AND REBUILDING SMALL SCHOOLS

(By John Ed Pearce)

LOUISVILLE, KY.—Of the fledgling battalions that wage President Johnson's war on poverty, probably none has accomplished more or cost less than an unsung organization known as the Appalachian Volunteers. This is a loosely organized outfit with headquarters in Berea, Ky., and composed mainly of collegians who spend weekends in the mountain counties of eastern Kentucky, rebuilding the area's rundown, one-room schools and offering help to the students who attend.

While the idea for the volunteers apparently originated with Richard Boone of the White House special projects staff, it has grown to its present proportions on the basis of trial, error, and youthful energy.

During the first week of November 1963, Mr. Boone asked Milton Ogle, of the Council of the Southern Mountains in Berea if it would be possible to get Kentucky college students to spend their Saturdays as a sort of domestic Peace Corps in the impoverished coal counties of eastern Kentucky. If a few dozen collegians could be recruited, Mr. Boone suggested, their experience might offer valuable guidelines for the war-on-poverty program when and if it was enacted into law.

UNEXPECTED RESPONSE

The response to Mr. Ogle's request was totally unexpected. Hundreds of students from 13 different colleges volunteered during the first month. By Christmastime they were swarming through the hills on weekends, limited in their efforts only by lack of money, materials, and coordination.

The White House arranged for a $50,000 grant from the Area Redevelopment Administration to pay for full-time directors. Private industry donated quantities of wallboard, lumber, paint, and nails. Communities in which the needy schools were located agreed to furnish transportation, tools, and professional help such as carpenters or plumbers. The Applachian Volunteers project was underway.

The schools toward which their efforts were directed are not a source of Kentucky pride. After half a century of school consolidation, Kentucky still has more than 950 one- and two-room schools situated at the heads of creeks and hollows in counties too poor to afford either modern consolidated schools or the all-weather roads that would make them available to the children in remote areas.

These schools are bleakly primitive. Flimsy frame structures, some almost a century old, they lack running water or toilets, are usually

heated by a single potbellied stove and are nearly always inadequately lighted.

SEVEN GRADES COMBINED

A single teacher, besides supervising the 25 to 40 students at study and play and preparing and feeding them lunch, attempts to teach all of the seven grades housed in the single room.

There is little time for nonsense, or even for personal attention. As the members of one grade recite, they sit up front while those in the rear study and await their turn. The older students are expected to help. The older boys keep the fire going in the stove and clean the blackboard and erasers. The older girls help the teacher prepare and serve the noonday lunch, much of which consists of Government-supplied surplus foods. They are given to the schools with the stipulation that they offer free lunches to those students who cannot pay the price, usually from 15 to 25 cents. The students use crude outdoor "privies." Only 10 percent of the schools boast a playground with real playground equipment.

Against such a backlog of need, the volunteers were not expected to make more than token inroads. Yet in their first winter of operation they winterized 44 school buildings, installing interior walls and ceilings of wallboarding, and new floors and blackboards when materials were available. They installed equipment on 40 playgrounds and painted the winterized schools plus 10 more on which only minor repairs were made.

In addition, the students, many of whom are training to be teachers, have offered "enrichment programs" to students of more than 50 of the remote schools.

Sometimes these programs consist of nothing more than group singing. The programs may also include films, slides showing foreign lands, a storytelling session, an afternoon of learning games or instruction in handicrafts or language, an exhibit of paintings, or map studies. Many of these schools lack maps, charts, paintings, and even the semblance of a library, as well as the more modern teaching aids.

INCENTIVE PROVIDED

Recently the volunteers have been bringing students from these head-of-the-hollow schools down to Berea College to show them what college life is like, hoping to give them an incentive to continue studying. Other groups have been taken to the State capitol at Frankfort, where they enjoyed guided tours and were entertained by Gov. Edward Breathitt.

Volunteer students labored against more than bad roads, freezing weather, and lack of money. At first they were viewed with suspicion by the mountain residents. After several months, suspicion disappeared. Parents in increasing numbers brought their children to the voluntary Saturday enrichment sessions. Mothers of children in the schools that were being winterized invited a score of volunteers for lunch.

PARENTS SEEK KNOWLEDGE

Often the students brought their guitars. Lunch periods became spontaneous hootenannies which nearby residents joined or watched appreciatively. Two girls who spent time teaching culturally disadvantaged children in Clay County reported that illiterate parents begged to be taught to read and write so that they could help their children.

During last summer the volunteers were put on a somewhat more orderly basis, with a full-time president and an organized chapter on each college campus in the mountain region. In addition to the winterizing, playground, and enrichment programs, they undertook to build shelves and install minimum libraries in as many schools as possible.

But this time they could not turn to the now penniless Area Redevelopment Administration for money. Private business firms were reluctant to provide building materials free of charge a second time. While member colleges offered to build the library shelves, no funds were forthcoming to fill them with books. Nevertheless, with the start of the college year, the volunteers again went into action, and in greater numbers than ever.

This virtue, true to romantic tradition, was rewarded. A national educational organization sent an initial 33,000 books, with a promise of more to come. The Office of Economic Opportunity, finally getting its war on poverty underway, announced that one of the first grants of money would go to the Appalachian volunteers. Said Jack Rivel, the volunteers' president, "I don't know whether we'll know how to act with enough money to work with."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, in connection with the work being done by private organizations such as the Appalachian Volunteers, I think it is also useful to call attention to the drive to collect 1 million books for Appalachian schools, announced last week, and being coordinated by the Office of Economic Opportunity. This book drive will benefit school children in the rural areas in Kentucky and other Appalachian States, and parent-teacher associations all over the country have volunteered their efforts to gather books for distribution by the volunteers. This project is being made possible by the cooperation and work of the nationwide offices of the Railway Express Agency and of the Louisville & Nashville Railroad, which will collect the books in Louisville for shipment to communities in the mountain regions. I think this kind of activity follows an old and well-established American tradition of voluntary cooperation, and I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the February 25, 1965, edition of the Louisville Courier-Journal and an article from the New York Times of the same date be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Feb. 25, 1965]

PTA LAUNCHES CAMPAIGN: MILLION BOOKS SOUGHT FOR APPALACHIAN YOUTH

(By Ivan Swift)

WASHINGTON.—The war on poverty attacked a new front yesterday with a drive to collect a million books to set up school libraries in rural eastern Kentucky and other Appalachian areas.

Sargent Shriver, director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, said the first libraries would go to Kentucky schools and the program would be expanded to other Appalachian areas after it gets geared up.

The project is a combined Federal-private effort.

It is set up this way:

Parent-teacher associations all over the country will collect books and build special cases to hold them.

Railway Express agencies will ship them to Louisville at a special low rate.

The Louisville & Nashville Railroad will collect them in Louisville and ship them to Barbourville.

From Barbourville, the Appalachian Volunteers, a college student organization, will distribute them to hundreds of rural schools, starting in Eastern Kentucky counties.

Shriver explained the system at a press conference here. With him was Mrs. Jeannelle Moorhead, national president of PTA; William B. Johnson, president of Railway Express Agency, inc.; and Milton Ogle, director of the Appalachian Volunteers, headquartered in Berea.

Shriver gave Mrs. Moorhead credit for initiating the program, saying she wrote him a letter asking how PTA's could help. Shriver recalled a similar book effort used by the Peace Corps to stock libraries in foreign countries, and it progressed from there.

Mrs. Moorhead said each of the 47,000 PTA's in the organization has been sent a brochure with two lists of books selected by librarians who are experienced in working with culturally deprived children.

The first lists the 100 most wanted books. The second list has 300 books that would also serve well, and the PTA's will also try to collect reference materials such as encyclopedias and atlases.

The 100 most wanted books list included picture books, histories and biographies, fiction such as "Little Women," "The Adventures of Tom Sawyer," Bible stories, science books, and fairy tales.

The supplementary list includes many other children's classics and such volumes as "Profiles in Courage," by John F. Kennedy, "First Book of the United Nations," by Edna Epstein and "The American Revolution," by Bruce Bliven.

Mrs. Moorhead said PTA's would accept money for purchasing books but preferred actual donations of books rather than cash.

She said many individuals want to help alleviate poverty in Appalachia but have not had a direct way to go about it.

Donating books lets the "private citizen exercise his good impulses," she said.

After the PTA's collect the books, special wooden crates about 2 feet long, a foot high, and 10 inches wide will be obtained from school shop classes, the PTA expects. The crates might serve as bookcases.

From March 15 through June 15, the boxes full of books will be shipped from anywhere in the country to Louisville for $1.95 a box. (Normal commercial rate would be about $5.50 a box.) The L. & N. will haul them free in carload lots to Barbourville.

Shriver set April 1 as the date for the first case of books to be delivered.

Ogle said among the first counties to get the books will be Knox, Leslie, Jackson, Floyd, Wolfe and Rockcastle. They will go into a total of 44 Kentucky counties, and then the program will be expanded to other Appalachian areas.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 25, 1965]

A MILLION BOOKS ASKED FOR NEEDY—PTA'S WILL GATHER THEM FOR APPALACHIA CHILDREN

(By Marjorie Hunter)

WASHINGTON, February 24.—Sargent Shriver appealed to Americans today to donate a million books for use of schoolchildren in rural areas of Appalachia.

The book collection will be part of the Nation's antipoverty campaign being carried out by the Office of Economic Opportunity, which Mr. Shriver directs.

The books will be collected and boxed by parent-teacher associations throughout the Nation and shipped to Kentucky at a cut rate by the REA Express (formerly Railway Express.) They will then be distributed to schools by the Appalachian Volunteers, a group of about 1,200 students from 20 Kentucky colleges and the University of Kentucky.

At first the program will focus on about 800 isolated schools in eastern Kentucky. Later, it is expected to be expanded throughout other areas of the 11-State Appalachia region.

The books will be shipped in boxes, constructed to special specifications so they can serve as bookcases when they reach the schools.

TITLES ARE LISTED

Librarians in the Appalachia region have compiled a list of the "most wanted books." Donations may also be made from a supplemental list containing about 300 titles.

The "100 most wanted books" are:

"Bible Stories," Jones: "Communication: From Cave Writing to Television," Batchelor; "Police," Colby; "America Travels," Dalgliesh; "All About Us," Evans; "The First Book of Negroes," Hughes.

"Manners To Grow on," Lee; "Riding the Rails," Olds; "Adventures of a Letter," Schloat; "First Book of Conservation," Smith; "Holiday Round Up," Cavanah and Pannell; "Holiday Storybook," edited by Child Study Association of America; "The Thanksgiving Story," Dalgliesh; "Customs and Holidays Around the World," Dobler.

"Christmas Everywhere," Sechrist; "Fairy Tales," Andersen; "Stories of Gods and Heroes," Benson; "Blue Fairy Book," Lang; "King Arthur," MacLeod; "Some Merry Adventures of Robin Hood," Pyle; "All About Dinosaurs," Andrews; "Rocks and Their Stories," Fenton; "The Story of Atomic Energy," Fermi.

"Fun With Science," Freeman; "Parade of the Animal Kingdom," Hegner; "Everyday Weather and How It Works," Schneider; "Trees: A Guide to Familiar American Trees," Zim and Martin; "Stars," Zim and Baker; "Flowers: A Guide to Familiar American Wildflowers," Zim and Martin; "Pets: A Complete Handbook," Chrystie.

"All About Radio and Television," Gould: "The True Book of Airports and Airplanes," Lewellen; "Everyday Machines and How They Work," Schneider; "America Sings: Stories and Songs of Our Country's Growing," Carmer; "Famous Painting: An Introduction to Art for Young People," Chase.

"The First Book of Music," Norman; "Ring-a-Round," Harrington; "When We Were Very Young," Milne; "A Child's Garden of Verses," Stevenson; "Picture Book of Kentucky," Bailey; "The Apache Indians," Bleeker; "First Book of Eskimos," Brewster; "America Is My Country," Brown and Bailey.

"The Big Book of Cowboys," Fletcher; "Medieval Days and Ways," Hartman; "Golden Book of Indian Crafts and Lore," Hunt; "Buffalo Bill," Aulaire; "Famous Explorers for Young People," Coffman and Goodman; "That Lively Man, Ben Franklin," Eaton; "Abraham Lincoln," Foster; "George Washington," Judson.

"On Indian Trails With Daniel Boone," Meadowcroft; "All About Famous Inventors and Their Inventions," Pratt; "They Showed the Day: 40 American Negro Leaders," Rollings; "Kit Carson: Boy Trapper," Stevenson; "Little Women," Alcott; "Mr. Popper's Penguins," Atwater; "The Hundred Dresses," Estes.

"The Moffats," Estes; "Who in the Willows," Grahame; "Little Eddie," Haywood; "King of the Wind," Henry; "Tree in the Trail," Holling; "Just So Stories," Kipling; "Rabbit Hill," Lawson; "Homer Price," McCloskey; "Miss Pickerell Goes to Mars," MacGregor; "Winnie-the-Pooh," Milne; "Bambi: A Life in the Woods," Salten.

"Good Master," Seredy; "Call It Courage," Sperry; "The Beatinest Boy," Stuart; "All-of-a-Kind Family," Taylor; "Mary Poppins," Travers; "The Adventures of Tom Sawyer," Twain; "Charlotte's Webb," White; "Little House in the Big Woods," Wilder; "Blaze Finds the Trail," Anderson; "Ola," Aulaire.

"Two Is a Team," Beim; "Madeline," Bemelmans; "Pelle's New Suit," Beskow; "Five Chinese Brothers," Bishop; "Johnny Crow's Garden," Brooke; "Stone Soup," Brown; "Andy and the Lion," Daughter; "The Story About Ping," Flacky; "The Country Bunny and the Little Gold Shoes," Flack and Hayward.

"Millions of Cats," Gag: "Little Toot," Gramatky; "Make Way for Ducklings," McCloskey; "A Tale of Peter Rabbit," Potter; "Tall Book of Mother Goose," illustrated by Rojankovsky; "500 Hats of Bartholomew Cubbins," Seuss; "The Biggest Bear," Ward.

"Children and Books," Arbuthnot; "The Arbuthnot Anthology of Children's Literature," Arbuthnot; "Reading With Children," Easton; "Favorite Stories Old and New," Gruenberg; and "My American Heritage," Henry and Panel.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR RANDOLPH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, all of us who have worked with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, Mr. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, know him as an exceptionally well informed and understanding and helpful colleague. With his unassuming and modest manner he has served the people of West Virginia and the Nation in an outstanding fashion, ever since he first came to Washington in 1932 as a Congressman.

Throughout these years he has been in the vanguard of the effort to deal with a wide range of regional and national needs. And out of his warm heart has come a special concern for the afflicted and the neglected in American life. His pioneer work on the employment of the blind is an outstanding example of this concern. His leadership in connection with the Appalachian bill and the Economic Opportunities Act was an indispensable factor in moving these measures through the Senate. A glance at the list of his committee assignments which include Public Works, Labor and Public Welfare, Post Office and Civil Service, Small Business and Aging—clearly underlines how his great concern for people has manifested itself in a practical way.

Recognition of his outstanding service in the Senate has always had a bipartisan flavor. Republicans and Democrats alike have paid tribute to JENNINGS RANDOLPH as an effective legislator. He is in the front rank of those who defend the rights of all Americans and seek to achieve for all an equitable opportunity.

An article which appeared in the Wheeling, W. Va., newspaper, the Intelligencer, of February 23, 1965, sets forth with great accuracy and understanding the contributions which JENNINGS RANDOLPH has made and will continue to make to the welfare of people of his State and the Nation. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer, Feb. 23, 1965]

SENATOR RANDOLPH EPITOMIZES SPIRIT OF WEST VIRGINIA: TEMPERS HIGH IDEALISM WITH HARD PRACTICALITY

(By Carl W. McCardle)

WASHINGTON.—An excerpt from a quotation that is framed on one of the walls of the office suite of U.S. Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, proclaims that "the only view that a hillman knows is to climb way up and look down."

That pretty well sums up the congressional career of this happy, hearty, and tireless booster for West Virginia since he was first elected to the House of Representatives in 1932 when he was 30 years old.

Senator RANDOLPH has long been identified with projects to assist the less privileged and the handicapped.

But he tempers this high idealism in the welfare field with a hard practicality.

"West Virginia is in the process of an unprecedented building and rebuilding program," he tells you.

"I'm not impressed by the word 'image' when we speak of our State.

"West Virginians are a hardy people.

"They are not interested in handouts.

"They want to participate in a partnership with the Federal Government which helps them to help themselves."

As an example, he cites the new city hall and community building at Philippi where he recently delivered the dedication address.

The cost of this enterprise was about $375,000, the Senator says.

And to raise the money in cooperation with the Federal Government, he explains the citizens of Philippi bonded themselves for approximately $177,000.

Currently Senator RANDOLPH is being hailed on a nonpartisan basis for his leadership in the Senate of the $1 billion plus Appalachia legislation, which will bring substantial benefits to West Virginia on a matching basis.

Republican JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky, who championed the Appalachia measure in the Senate for his party, had already said of him: "Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH is an able and effective Senator for West Virginia and for our country." Senator COOPER extolled Senator RANDOLPH's "qualities of heart and mind, his integrity and character."

After the big Appalachia bill passed the Senate, Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY scribbled out a note of high praise and sent it down by a page boy to Senator RANDOLPH, at his desk on the Senate floor.

The handwritten memorandum from the Vice President read as follows:

"U.S. SENATE,
"February 1965.

"MEMORANDUM

"JENNINGS: My congratulations. You have done a masterful job. Proud of you. Appalachia owes you a debt of gratitude.

"HUBERT H."

Senator RANDOLPH is a good conversationalist, recounting anecdotes with a sure eye for human interest.

There is the story about the four-poster canopied bed that a Charleston man who owns it can now brag about accurately that it was where the President of the United States once slept.

That this is so was due to Senator RANDOLPH.

The Charleston man had been working in Washington back in the thirties. He was transferred, so he and his wife asked their friend, RANDOLPH, then a Congressman, if he could find someone who wanted to rent their furnished apartment.

RANDOLPH told him that he had a fine prospect, a splendid couple from Texas, the husband being a new Member of Congress.

His name, of course was Lyndon B. Johnson.

Not long ago it was all written up in a newspaper, together with a picture of the now celebrated L.B.J.-once-slept-here four poster.

Senator RANDOLPH thought Mrs. Johnson might like to read it and saw to it that she got it at the White House.

Mrs. Johnson wrote to him:

"DEAR SENATOR: What a delight. The clipping you left for me last night stirred many nostalgic memories of our very first days in Washington—and will have a special spot in my scrapbook.

"Thanks so much."

It was signed "Lady Bird Johnson."

Some weeks ago Paul B. Martin, editor of the Martinsburg (W. Va.) Journal, raised all sorts of havoc for a few hours by relaying a rumor that Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., might run for the U.S. Senate from West Virginia.

Young Roosevelt is a citizen of New York who now lives in Washington where he is Under Secretary of Commerce.

Editor Martin speculated upon the idea that Senator RANDOLPH might not be a candidate for reelection to the Senate this year, because of an eye operation that the Senator had undergone some months ago.

The rumor was quickly knocked down, with RANDOLPH stoutly declaring that he would indeed be a candidate for reelection and F.D.R., Jr., declaring that he certainly would not oppose his friend, Senator RANDOLPH, with whom he has worked on the Appalachia program.

So Senator RANDOLPH, with a smile that comes easily to him tells you that he is accompanying young Roosevelt to Martinsburg next month.

There Roosevelt will speak at a banquet meeting and RANDOLPH will introduce him.

The Senator didn't say so, but it can be assumed that he would be pleased to have Editor Martin "cover" the event.

In April, the Senator is coming to Wheeling to make a speech to Ohio County schoolteachers, and he has other plans for visits in this city.

Senator RANDOLPH emphasized that his health is fine and his energetic manner and appearance seem to bear that out.

He is now occupied with the administration education bill, and is taking a lively interest in the antipoverty actions of the administration, particularly those helping West Virginians.

But he probably takes more pleasure out of legislation he sponsored in Congress almost 30 years ago which has provided jobs and a livelihood for 2,425 blind people.

Once hopelessly handicapped, these sightless persons, as a result of the RANDOLPH legislation, have been trained to operate news, candy and tobacco vending stands. It is a business that grosses, he estimates, $50 million annually.

He has many trophies in his office, testifying to his work in the House and Senate, but the trophy he is proudest of is one from an association for help to the blind.

Senator RANDOLPH, whose hometown is Elkins, W. Va., is a friendly, polite man.

So it is natural that he is one of a comparatively small number of U.S. Senators who list their telephone numbers in the Washington telephone books.

The majority have unlisted numbers.

The Senator could point out that even the White House number is listed in the telephone book.

He is married to the former Mary Katherine Babb. They have two grown sons.

AUTOMOBILES FOR PARAPLEGICS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a newspaper article which appeared in the Washington, D.C., Evening Star on February 14. The report deals with the loss of a leg by an American soldier as a result of the recent sneak night attack on the U.S. enlisted man's hotel at Qui Nhon, Vietnam. I also request permission to insert a letter which I received on November 12, 1964, from Capt. Donald S. Cunningham, AUS, retired, of Vienna, W. Va., regarding the need for specially equipped automobiles for paraplegic veterans of military service during the cold war.

Believing that cases such as these are fully deserving of the special assistance necessary through grants toward the purchase of an automobile, I introduced S. 1199 on February 18 to liberalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, to permit action by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make the necessary grants to service-connected paraplegic veterans of the cold war. The grants, not to exceed $1,600, are to be handled on the same basis that such grants were made available to seriously disabled veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 14, 1965]

LEG AMPUTATED TO RESCUE GI BURIED IN WRECKAGE OF HOTEL

QUI NHON, VIETNAM.—Sweating and crying, American rescue workers pulled two American soldiers alive today from the rubble of a U.S. enlisted man's hotel destroyed by Vietcong terrorists.

One of the young American survivors was dragged out of a tunnel dug through the debris after a Korean doctor amputated his leg to free him.

The doctor, a member of a Korean medical team stationed at Qui Nhon, crawled into the tunnel smashed into the rocks by U.S. Army Engineers and rescue workers.

Faint cries from the trapped man were heard at 2:30 a.m., about 6 hours after Vietcong bombs crumpled the 4-story concrete building. The soldier was in the rubble for 18 hours before he was pulled out.

By late Thursday, the toll from the blast was:

One American killed in the hotel when a bomb went off in the hotel bar. Another died later in the hospital. Sixteen Americans were wounded but survived and got out. Four escaped injury, and got out. Twenty-two others, including two believed to be still alive, were buried under the mountain of debris.

The blast also buried 12 Vietnamese house servants working in the hotel. The mangled leg of one could be seen protruding from the rubble.

FAMILY OF SEVEN KILLED

A family of seven Vietnamese living in a nearby house also died.

All the Americans in the hotel were Army enlisted men with the 140th Maintenance Detachment, except for the American killed in the bar. He was a Special Forces man.

Soon after the first cries for help, the cries of three other men in the rubble were heard. One of them was pulled out, leaving two others trapped late Thursday.

One of the heroes of the bloody night killed two of the Vietcong attackers and survived himself.

Sp5c. Robert K. Marshall was on the second floor of the building when the attack began. Vietcong squads poured machinegun fire into the building.

FIRES BACK WITH RIFLE

Marshall rushed onto the balcony of the building with his carbine and emptied his magazine at two terrorists firing from a street across the way. After killing both, he rushed back into his room for more ammunition, but the explosion went off at that moment. Marshall was evacuated to Saigon.

Marshall saved himself by diving under his bed when the building collapsed.

The Vietcong bomb squad hit the building from three sides. A 40-pound explosive charge in a suitcase was found later in a store across the street.

Capt. Charles A. Brassart, 32, of Pittsburgh, Pa., saw the hotel go down.

"I was standing in front of the district railway office talking to an officer about 20 yards from the hotel," he said. "From where I was standing I could see only the third and fourth floors of the hotel. I heard shooting and saw men firing from both directions from the balcony of the hotel.

"At the same time, the lights started to go out. Fifteen seconds later I heard an explosion which was followed soon afterwards by another explosion.

"The top two floors of the hotel disappeared. * * * They collapsed completely out of my vision. I said to myself, oh God, many must be hurt in there."

NOT FIGHTING MEN

"This was a billet for maintenance men, not for combat soldiers," said Lt. Col. Theodore Metaxis of Seattle, Wash., senior adviser to the Vietnamese Army's 2d Corps.

"There are advisers here, not fighting men. We are not in the war. This is like a pack of criminals hitting a bank in any city in the United States. They can plan it carefully and launch it and get away with it, and is what the murderous Vietcong have done."

Rescue workers at the scene were working to the point of exhaustion. One who played a key role in freeing the first trapped American was Sp. John Huske, a tall, stocky man from Ronan, Mont. He was one of the first at the scene and was still there late Thursday afternoon.

Huske built the tunnel to the trapped man, then stayed, and comforted him. The tunnel was 2 feet wide and 10 feet long.

HAD TO BREAK LEG

In the final moments of the rescue, Huske had to break the remaining part of the leg which the Korean surgeon could not saw off. Huske was in tears as he emerged, grimy and dusty, from the hole.

The Korean doctor administered morphine and another powerful drug to the trapped man, but the soldier, who had put a tourniquet around his leg before help came, was still conscious.

The leg was smashed and pierced by a heavy metal beam.

Qui Nhon, a fairly large city, was almost deserted on Vietnamese Thursday, and a firefight with the Vietcong was still on. About 100 Vietcong who assaulted the city in junks Thursday night were still fighting from a spit of land across the harbor from the city.

U.S. helicopters were hitting the position hard.

VIENNA, W. VA.,
November 12, 1964.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
Senator from West Virginia,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I don't know if you remember me. I was the Army captain who fired the small arms demonstration for you at Veterans' Day ceremonies at Welch, W. Va., 1962.

In early 1963, the Army was asking for volunteers for combat duty in Vietnam. Being a career infantry captain, I felt if my country needed volunteers for combat duty, it was my responsibility. I responded to this call. After 8 months of extensive schooling, I reported for duty with Military Assistance Advisory Group, Saigon, Vietnam, on December 6, 1963.

With my schooling and combat experience from the Korean war, I was immediately assigned to a line infantry battalion as battalion adviser. After 3½ months as battalion adviser, I was moved up to regimental adviser. On the morning of April 4, 1964, my regiment was ordered to retake a town 2 kilometers from the Cambodian border that the Vietcong had taken the night before. At 1030 hours that morning we made

first contact with a Communist outpost. We reduced the Communist resistance and continued to advance. By 1430 hours that afternoon, after three times failing to heed my warnings to secure his flanks, the Vietnamese regimental commander lead his regiment into a horseshoe-type ambush. We were under heavy small arms and mortar fire from three sides. He immediately began to lose control of his regiment. I tried to get him to have his men hold position and fight back to no avail. I then called for air strikes which I received. After 2½ hours of moving under heavy fire my radio operator and I, directing air strikes, stopped the Communists from completely encircling the regiment. About 1700 hours my luck ran out. I caught a machinegune bullet in the neck, breaking my neck and paralyzing me from the chest down.

On August 13, 1964, I was medically retired from the U.S. Army with 100 percent total disability. Upon submitting my claim to the Veterans' Administration for my VA compensation (the part granting $1,600 toward purchasing a specially equipped automobile), I was informed that the law (38 USC 1901) limits this benefit to veterans whose disabilities resulted from service during World War II or the Korean conflict, such coverage ending January 31, 1955.

To my knowledge at the time of my retirement, there had only been one other man totally disabled from the war in Vietnam. This man was a helicopter pilot from California, shot down on a combat mission in Vietnam.

Sir, I feel that there should be an amendment to this law to cover battle casualties from Vietnam or any other place in the world where our troops are required to pull combat duty.

In my 4 months of combat duty in Vietnam, I was awarded the Second Award to Combat Infantryman's Badge, First Oak Leaf Cluster to the Purple Heart, and Silver Star for gallantry in action. In my opinion, it makes no difference whether I lost the use of my legs in Korea or Vietnam. Either place, I was fighting a common enemy of the United States with the ultimate goal of keeping this country and other countries free from Communist domination.

Any consideration or assistance that you can render in getting this law amended will be greatly appreciated by me and other members of the Armed Forces who have lost the use of their legs while fighting in Vietnam.

I have the honor to remain,

Yours very truly,

DONALD S. CUNNINGHAM,
Captain, AUS, Retired.

WEST VIRGINIA—THE NATION'S TOP COAL PRODUCING STATE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Nation's top coal producing State is about to reach another milestone. Sometime this month the mines of West Virginia will produce the 7 billionth ton in the history of our coal industry. The occasion is important not only in tribute to the comfort of our people and the industrial progress of our Nation, it also provides an opportunity to emphasize that there is a vast volume of solid fuel remaining within the confines of our State which will be available to provide heat and power for generations to come. Coal was first found in our part of the Appalachian basin more than two centuries ago. As early as 1800, commercial mines were operating in Brooke and Monongalia Counties. When West Virginia became an independent State in 1863, annual production amounted to about a quarter of a million tons—most of which came from Kanawha, Preston, Mineral, Mason, and Marshall Counties. As soon as the War Between the States was terminated, production increased quickly, passing the million-ton mark in 1869.

By that time coal's advantages as a heating fuel were becoming generally recognized; railroads branched out to mine communities and began to take over a growing share of the transportation that previously had been confined to water movement. With the development of the bessemer process for steelmaking, coal became established as one of the world's most important commodities.

West Virginia's coal output first exceeded 100 million tons after World War I, settled slightly in the middle twenties, and then averaged out at more than 100 million tons through even the depression years.

Production skyrocketed at the outbreak of World War II and reached 146 million tons at the height of our war effort in 1944. Thereafter, there was another slight drop, but, to assist in the return to a peace economy in this country and in reconstructing wartorn Europe, the mines of our State sent 176 million tons to market in 1947.

Because residual oil imports have crowded domestic fuel on a progressively greater scale for almost two decades, West Virginia's coal business has been badly hurt. Yet, we have remained unchallenged as the Nation's No. 1 producer. After slipping to 129½ million tons in 1963 we are slowly moving forward again and last year had a production record of approximately 137 million tons, thus bringing cumulative output into the vicinity of that 7-billionth-ton figure which we expect to reach this month.

Where does this leave West Virginia's energy cupboard? According to the U.S. Geological Survey's most recent analysis, there are still more than 51 billion tons of recoverable reserves remaining. This vast storehouse of energy amounts to more than 7 times the State's total production throughout its mining history. In further explanation of the volume of these reserves, I point out that the total amount of bituminous coal produced in the entire United States from the earliest record to this date is less than 31 billion tons.

I feel that these statistics are important to my colleagues. They should be of extreme interest to manufacturing and processing industries looking for sites to establish new plants. Certainly utility companies recognize the advantage of setting up shop in an area blessed with abundant fuel reserves and adequate water supply. In both northern and southern West Virginia, powerplants are being constructed and designed that will transmit electricity from mine mouth to labor-consuming centers of the east coast. Aluminum plants, once tied exclusively to hydroelectric power, are also moving into this region of inexpensive electricity and ample water.

Under the leadership of Gov. Hulett C. Smith and our energetic State and local development groups, West Virginia is ready and waiting for the new business that will find our region an ideal location from the standpoint of natural resources, conducive business climate, and skilled labor supply.

AMERICAN LEGION HONORS DAVID SARNOFF

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, this noon at a large luncheon in the Sheraton Park, Secretary of the Senate Felton Johnson and I were privileged to represent the U.S. Senate at the head table at a meeting presided over by Cartha "Deke" DeLoach of the FBI and arranged for the purpose of conferring upon David Sarnoff the National Commander's American Legion Award.

National Commander Donald E. Johnson paid a magnificent and well-earned tribute to Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corp. of America, on behalf of the American Legion and the responding remarks by General Sarnoff were pregnant with praise of our American system and confidence in its ability to continue to lead the world.

I ask unanimous consent that the presentation remarks by Commander Johnson, the response by General Sarnoff, and the most significant closing prayer by Father Power, of Georgetown University, using as his words the favorite prayer of the Father of our Country, George Washington, be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

REMARKS BY DONALD E. JOHNSON, NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION, ON PRESENTATION TO BRIG. GEN. DAVID SARNOFF, AT WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 1, 1965

Thank you very much, Deke. We have so many distinguished guests with us this afternoon that I shall make no attempt to recognize individuals. I know that your presence here is a well deserved tribute to the man we have gathered to honor, and our thanks to all of you for being with us.

While this has the makings of perhaps the busiest Washington conference the American Legion ever has conducted, I think I shall derive no greater personal pleasure from any single event of this week than this occasion where we recognize the genius of a man who, perhaps as much as any living individual, has helped to convince the world that radio and television are here to stay.

As early as 1916 he envisioned the "radio music box," an idea which developed into the worldwide radio communications system which we take almost for granted today. In 1923, before the miracle of radio was well established, he was giving serious thought to the possibilities of adding sight to sound, and television has long since been an accomplished fact.

This man's personal achievements and the honors and recognition which have been accorded to him would take more time to recount than is available to us today. He has been awarded 23 honorary degrees. He has received 15 Government decorations, including 6 from foreign governments, and he has received more than 50 other awards. His fabulous career in the electronic communications industry spans the era from the *Titanic* disaster to the miracle of Telstar, and I'm sure he proposes to go beyond the latter achievement.

A longtime member of the American Legion Advertising Men's Post No. 209 in New York City, I am pleased to note that this is not the first occasion on which the American Legion has recognized the great and diversified talents of General Sarnoff.

In 1953 he was selected by the American Legion Department of the District of Columbia as the recipient of their citation of merit for outstanding service in the cause of Americanism, and he has received similar citations from the American Legion of Pennsylvania and from School Men's Post No. 543 of New York City.

I now deem it an honor and a privilege to present to Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, the American Legion National Commander's Award for 1965.

This award is inscribed as follows:

"The American Legion National Commander's Award presented to Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board, Radio Corp. of America, in recognition of nearly 60 years of creative service to the electronic communications industry which has served America's military and civilian needs so well in time of war and peace.

"His vast contributions to the sciences of radio and television have enhanced man's knowledge and understanding of the world about him, and provided entertainment and educational opportunity for all mankind.

"With this citation the American Legion proudly recognizes the achievement of one of its most illustrious members.

"Presented at the Fifth Annual American Legion Washington Conference, March 1, 1965."

ADDRESS BY DAVID SARNOFF, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, RADIO CORP. OF AMERICA, TO THE FIFTH ANNUAL WASHINGTON CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 1, 1965

Commander Johnson, Mr. DeLoach, fellow Legionnaires, distinguished guests, thank you very much for this magnificent plaque and for the generous words inscribed upon it. I am profoundly grateful, Commander Johnson, for the honor which you have bestowed upon me here today. My gratitude goes to you and your fellow officers, and to the members of the American Legion everywhere.

It has always seemed to me a happy coincidence that two organizations with which I am associated—the American Legion and the Radio Corp. of America—were born within a few weeks of each other. The Legion, as you know, was formed in Paris, in March, 1919, and chartered by the Congress in September. One month later, at the request of the U.S. Government, RCA came into corporate existence for the purpose of giving this country its own strong and independent voice in international communications.

We have both grown up in a turbulent era of world history and we have both sought, in our own ways, to serve the Nation's needs and to strengthen its security.

Sixty-five years have gone by since I first came to these shores as a boy of 9—knowing nothing of America, its people, its language, or its customs. The trail that led me here today, as guest of this patriotic organization, has been long and challenging. My gratitude above all goes to our beloved country which has given me the opportunity to pursue my life's work in an atmosphere of freedom.

But far from being unique, my experience is typical of many others in this and earlier generations. From the first it has been the special genius of America to encourage its sons, whether by birth or adoption, to develop the best that is in them.

In the outpouring of tributes to the titan of our century, Sir Winston Churchill, his memorable phrases have been repeatedly quoted. What impressed me most about them was the man's magnificent patriotism. Repeatedly, without apologies or inhibitions, Churchill conveyed an all-encompassing love of his country, faith in its people, and devotion to its traditions.

In this, as in so many other aspects of his remarkable life, he set an example we would do well to follow. Let us not take our Nation and the glories of its history for granted. Let us demonstrate an unabashed pride in its achievements and a renewed faith in its destiny.

It is with these thoughts of our country in my mind that I would like to address myself particularly to one aspect of American life where experience has been my teacher.

For nearly 60 years I have been associated with electronic communications. The principal lesson these years have taught me is that the power to communicate is the power to lead. The nation which achieves the greatest mastery of this power is equipped for leadership in many other areas of national and international endeavor.

Today we are poised on the threshold of a new era, in which the power and scope of electronic communications will be vastly multiplied. The destiny of this Nation will in large measure be shaped by our response to the challenges of a changing environment.

The new era is coming with bewildering speed, for speed is the hallmark of this art and science. It was only at the turn of this century that Guglielmo Marconi spanned the Atlantic with three faint sparks—the letter "S" in Morse code—enabling man for the first time to communicate over long distances through the air. It is less than half a century since the American inventors De Forest, Fessenden, Hammond, Armstrong, and Zworykin—to mention only a few—supplied many of the essential keys to modern electronic communications.

Out of the work of these great pioneers of science have come political, social, economic, and military consequences of enduring and universal significance.

The power of radio communication as a political and social instrument was first demonstrated near the close of World War I. The wireless station at New Brunswick, N.J., had become the focal point for communications between this country and its allies and expeditionary forces overseas. In 1918, President Woodrow Wilson decided to use its voice in a dramatic appeal to the world for peace and justice. From that station he transmitted his famous 14 points. Ten months later, by the same means, he delivered his terms for an armistice and peace directly to the German people, calling for repudiation of their rulers.

One man communicated by radio to all mankind, to a world weary of devastation, and the impact of his words was electrifying. New, unprecedented power was thus added to man's capacity for persuading his fellow men. He now had the ability to influence simultaneously the thoughts, actions, and lives of millions of men and women far removed from one another.

Many Legionnaires have experienced at firsthand the military value of communications. Electronics became the eyes, ears, and voice of battle during Britain's finest hour. Radar intercepted the Luftwaffe crossing the English Channel and guided the RAF into combat. Sonar plumbed the ocean depths to seek, find and destroy the enemy's submarines. On D-day, when the Allies invaded Normandy, radarscopes aboard our bombers pierced the overcast and made it possible to lay down a devastating barrage in advance of the landings.

The universal aspect of communications—its ability to reduce the infinite to the immediate—is a result of the electron's agility. A radio signal travels at the speed of light and can circle the earth in less than one-seventh of a second. This is less time than it takes the sound of my voice to reach the back row of this ballroom. The electron's speed is more than a million times faster than the speed of sound.

From this tiny particle, the electron, has come a new American industry that has already attained a $17 billion annual volume and continues to grow rapidly. Today, electronics embraces broadcasting networks, black-and-white and color television, computers, industrial controls, military and space system. Its range of information handling extends from the swift solution of complex problems to the detection and measurement of the most remote objects in the known universe.

Our technology has established new communications networks linking men with men, men with machines, and machines with machines. Through intricate electronic systems of immense capacity, we assemble, store, compute, and analyze within seconds millions of bits of information for intelligible presentation and human decision.

We prepare coded programs that permit these systems to analyze our business trends, keep our accounts, run our assembly lines, and predict our elections. We link them with radar eyes that sweep the horizons to warn us of any hostile missile attack, and with communications and controls that could trigger and guide our retaliatory force.

Electronic communications extend our senses beyond the earth to the moon and the neighboring planets. They control vehicles that navigate across millions of miles of space and transmit their findings back to us.

A dramatic measure of the distance we have traveled—in miles, in speed, in power, and in diversity of communications—is seen in two developments 42 years apart.

In 1920, 14 transmitter towers, each 400 feet high, were required for the first radiotelegraph service across the Atlantic. They supported an antenna 2 miles in length which was fed with 200,000 watts of power. All this array of equipment and all this power were needed to reach across 3,400 miles, and then for only 20 to 30 words a minute.

Two years ago, by contrast, the Mariner II satellite journeyed beyond Venus and its radio transmitted 65 million bits of information back to Earth from distances of up to 54 million miles. It did so with an antenna only 4 feet in diameter and with only three and a half watts of power—less power than it takes to operate an electric toothbrush.

Experiments such as these have provided the springboard to project us into a revolutionary era in which we shall communicate, guide, command, control, and operate on earth, beyond earth to the planets, and out to interstellar space.

Within the next 10 years or so we will see several operational satellite systems in space—performing distinct functions of communications, sensing, and surveillance. Equipped with their own spacial computers and message switchboards, and linked to computers and communications on the ground, they will bring into instant reach any information that is available on earth or the space beyond—by sight, sound, or facsimile.

It has become almost a commonplace for audiences numbering in the hundreds of millions on both sides of the oceans to receive television transmitted by satellite—the moving pageantry of Britain's farewell to Winston Churchill, the panoply and inspiration of a presidential inauguration in the United States, the Olympic games in Japan.

Within a decade, the global audience may run to a billion. Through satellite television different societies will be brought into direct and daily contact. This may be expected to mark the beginning of a fast process of reeducation for all of us on earth, a redefining of old relationships and a searching for new ones. Out of this interplay a global culture

may begin to emerge, and perhaps, in time, a global language.

The time will also come when an individual carrying a vest pocket transmitter-receiver will connect by radio to a nearby switchboard linked to communications satellites and be able to see and speak with any similarly equipped individual anywhere in the world. Each instrument will have a decoding unit, responsive to only one of a billion or more arrangements of pulses, similar to today's personal telephone number. In the higher frequencies of the radio spectrum, and in controlled light beams, the channels available for such personal communications will run into billions.

Through satellites and unmanned instruments on land, sea, in the air and space, we will receive a total picture of the natural forces sweeping across the surface of the earth. The related sciences of meteorology and oceanography will be revolutionized. It will be possible to make provision well in advance for storms, excessive snow, rain or drought, extremes of heat or cold. Ultimately, with global knowledge of the weather will come techniques of weather control.

Our new technology can enable us to cope with and eventually to solve some of humanity's most pressing material problems. Today, the population explosion weighs increasingly upon world resources. Only 35 years from now, by the end of the century, the number of humans on this planet—approximately 3 billion at this moment—will double. The means must be found to sustain this enormous increase if the world is to avoid misery and conflict.

Vast areas of the globe—its land masses, its oceans, even its air—contain great quantities of untapped resources. To tap them on the scale needed will require an explosion in science and technology equal to the population explosion itself. One of the techniques employed will be exploration by satellites of the entire surface of the earth.

By satellite surveillance it will also be possible to detect and report activities of a significant military nature anywhere on earth or in space. From a height of several hundred miles above earth it is technically feasible to televise and recognize objects such as cars and trucks—or even a man.

In the fall of 1962 it took several hours before President Kennedy was shown photographs definitely indicating missile sites in Cuba. In years ahead, satellite television, instantly taped and transmitted, will reduce to minutes the time between detection and display. Simply by pressing a button, the President and his military and diplomatic advisers will instantly receive up-to-the minute pictures and data from distant places for command decision.

Satellite military communications will reach any plane in the air, ship at sea, missile site and ground unit down to the individual foot soldier—instantly readying them for action. With these new capabilities, we will increase enormously our means to cope with any external threat to ourselves or to the free world, no matter where it originates.

Earth itself will become the hub of a communications network extending to the moon, to manned space stations, and to other planets. We shall learn whether life in any form exists on Mars, and we will intensify the systematic search of the heavens to determine whether communicating intelligence exists on other planets of our galaxy.

Already, we have built instruments to map the universe which are capable of detecting radio waves from billions and billions of miles out in space. Emissions at certain frequencies in the radio spectrum come to us across the interstellar reaches. We are directing our attention to several emissions in these frequencies that appear to be coming from certain pinpoints in the Milky Way.

If and when intelligible signals ever should be received, it will be the most profound moment in human history, for man on earth will then know he is not alone. We will have discovered a communicating bridge to the cosmos.

In his recent report to the Congress on our space achievements last year, President Johnson said that the goal of the United States is to become the world's leading spacefaring nation. His words gave emphasis to the cardinal fact that space is not the exclusive domain of scientists and astronauts any more than the seas or air are the sole concern of those who sail them. Space has become a new ocean of national destiny.

Leadership in space, and in the communications art which is a key to mastery in space, translates itself today into political, military, economic, and social leadership among the nations of the world. Indeed, technological leadership resembles a magnet which attracts other forces. If it is weakened, these forces are drawn to other poles.

When the Soviets launched their first sputnik and followed it with further demonstrations of their tremendous rocket thrust, they advertised their accomplishments as evidence of their national and idealogical superiority. They attempted to establish the image of a technological giant capable of surpassing the best that Americans could achieve.

But we know the Russian advantage to be both limited and transitory. We have continued to hold a clear and decisive superiority in all vital areas of electronic communications for space. We have sent into space more devices, more sophisticated in their instrumentation, more versatile and varied in their functions than Soviet spacecraft. Even the superiority which they have claimed in rocket thrust will soon be overcome by our Saturn vehicles.

We must continue an unrelenting pursuit of knowledge and experience in the fields of space. If this country, through complacency or lack of foresight, permitted any other nation to seize ascendancy in space, we would be relegated to a secondary role not only in the military area but also in the other principal affairs of men.

Since the time of its founding 46 years ago, the American Legion has devoted itself to advancing the Nation's interests and its destiny. Today, our destiny is manifest in the space above us. The same sense of mission that ignited our strong Nation's westward expansion a century ago should now be brought to bear in support of the President's space objectives.

An imaginative and venturesome spirit has always been our country's distinguishing characteristic in its thrust to the summit of world leadership. I am confident that it will continue to inspire our people as we surmount the cosmic challenge that lies ahead.

CLOSING BENEDICTION BY FATHER DANIEL E. POWER, JR., OF GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, D.C.

WASHINGTON'S PRAYER

I now make it my earnest prayer, that God would have you, and the State over which you reside, in his holy protection, that he would incline the hearts of the Citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to Government, to entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another, for their fellow Citizens of the United States at large, and particularly for their brethren who have served in the Field, and finally, that he would most graciously be pleased to dispose us all, to do Justice, to love mercy, and to demean ourselves with that Charity, humility and pacific temper of mind, which the Characteristicks of the Divine Author of our blessed Religion, and without an humble imitation of whose example in these things, we can never hope to be a happy Nation.

Mr. MUNDT. All in all, Mr. President, today's awards luncheon of the national department of the American Legion was a most impressive and significant occasion. Surely, David Sarnoff's informative address provides us all with both a challenge and a cause for confidence.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

Mr. JAVITS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York withhold his request? We are running short of time, and the Senator from Wisconsin has a lengthy speech to make.

Mr. JAVITS. I withhold my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. PROXMIRE obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the majority leader, with the understanding that I will not lose my right to the floor.

WHITE PAPER ON VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the State Department's white paper on Vietnam underscores what able American journalists have been reporting for some time: that there has been a new and higher level of North Vietnamese military involvement in the conflict in the South. This is the second time that the Department has seen fit to issue what amounts to an official confirmation of this kind. It will be recalled that in December 1961, a white paper was issued on the same subject. At that time, the issuance coincided with a marked increase in our indirect military and economic aid to South Vietnam. The present white paper coincides with still another major—a geometric increase in American aid.

In my judgment, the white paper does not set forth a new policy. It confirms the necessity of what has been undertaken to date by this Government. It is a new explanation, not a new prescription.

The paper helps to make clear why this Nation has been compelled to take steps which it has taken in recent weeks, if South Vietnam is not to be abandoned, if the United States is to honor its commitment to help the Vietnamese of the south to retain a degree of choice in their future. In that respect, it should satisfy those who have been insisting that the President should address an explanation to the American people as to what is involved in Vietnam. The President, so far as I can see, is trying to keep a lid on a dangerous volcano in southeast Asia. He is not seeking to blow it off. Insofar as information is concerned, we have had the white paper and statements from Secretary McNamara and Secretary Rusk, Ambassador Stevenson, and many other distinguished members of the administration as to what we are doing, and why. American press coverage of the situation has been exceptionally extensive

and well informed. Insofar as our policies are concerned, the President is receiving a wealth of advice from his administration and from Senators who have participated in the highly useful debate on Vietnam—and all of them may I say are to be commended for participating.

The truth of the matter is that the President has a policy in Vietnam, and it is not expressed in any single action or nonaction. He is trying to prevent a great war in Asia, and he is trying at the same time to meet a commitment to the people of South Vietnam of many years standing in a situation which changes constantly. He seeks to aid the South Vietnamese people to find a solution to their difficulties, as did his two predecessors in office. And he seeks a peace in which freedom in that part of the world will not become a dead letter. That is all, even though it is a great deal.

The paper also emphasizes, indirectly, the need for an end to the jealous rivalries, military and others, who have led to coup on coup in Saigon since the unfortunate and most deplorable assassination of President Ngo Dinh Diem. If we are to aid the people of South Vietnam in a situation such as is detailed in the white paper, there must be a dedicated and responsible leadership in South Vietnam, through which they can be aided, through which their choice, whatever it may be, can be expressed, and their right to a choice defended.

Neither this Nation nor any other nation can supply an alien leadership where only an indigenous leadership can suffice in this day and age in Asia. Despite the serious intensification of the military conflict, the problem in all Vietnam is still primarily a Vietnamese problem.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am happy to have yielded to the majority leader on this subject. My speech is on the same subject. The majority leader has discussed the white paper, which I also intended to discuss.

President Johnson's Vietnam policy is to restore peace and to help the South Vietnamese defend their country from subversion and attack by the Communists.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point? I wish to say something about what the majority leader has said.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope to be in the Chamber for all practical purposes throughout the Senator's speech. I consider him one of the most thoughtful Members of the Senate. I want very much to hear how he feels about this subject.

I should like to say about the majority leader's statement, just read, that it raises a serious question, which is: Do the Vietnamese people really want to fight for freedom, and do they want us there? We cannot hold plebiscites in Vietnam; nonetheless, it is essential that this question be before us, because I believe it is basic to every other question as to whether we stay in South Vietnam or not. I therefore express the hope that the President and his spokesmen in Congress, such as the majority leader, will keep us apprised, so far as information on this situation is available to us which ought to be made public. It is a subject that is under constant review and is of constant concern to the American people.

I have read the speech of the Senator from Wisconsin; and, of course, we know the position of the majority leader. I, too, have supported the President. I do not go along with those who seek negotiation as a way to get out. We must fight this problem through until there is some result consonant with our objectives. I know there are tragic losses, and that we all must bear them. As the Senator feels, and as I know I do, we only wish we could go there and do the job ourselves. It would be so much easier than standing here and saying that the struggle must go on. However, I feel that essentially there is a majority in South Vietnam who are interested in fighting for freedom, and that they want us there.

I again address an appeal to the President. I do not do so to imply that he is not taking action or will not do so. However, what the Senator from Montana has said bears so heavily on the subject that I hope we shall be kept, as far as possible, closely in touch with that aspect of the matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have been considering what the distinguished senior Senator from New York said on Thursday, February 18, at which time he raised similar questions which I think are entitled to an answer.

One of those questions was, of course, whether the President should take to the airwaves to inform the American people on the situation in Vietnam and our policy with respect thereto. I have stated since, and I reiterate, that in all honesty I cannot see the need or desirability for such a course of action and statement at this time. But getting down to specifics, if the Senator from Wisconsin will allow me, I would recall that on Thursday, 10 days ago, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] joined in a debate on the Vietnamese situation.

As the Senator from New York knows, I hold him in the highest esteem and I have great respect and admiration for his knowledge and judgment in questions of foreign relations. We have from time to time engaged in colloquies on certain subjects in this particular field, and I have invariably emerged from them with an enrichment of my own understanding. So what I say is not in criticism of the recent remarks of the Senator. It is for purposes of clarification.

The Senator will recall other colloquies which we had a year or so ago. Unfortunately, I do not have the RECORDS here covering these colloquies, but they are in my office. When I sought to examine certain premises and policies with respect to Vietnam or southeast Asia, the Senator's great concern was not so much with what I was suggesting, but rather with the possibility that it might be misconstrued.

The Senator noted, as I recall, that my remarks might erroneously be interpreted as an advocacy of a pullout or the abandonment of solemn commitments. With all due respect, I would suggest that a similar misconstruction could be placed on the remarks of the Senator in his talk on February 18, although I personally did not so interpret them. But, lest there be any doubt that the Senator from New York stands foursquare behind the President, I would point out that he did vote for the Vietnamese resolution on August 7, 1964, as he has stated many times. Part of the resolution reads:

> The Congress approves and supports the determination of the President as Commander in Chief to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.

As I said, the Senator from New York voted for that resolution. So there ought to be no doubt that he supports fully and completely the military actions which the President has felt compelled to take in Vietnam.

With that as background, I should like to commend the Senator for raising certain questions on February 18 with respect to the present situation in Vietnam.

First, the Senator from New York asked the President whether the majority of the people in South Vietnam are determined to fight for their freedom. This is very pertinent indeed, for, as President Johnson has said, our objective in South Vietnam is to help the people of that country defend their freedom. May I say in all frankness that the inability of their leaders to form a stable government, as evidenced by at least 13 coups, or attempted coups, in less than 16 months, the last being about 2 weeks ago, is not a source of encouragement.

I would say to the distinguished Senator from New York the hour now is late for his question. I would ask him: How do you find out now, while the American forces are becoming the prime targets of the Vietcong, whether the Vietnamese people are determined to fight for their freedom, especially when their leaders compound the difficulty by their feuds and struggles for prestige and power? Do you take a Gallup poll? Do you have a congressional investigation? This is a very serious question. But how in the present circumstances do you set out to answer it? And if the answer could be obtained and if it were found that the Vietnamese people are not determined to fight for their freedom, what would the Senator suggest that the President do? Would he have the President negotiate out, or simply pull out, or move in further?

The Senator could make a great contribution, I think, not only by raising the questions, but also by exploring the implications of the answers.

Second, the distinguished Senator from New York asked whether the people of South Vietnam actually want the United States in their country. This,

too, is a vital question. But I would most respectfully suggest that it is difficult to consider this question now, while the guns are being fired at Americans, and Americans are losing their lives in increasing numbers. The time to have examined this question with the dispassion that it warrants was months ago.

But the Senator, as far as I can recall, generally expressed the view in his colloquies with me a year ago that the examination of any such vital questions would invariably introduce worldwide doubts as to our steadfastness. How much more would that be the case in the present circumstances?

So I would say to the Senator with all due respect that his question is likely to remain rhetorical unless he can also focus attention on it and suggest to the President ways in which it can be intelligently answered while the fighting is in progress.

Third, the Senator from New York asked whether the United States has done everything possible to get our Asian allies—Japan, Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Thailand, and so forth, to help in the fighting. Here the answer is plain. Everything possible has been tried as it was in 1954, when President Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles were confronted by a similar problem, as it was in 1961, by the late President Kennedy, with respect to a crisis in Laos at that time. The response has been very meager in so far as military assistance to Vietnam is concerned.

So I would say to the Senator that if he feels we must have significant international or Asian support as a condition for remaining in Vietnam in a limited conflict, there is little sign that it is going to materialize. In present circumstances, sacrifices of life and resources insofar as they are borne by other than Vietnamese are going to be continued to be borne almost wholly by the United States, as they have been for a long time.

Finally, the distinguished Senator from New York asked that if the United States is willing to negotiate, will it negotiate with dignity, and not at the expense of the South Vietnamese people. The phrasing of the question reveals an uncertainty in the mind of the Senator, which I must confess I do not understand, and which I find somewhat disturbing.

I cannot imagine President Johnson, or any President, entering into negotiations other than with dignity and honor. Did not President Truman negotiate with dignity and honor in Korea? Did not President Eisenhower, when he continued these same negotiations which led to a cease-fire, insist upon dignified and honorable negotiations? Does the Senator from New York really doubt that President Johnson, if he felt negotiations desirable, would negotiate with any less dignity and honor, or with less awareness of the realities in the Vietnamese situation?

I do not believe that the Senator from New York thinks that the President would repudiate our obligations to the Vietnamese people. Who has suggested that we should?

Certainly, the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] made clear in his recent speech, for example, his support of the President's military actions, as did the Senator from New York. In his argumentation in this Chamber a few days ago, Senator CHURCH stated explicitly that, "Having made a solemn commitment to Saigon, we intend to keep it."

To suggest that negotiations be considered, is not to break a commitment, as the Senator from New York well knows; in some situations, negotiations may well be the best way to keep a commitment. And despite the possibility of misconstruction, I would say to the Senator from New York that any suggestions which he may have as to how negotiations, both dignified and honorable, may be applied in this situation to bring the bloodshed to an end would be welcomed.

I, for one, would urge him to make such suggestions.

In summary, Mr. President, I would like to commend the senior Senator from New York for the questions which he raised 10 days ago because I have for him the highest admiration and affection. The Senator has made an effective contribution to the debate on Vietnam.

I express the hope that he will elaborate his thoughts, as I am sure he will, and that he will shed further light on how we may best go about finding the answers, not only to the questions which he raises, but also to the larger questions of a durable peace in Vietnam and southeast Asia, as a whole.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may respond?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President. I shall yield, but I shall yield very briefly.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have asked witnesses many questions in my day. On occasion, I have been asked questions, and sometimes as a lawyer I have said, "I am glad you asked me that question."

I am very much reminded of that, as the Senator has made a very well prepared statement in response to a question which I asked him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield briefly, these remarks were prepared a week ago Friday, in response to questions raised the preceding day by the Senator from New York on this floor.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague, but I am prepared to deal with this question. I should like to do so very briefly.

I believe there are ways of finding out about and reporting to the American people the will to resist by the South Vietnamese. We hear of more or less sporadic attempts to resist in one area or another in South Vietnam, but they are quite diffused. We do not see an accurate map of areas of resistance. I think the President, or his spokesmen, could do something about locating these areas, so it could be pointed out to the American people just how much of this country is really controlled by the Vietcong and what other areas are in control of the South Vietnamese. Just how much is there left of the strategic hamlet program, for example, which we have supported with a considerable amount of money? This is a very important question?

In addition, there is a large complex of activity to get us out which certain Buddhists have engaged in that affects the results as far as the Americans are concerned and as far as the South Vietnamese are concerned.

I believe a finding on the will to resist in South Vietnam would be very convincing to me, and I think to the American people. I would credit the President with the greatest good faith in respect to such a finding so far as policy is concerned. The question of whether the South Vietnamese want the United States in could very well be answered in much the same way by the degree to which the country still remains in control of the South Vietnam people, as important proof of their will to resist. Some proof of their will to resist is what remains to them in control. It determines the question of what degree of cooperation the United States gives, whatever may be the regime in power at the moment. Considering the emanations of opinions, the great number of correspondents who are there, and the many visitors who come here and go there, I think a window can be kept open on the country. The central point of my remarks is that I affirm a need for a finding of fact by the President, based on his information.

The Senator from Montana has asked what I would suggest we do if the South Vietnamese people are behind the resistance movement. If it is found that a majority of the people are for resistance, and that finding is made by the President, we would be behind that finding. If a majority of the people have lost the will to resist, there is a serious question as to how long the United States can continue the struggle at this large cost in money and cost in lives.

With respect to Asian allies giving help, I did not mean that the President is not trying. The President may be trying, but is the U.S. diplomatic machinery trying enough, giving enough emphasis and priority to this aspect? As long as the President tries ardently that would be fine. Essentially, my point was raised not with respect to whether the President has tried, but with respect to the actual efforts of our Asia and southeast Asia allies. We are entitled to receive from them more help than we are getting.

Finally, on the question of negotiation, the Senator from Montana had before him reference to my recent remarks. Memory is always poorer than the words themselves, but my desire and intention was not to say if the Nation is willing to negotiate, let it negotiate with dignity, but rather, that we are ready to negotiate at any time. If I did not say it, I apologize to the Senator for that. I think I used somewhere former President Eisenhower's analogy that we should walk the extra mile—provided our negotiations are not in a frame of reference which would sell out the South Vietnamese people. I would like to see an announcement made, since there is such

confusion about our willingness to negotiate. I have endeavored to indicate that if the United States will negotiate, it will be only on the understanding that it was absolutely sure there are no sell-outs of the hopes of the South Vietnamese people.

That, it seems to me, represents a summation of my thinking in reply to the Senator's questions.

I will accept his suggestion that I state in greater detail my views on this matter, but I thought I should reply to the Senator's questions at this time.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am deeply sorry that I shall not be able to remain in the Chamber to hear the speech of the Senator from Wisconsin. I find myself in deep disagreement with him. I shall have remarks to make on the subject later in the week. I am on my way downtown to make a speech on the "white paper," which can be described as Swiss cheese with holes in it made by the lips of the administration people to the Foreign Relations Committee who said time and again that was a civil war fought by South Vitenamese rebels largely with equipment captured from the government. Now we are excited because in recent weeks the North Vietnamese are going in on a big scale. Why should they not go in?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial in the New York Times of yesterday and Mr. Reston's column in the New York Times be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

STORM SIGNALS OVER ASIA

The Johnson administration seems to be conditioning the American people for a drastic expansion of our involvement in Vietnam. The State Department's white paper accuses North Vietnam of intensified aggression and stresses that military efforts aimed solely at the Vietcong guerrillas in the south no longer suffice.

The logic of all this is that the United States, which only last week moved from the role of "adviser" to active and undisguised combatant in South Vietnam, now feels free to strike at will—whether by air, sea, or land—at any targets it chooses in North Vietnam. In the 3 tense weeks since the Vietcong attack on Pleiku, American policy has plunged dangerously beyond the one enunciated then by the President and Secretary McNamara of limiting ourselves to retaliatory action and shunning a wider war.

And what has happened to alter our policy? The assertion that North Vietnam is a principal supplier of men and munitions to the Vietcong is certainly not new, nor is the charge that the extent of its support is increasing. Such activity by Hanoi constitutes the sole reason for our being in South Vietnam, and has since the United States moved into the vacuum left by the French withdrawal in 1954.

Apparently, the major new evidence of a need for escalating the war, with all the hazard that this entails, was provided by the sinking in a South Vietnamese cove earlier this month of a 100-ton cargo ship loaded with Communist-made small arms and ammunition. A ship of that size is not much above the oriental junk class. The standard Liberty or Victory ship of World War II had a capacity of 7,150 to 7,650 tons.

Page after page of similarly minuscule detail about Communist infiltration from the north merely raises anew the question of whether massive air strikes would accomplish anything except large-scale civilian casualties in industrial centers and ports. The question is made sharper by the absence of any stable government in Saigon to fight or even to speak in the name of the South Vietnamese people.

Communist China, the nation whose imperialist ambitions the world has most to worry about, will be a clear gainer from the ill timing and judgment of our warning to North Vietnam. It comes just as the Soviet Union is about to begin an international meeting of Communist parties in Moscow—a meeting originally called to pronounce Peiping a renegade from Marxist-Leninism. Washington is now doing precisely what that most sophiscated of Kremlinologists, George F. Kennan, former U.S. Ambassador to Moscow, cautioned against in his Senate testimony Friday: Forcing the Soviet Union to come down on the side of Communist China.

Washington and Peiping are in bizarre tandem as the only major capitals in the free or Communist worlds openly resistant to seeking a negotiated settlement of the Vietnamese conflict now. It is not too late for the President to make it plain that the United States is ready to talk as well as fight, and thus leave China isolated as the obstructor of any attempt to achieve a sound and enforcible peace.

WASHINGTON: PRESIDENT JOHNSON UNDER PRESSURE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 27.—President Johnson is making no excuses for anything he has done in Vietnam, and is visibly irritated with the critics of his policy.

He knows he is now up against the most difficult policy decision of his life, and that all the options open to him in Vietnam are risky, but this is all the more reason, in his view, for the country to back the President and stop the critical chatter.

This is not a new attitude on the part of Lyndon Johnson. When he was majority leader in the Senate, he often criticized President Eisenhower's domestic policies but invariably backed him without a murmur on major foreign policy questions.

THE CONSOLING POLLS

Accordingly, his attitude toward Democratic Senators who have differed with him publicly on Vietnam has not been to assume that they are expressing what they believe to be a better course of action, but to charge them with letting him down—sometimes merely to get themselves in the headlines.

He is particularly sensitive to charges that he is not talking enough to the American people about the complexities and risks of the Vietnamese war. He carries around in his pocket a series of private polls that purport to show that the vast majority of the people not only know what he is doing but approve what he is doing.

NO EAR FOR CRITICS

The mail coming into the congressional and newspaper offices here does not support his polls, but when anybody ventures to mention this criticism, he insists that the polls are right, the people understand his problems better than the newspapers, and besides, the Congress authorized the action he has taken, with only two opposing votes.

Lyndon Johnson has gone through other hard times in his career but nothing like this. He sat in on the two Cuban crises with President Kennedy, but he did not have primary responsibility for the decisions.

The decision to bomb the bases of the Communist torpedo boats after their attack on the American Navy was difficult for him in only one respect. One of the bases was very close to the Chinese Communist coast, and in the end he gave the order to hit it. But he was elaborately calm all through that night of decision and, anyway, he felt he had no honorable option but to retaliate.

His present situation is different. All his opinions now seem unsatisfactory and even dangerous. If he doesn't keep up the military pressure on North Vietnam, his advisers fear that his first attacks on North Vietnam will seem a bluff. But if he does, every day that passes raises the prospect that new Communist antiaircraft weapons and defensive fighters will be added to the battle.

Usually he is at home with middle-of-the-road policies, but the middle of this road is full of dangers. He does not want to talk out on negotiations because this might impair the morale of the South Vietnamese, and also because he feels it is difficult to speak about negotiations without setting conditions that might make negotiations all the more difficult.

Johnson is a poker player and he knows that the man who raises is always in a more difficult position than the man who calls. In Vietnam, it is Johnson who is raising, and the stakes get higher in this game with every succeeding play.

In recent days, he has spent a great deal of his time defending his policies to groups of Congressmen and newspapermen. He has, indeed, been running a series of seminars, with Secretary of Defense McNamara defending the military policy, Secretary of State Rusk defending the diplomatic process, and Vice President HUMPHREY and himself appealing for understanding and unity.

His faith in polls is astonishing, maybe because the polls were so accurate in predicting the size of his own electoral victory last November.

CHURCHILL'S ADVICE

"Nothing is more dangerous," Churchill once said, "than to live in the temperamental atmosphere of a Gallup poll, always taking one's pulse and taking one's temperature. There is only one duty, only one safe course, and that is to try to be right and not to fear to do or say what you believe to be right."

President Johnson is undoubtedly doing that, but it is an agonizing problem for a man who is not accustomed to losing and not yet at ease with the devilish complexities of foreign affairs.

Every American President since the war, however, seems to have faced a frightful foreign policy decision early in his administration. For President Truman it was whether to drop the atomic bomb on Japan. For President Eisenhower it was whether to expand the war or negotiate a truce in Korea. For Kennedy it was the Bay of Pigs adventure in Cuba. And for Johnson it is Vietnam.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I wholeheartedly support the President's policy. I admire the restraint and perseverance he has shown in carrying it out.

The present policy offers the best chance for us to achieve an enduring peace in this enormously complex situation.

Mr. President, this policy has been under serious attack lately.

In his statement as modified last week, the Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant, charged that although the American people are the best informed in the world, he doubts that even

in the United States is it possible to receive fully balanced information on Vietnam. The Secretary General said that Americans are not sufficiently aware, and these are his exact words, "of the serious risks and dangers implicit in a war course without political efforts to bring the war to an end."

Other Senators have seriously questioned our Vietnam policies. My visits in recent weeks with hundreds of Wisconsin people convince me that this protest is widely shared by the American people.

WHY ARE WE IN SOUTH VIETNAM?

Mr. President, why are we in South Vietnam? Why are we pouring so much of our taxpayer dollars into this remote, far-off land? Why have we ordered thousands of American soldiers to risk their lives and, indeed, hundreds have laid down their lives in this distant corner of Asia? Why?

Do we want South Vietnam or any part of it?

The question is so ridiculous that even the Chinese Communists have not accused us of it.

It is transparently clear that we have no desire for any territorial aggrandizement in any part of the world, certainly not in remote southeast Asia.

Why, then, are we in South Vietnam at such painful cost?

Do we seek any economic advantage there?

Has anyone, even the North Vietnamese or the Vietcong, accused us of economic exploitation? Are we pursuing dollar diplomacy?

The answer again is a resounding "No."

From an economic standpoint, America would be far better off if there were no Vietnam. We have poured literally billions of dollars as well as the priceless lives of some of our finest young men into South Vietnam.

We will get nothing in return, not a penny.

Mr. President, if any nation's hands can be said to be clean, ours are clean in South Vietnam.

We seek no power, no territory. We want no money, no oil, no food, no resource of any kind in this distant nation.

Why, then, are we there? Why? Why?

We are there for one very simple reason, Mr. President. We were invited by the Government of South Vietnam to come. We were asked to help. So we did. The Geneva accords formally recognized South Vietnam as a nation. Its sovereignty is established by solemn agreement, ratified by the principal powers of the world.

That sovereignty has been challenged by an invasion from outside its boundaries. The fact of aggression has been proved beyond any doubt, repeatedly—and of course, most recently, by the white paper released over the weekend by the State Department which documented the facts in great detail and over a period of time.

It has been proved over and over and over again virtually every day for more than 10 years now.

SINGLE AMERICAN MOTIVE: PEACE

But why should we, the U.S. Government, become so involved? What is our motive, if our hands are so clean, if we desire no territory, no power, no economic advantage? What do we want?

Mr. President, we want peace. Peace.

Our record proves that we want peace. Every action we have taken has been taken to prevent aggression and restore peace. Every pound of food—and we have sent millions of tons—every man-hour of education in peaceful pursuits—and we have poured in thousands of man-years in such education—every dollar spent to provide health facilities, build schools, construct roads and improve agriculture—and we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars for these purposes—has been directed toward our peaceful goal of building a solid and stable South Vietnam.

For years our Vietnam policy has been carefully, and sometimes painfully, designed to avoid overt military action by American soldiers. This has been done in spite of the most serious and continuous provocation.

Even following the Tonkin Gulf and Pleiku incidents the President had confined our retaliation in size. He has limited it to military targets and he has limited its duration and made it appropriate to the provocation.

These are not the reactions of a President or an administration interested in extending the war, or of developing a big war. It is the obvious reaction of an administration deeply interested in securing peace. Above all, he has announced that the retaliation was for the sole purpose of preventing further aggression.

LONG RECORD OF NORTH VIETNAM AGGRESSION

To understand what is happening in Vietnam—and what is at stake in the whole of southeast Asia—it is necessary to go back to the fundamentals of the situation: to the history of Communist efforts to capture South Vietnam and our commitment to prevent this from happening.

The root of the problem is well known. From the time of the Geneva Conference in 1954, the Communist authorities in North Vietnam planned and expected to take over the area south of the 17th parallel. At first, they probably believed South Vietnam would fall to them like an overripe fruit, theirs for the plucking, as a result of failure to achieve internal stability and unity in the South. But their fond hopes were thwarted by the progress achieved by South Vietnam in the areas of political stability—this was at the beginning—and economic development.

In these fields, the South soon outstripped the North. From the first, it was clear that whatever internal problems South Vietnam had, they were united in their opposition to falling under the Communist domination of Hanoi. By 1956, South Vietnam had become a self-governing republic and had assumed its place in the family of nations.

Thwarted in their initial hopes of easy conquest, the Communists undertook a campaign of terror and subversion aimed at undermining the South Vietnamese Government and social structure. By 1959, a war of covert aggression was well underway. Without openly declaring war, the Hanoi government began to infiltrate guerrilla fighters and military equipment from the north, supplementing a base of loyal Communists who had stayed behind and gone underground after the 1954 accords. Any thought that this was a small effort which would soon end was quickly shown to be false.

In this confusing situation, we cannot argue—and I do not believe that any person devoted to the administration has argued—that all the invasion is from outside. There are fifth columnists living in South Vietnam. They, too, include a substantial and significant part of the Vietnamese population.

In 1960 and 1961, the situation in South Vietnam grew more critical. As one measure of its seriousness—and of the character of the attack—over 3,000 civilians, in and out of government, were killed, and another 2,500 kidnaped in those 2 years.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As usual, the Senate is listening to a thoughtful and constructive address by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] on one of the major problems facing this country today.

I am glad to note at the end of the Senator's remarks—which I had the privilege of reading earlier—that he mentions a speech made by the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, William Bundy. That talk was made in a country town in my State. Although it was given considerable publicity in the metropolitan newspapers, it is also important that the problem be disseminated throughout the country so that the American people will understand the problem better than they do today.

I am impressed with some of facts and figures the Senator is giving today which, to be frank, I did not know.

I would ask the Senator inasmuch as he emphasizes the fact that the reason why we are in South Vietnam is that we were asked to come in to help preserve their freedom—what does the Senator believe would be our course of action if one of the many South Vietnamese governments—and I believe there have been 13 or 14 since the death of Diem—suggested that it could handle the situation better if we left?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that one of the implications of his question, which should be noted, is the fact that not one of the 13 or 14 governments, some of which have had Buddhist representation, and various kinds of representation, has requested us to leave South Vietnam.

It is clear, of course, that there may be circumstances beyond our control which would make it necessary for us to leave. It is not inevitable, and it is not written in destiny, that we are sure to win. Of course, if the South Vietnamese Government were to ask us to leave our position would be seriously weakened.

It would be tragic. However, what would happen under those circumstances would be a decision that the President would have to make, considering all the factors and considering what would be the attitude of the people of South Vietnam and the attitude of the Armed Forces.

However, I believe it is significant that the Senator's question implied that not one of these governments has asked us to leave; in fact, they have all been anxious to have us stay there.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my friend from Wisconsin for the speech he is making. It is further clarifying some of the problems we face in Vietnam, and I also thank him for his kindness in yielding to me.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri, whom I very greatly admire, not only as one of the outstanding experts in this country on our military position, but also as a true statesman, who is an expert on our foreign policy and on our foreign policy position.

The Senator from Missouri is one of the few Senators who have been Cabinet officials. He is also a member of both the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, and has taken an informed and constructive position constantly in our foreign policy.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am grateful for the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin.

COMMUNIST TERROR CAMPAIGN AGAINST SKILLED, EDUCATED

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Communists concentrated their attacks on the skilled and educated: teachers, doctors, engineers, government officials. By this method, they spread terror and severely damaged the nation's social fabric by eliminating individuals crucial to the functioning of civilized society. Infiltration from the north increased.

We must remember that this is a new kind of war. This is an entirely different kind of situation than we have ever experienced in the past. It is not the kind of clear-cut situation with which we are accustomed to dealing in our military conflicts. It is very hard to find any historical precedents for the situation which confronts us here.

People in many areas came under Communist control and had to provide food and supplies for the guerrillas.

It was obvious that the peacekeeping machinery created by the Geneva Conference had failed. The United States had been assisting South Vietnam from the start, and at its urgent request in 1961, our military and economic assistance was increased.

But it is important to bear in mind that the basis of our presence was entirely different from that of the French. The French were in Vietnam seeking to reestablish a colonial empire.

Many critics of our Vietnamese position have asked, If the French could not stay there with several hundred thousand troops, how can we expect to stay there?

Mr. President, we are in South Vietnam on an entirely different basis. The Vietnamese know that we do not intend to exploit them, that we do not intend to use them to enrich our own country in any way. We are there to assist them and to support them. We are just as far from being a colonial power as any country could be.

On the other hand, the infiltrators, the invaders from the north, are certainly in the old tradition of the empire builders.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I do not have the exact figures at my fingertips, but I believe the RECORD shows that there are about 600,000 Vietnamese troops fighting for South Vietnam at this moment, compared with 26,000 Americans over there. Furthermore, for every casualty we have suffered, the South Vietnamese themselves have suffered at least 10 casualties. Also, it should be remembered, that for every South Vietnamese soldier who has been wounded or killed in combat, the South Vietnamese soldiers have killed or wounded two Vietcongs.

When some people say that the Vietnamese are not fighting for their country, it seems to me that statement is disproved by the ratio of their killing or wounding two Vietcongs for every casualty that they suffer. To me that indicates that the South Vietnamese are doing a pretty good job of fighting for their country.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is absolutely correct. I might point out, also, that not only have the South Vietnamese engaged in this very difficult war for many years, but they have also suffered the infiltration and intimidation and terror that is so remote from any experience that we have ever had, in which the mayors or the leaders of their little hamlets are tortured and murdered, and even the South Vietnamese children of local officials are tortured and murdered to break the continued will to resist.

We must not lose sight of this kind of terror, torture, and murder.

As the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has said, the South Vietnamese soldiers are fighting and are fighting well and inflicting more casualties on the infiltrators and invaders than they are themselves suffering. That is not the conduct of people who are not willing to support their friends and defend their nation. This, I believe, is the real answer to the question raised by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If our country should pull out, we would be running out on hundreds of thousands of courageous fighting men who are fighting on our side, with the result that those people would have no hope of being able to continue their fight against the Communist aggression.

Red China knows that it would confront the United States if it got into the war. Does the Senator have any doubt that Red China would be using every method of subversion and infiltration available to that country if they felt the United States would stay completely out?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Louisiana raises an excellent point that I had not thought of. If it were not for our presence in South Vietnam, there is no question that the rich ricefields of South Vietnam and its potentially very rich economy would induce the hungry Chinese to move down, in view of their philosophy that war should be an instrument of foreign policy.

The Red Chinese have a very militant kind of government, which would not hesitate to do exactly what the Senator has suggested, if it were not confronted with the kind of language it understands, and that is the language of real military power.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have had an opportunity to read through the first part of the Senator's speech, and I regret that I have not had an opportunity to read all of it. I agree with the portion of the speech that I have been able to read, and I am sure that I would also agree with the Senator's entire presentation.

I should like to ask the Senator this question. If we were to pull out and start running, can the Senator tell me where we are supposed to fight, in view of the fact that we have been trusted by people who have 600,000 men fighting in this war, in behalf of a cause that is very dear to our heart?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator raises a good point. It would be far better, in my opinion, if the war were to end in a stalemate in South Vietnam, or if it were necessary for us to stay there 5 or 10 or 15 years, than to retreat and fight elsewhere. If the Communists can win this kind of war of intimidation and violence and infiltration, they will not stop. Why should they stop, when they will have been rewarded? They will continue. Our present policy of standing up to the Communists is by far the best way to achieve peace.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If we proceed to limit ourselves to fighting the war on the enemy's terms, after we have suffered 200 or 300 American casualties, and then proceed to say the price is too high and desert this friendly government and put it in the position of being forced to surrender the 600,000 well-armed troops into the hands of the enemy, can the Senator from Wisconsin tell me what the attitude of the Communists would be the next time they started to infiltrate a friendly nation? Would they not say, "If we inflict a few casualties on the Americans"—and they have been relatively light casualties, if we relate them to the kind of casualties that we have been accustomed to suffering when we have decided to fight—"they will lose their nerve and courage"?

Is it not true that the Communist doctrine is to take over the whole world, including this country, and that that doctrine, particulary on the part of the Chinese Communists, which is voiced by Hanoi, is that there must be no coexistence, that they must stop at nothing until they have taken over the whole world, and that the sooner they do it the better?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I could not agree more with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. These are dangerous policies on our part, but any policies that we could follow would be dangerous. We are making a sacrifice. It is a terrible thing when American men lose

their lives. The expense is very great. But after all, considering the strength and wealth of this country the burden on us in Vietnam is relatively light, not heavy. If we must give in, if we cannot win under those circumstances, light as this burden is, if we have to complain of a burden when we have tax cuts at home, when our personal income has never been higher, when the foreign aid bill is being cut, and the defense budget is being cut—if we cannot bear this kind of burden, the Communists will not be stopped. Of course, they will continue.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. I have had the advantage of reading the script of the speech of the Senator from Wisconsin. In the main, I agree with him wholeheartedly. He has done his usually good job. He is very articulate and persuasive.

One portion of his speech disturbs me, and I should like to have the Senator address himself to that portion. The Senator stated:

> Even following the Tonkin Gulf and Pleiku incidents the President has confined our retaliation in size, limited it to military targets, limited its duration and made it appropriate to the provocation.
>
> And above all, he has announced that the retaliation was for the sole purpose of preventing further aggression.

Does the Senator believe that we can only fight up to the strength of opposition and then lie by waiting for the enemy to gain new strength? Let us take the example of a prizefighter in the ring. He does not merely retaliate in kind. He pours on the heat and tries to win the bout by his own force. In the instance about which we are speaking, it would be the full force of arms.

It seems to me that this cat-and-mouse business is bad for America. If we are in a war, why do we not conclude it? We have the strength and power to do so. Why do we not conclude it and restore peace to South Vietnam, even at the risk of a great loss to the North Vietcong?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The question of the Senator from Wyoming is very helpful. It is helpful because it defines what I believe is the position taken by the administration under the circumstances and the position taken by other people who feel that we should undertake an all-out effort and do whatever is necessary in order to win, even if winning should mean an invasion of North Vietnam—and, in my judgment, it might very well under those circumstances mean drawing China in and being involved in a major war on the continent. There are many well-informed and able people like the Senator from Wyoming who take that position. I do not take that position. It seems to me that is clearly not the position at the present time of the administration. The position of the administration at the present time appears to be that we are not trying to win unconditional surrender of North Vietnam, let alone China or Russia. Many people feel we should never have settled for the qualified termination of hostilities that we did in Korea, and that we should have insisted on unconditional surrender in Korea.

Others—and I think more wisely—have felt that that was the only way we could settle the problem without involving ourselves in a catastrophic war on the continent of Asia that would have been endless or would have required our use of nuclear weapons.

I am inclined to feel that the position which the administration is taking in South Vietnam is a halfway position. It is not a position that would go all out and use all of our weapons, including our nuclear weapons, and whatever else is necessary, in order to win. The administration is taking a position that we should not do that, and I agree with that attitude.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his learned discussion. In the main I agree with his entire speech, but I am in disagreement with him on this particular point.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming very much.

We are there in response to the request of a native, indigenous government seeking to preserve itself against aggression. We are not involved in Vietnam in pursuit of national military aims. Secretary of State Dean Rusk recently pointed out that in 1959 "no foreign nation had bases or fighting forces in South Vietnam. South Vietnam was not a member of any alliance. If it was a threat to North Vietnam it was because its economy far outshone the vaunted Communist paradise to the north."

Much of this progress represents the fruits of economic aid furnished by the United States. While there has been much discussion of military aid we have sent to South Vietnam, it is important to recognize that our military aid has been defensive in nature. Our forces there have been advisory. Until the provocations of recent months, American servicemen were engaged almost exclusively in training and advisory positions.

When American forces participated in any combat action, with the exception of the limited air strikes, their efforts were defensive. The air strikes themselves were defensive in that they were designed to deter further aggression, not to expand the war.

Last night at the Leipzig Trade Fair Soviet Premier Kosygin said:

> I haven't read the American white book. It cannot be a white book, but rather a black book. The dirty acts of the Americans in Vietnam cannot be put down in a white book.

Mr. President, disregarding the dirty acts of the Soviet Union, with which history is replete ever since the Soviet has been in power in Russia, what is the real American story in Vietnam? Our record in South Vietnam is a great record. Of course, it has not been talked about by Premier Kosygin, the Red Chinese, or the Red North Vietnamese. But the tragedy is that it has not been talked about much by U.S. Senators either. It is a peaceful record, an amazingly peaceful record, for which the only precedent is the American people's peaceful attempts at international assistance and our answer to appeals from other nations in the world since World War II.

SOLID U.S. RECORD OF PEACEFUL AID

A study of our record in South Vietnam shows clearly our peaceful intentions—and more than intentions—a remarkable working for peace.

Much of our effort there has been economic and technical, to build the country's agricultural and industrial economies.

Our support in South Vietnam has stressed education, health, and community development. Since 1962 alone we have spent more than $228 million in food-for-peace shipments to South Vietnam—and Kosygin talks about a dirty record and about a black book of American performance in South Vietnam.

During the same period, counting estimated expenditures for this year, our economic aid will total $599,800,000. And since 1955, again counting estimated expenditures for 1965, we have committed $2.8 billion in nonmilitary economic aid.

Compare that with the record of the Soviet Union anywhere in the world. This is a record of generosity, a record of help and peaceful constructive assistance.

What programs are these funds supporting? Do they represent a threat to the security of North Vietnam?

DETAILS OF U.S. AID

Illustrative of the social and economic activities being implemented with United States help are—

Introduction of improved varieties of pigs and construction of improved pigpens. This is the kind of thing that helps the peaceful agriculture economy in South Vietnam.

Teaching the primitive Montagnard tribal people how to use water buffalo as beasts of burden rather than as sacrificial animals. The Montagnards are people somewhat different from the rest of the South Vietnamese. They are more primitive people, and from all records they have a deep affection, admiration and gratitude to the American people. They are also fine fighters.

Developing and helping build a variety of simple, economical, and practical devices which will improve the life of rural people, such as water wheels for irrigation purposes.

Introduction of wooden windmills.

Introduction of cheap, locally made hydrojet well drilling rigs.

Helping the Vietnamese to build simple and inexpensive hamlet school buildings.

Assisting hamlet leaders in planning, selection and mobilization of support for self-help projects.

Training teachers in agricultural methods.

When I said thousands of man-years, I meant that. Thousands of man-years have been spent to help the economy of South Vietnam. These teachers will then form demonstration teams to teach improved agricultural practices to peasants.

Introduction of fertilizer, which has often doubled yields.

Introduction of improved varieties of crops which are suited to the climate and soil, such as onions, sweetpotatoes, and

corn. That is the American record of South Vietnam.

In addition to stimulating rural progress, the economic aid has laid the groundwork for substantial economic, educational and social progress in urban areas.

U.S. EDUCATIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Some of these achievements include—

Vocational education: This American Nation of ours has built and equipped a central polytechnic institution and three secondary-level polytechnic schools in South Vietnam. The United States has reequipped six other vocational schools. We have provided technical assistance for nine rural 2-year trade schools. In 1955, there were only 1,700 students. Now there are 7,000 students enrolled in vocational schools receiving American assistance in South Vietnam.

General education: America has helped build four teacher-training schools—one at Saigon, two in the provinces and one designed for Montagnard teachers. Americans are right now engaged in helping train more than 2,000 prospective teachers in these schools.

We have helped build some 900 hamlet classrooms since mid-1962. We helped build 3,500 elementary classrooms and 282 secondary classrooms earlier. Over 1,000 teachers have attended a 90-day training course with American help. We have helped train over 4,000 teachers at vocational workshops. Enrollment in elementary schools has increased from 300,000 in 1955 to 1,400,000 in 1963. More than 3 million textbooks have been published.

That is the kind of record that Kosygin calls a dirty record, best reflected in a "black book."

U.S. HEALTH AID

Health: This American Nation of ours in pursuit of a strong, peaceful South Vietnam has helped establish and stock 12,500 villages and hamlets. Each station has been staffed with a local person trained with American help in first aid and health courses. A malaria eradication program, financed by the United States, has resulted in a drop in the malaria incidence rate from 7.22 percent in 1958 to .77 percent in 1962.

That was in only 5 years. In other words, a 7 percent malaria incidence was reduced to less than 1 percent, thanks to an American-financed health program.

Public administration: With American help the National Institute of Administration, which will graduate some 350 qualified civil servants annually, has been built and staffed. We have assisted in establishing training centers for village officials in 21 provincial centers.

U.S. INDUSTRIAL ASSISTANCE

Transportation: With American help substantial progress has been made in all areas of transportation. We have helped build 272 miles of roads in South Vietnam. A $7.7 million United States' loan financed the purchase of equipment for the Vietnam National Railway system. American funds provided eight dredges to keep water arteries open. We financed a 10,000-foot jet runway at Saigon airport.

Water supply: Americans helped to drill more than 1,400 wells that will provide clean, fresh, sanitary water for 750,000 rural inhabitants. Thanks to America, fresh water will be supplied to some 500,000 urban dwellers through the installation of water systems in 35 cities.

Electric power: In pursuit of an independent, peaceful South Vietnam, we have helped provide the chief province and district towns with the electric power of 162 diesel generating units. We will step up this program.

This is the kind of peaceful, strong economy we are building in South Vietnam. The reason why the Communists are invading is that they cannot afford to have another show window for the West, a window to show how people can prosper when they have the kind of peaceful, prosperous, growing economy free of Communist domination.

A $12.7 million AID—American—loan is being used to construct a 33,000 kilowatt powerplant in the Saigon metropolitan area. When the plant is completed shortly it will be a boon to industrial users who are now often dependent on costly individual diesel generators.

Industry: About 13,000 workers are employed in 50 new factories, built with American aid. South Vietnam is now largely self-sufficient in the spinning and weaving of cotton textiles as a result of this U.S. program.

Communications: We have helped build a national network of seven major radio stations. With American help 6,000 community listening centers were established. A modern microwave telecommunications system is nearing completion, which will give Saigon telephone connection with the principal towns of the Delta provinces.

What a brilliant and proud record of constructive contributions to peace this story of American services in South Vietnam represents. We have devoted ourselves unstintingly to education and health, to the patient, peaceful development essential to independence for this country.

This is the story that has not been told in the headlines of violence, murder, coups, and retaliation in South Vietnam. But this is the big American story.

U.S. PEACEFUL AID VS. COMMUNIST TERROR

I detailed these programs to point out that not one of them—not a single one—can be in any way interpreted as providing a threat to the North Vietamese Government or people. There should be no doubt of this.

Let there be no doubt on another score. The Communists in North Vietnam are responsible for the aggression against South Vietnam. They direct and supply it; if they desire they can bring it to an end. Recent evidence makes it clear that a majority, possibly as much as three-fourths, of hard-core Vietcong strength in South Vietnam comes from the north.

North Vietnam provides nearly all the more sophisticated weaponry used by the Vietcong, such as high-caliber guns, mortars, and antiaircraft weapons. The evidence is that the flow of men and equipment from North Vietnam increased in 1954, and continues to increase.

Those who have been criticizing our policy in South Vietnam are quick to argue that, after all, the Americans have installed more weaponry in South Vietnam than North Vietnam has sent in, more than the Vietcong has supplied. Of course we have. But what a difference: We are sending in our weaponry to defend South Vietnam because its duly constituted governments have asked us to do so. The other side is supplying theirs to subvert, dominate, overwhelm, and control that country.

Along with the men and equipment comes command and strategy, and the basic training and guidance in the sordid arts of guerrilla warfare. Hanoi's supplies, direction, support and inspiration are crucial to the continuation of the Vietcong campaign against the south.

Faced with this kind of attack it is hardly surprising that the fledgling country of South Vietnam has had its share of problems. It is hard enough for a new nation to govern successfully under the best of conditions. Fighting a counterinsurgency war imposes enormous additional burdens.

POLITICAL INSTABILITY

The weakest part of the situation in South Vietnam is its political instability. This is a really vulnerable position. The distinguished Senator from New York is correct in asking the question. It is a question that is extremely difficult to answer. How can we determine whether the people of South Vietnam really support our position? But, of course, this is what the Communists are working toward.

One consequence of the difficulties has been the chronic political instability of the central government in Saigon. A succession of coups has installed one government after another, creating an impression that is both bewildering and disturbing to those of us who are used to having our governments assume office as a result of elections, not coups—and every 4 years, not eight times in 16 months.

This political instability is a serious matter, both because it interferes with successful prosecution of the war against the Vietcong and because it makes it harder to build a better life for the people of South Vietnam. We are doing what we can to aid the cause of political unity and stability in South Vietnam—but this is an area in which we can play only a limited role.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McGEE. I commend the Senator from Wisconsin for the focus of his comments on Vietnam. So much information is on the loose today that it seems to me that an attempt is being made to reduce the question to very simple terms—to jump to the conclusion, for example, that the people in South Vietnam do not approve of the government in Saigon. Like the Senator from Wisconsin, I share the view, first, that we cannot know for certain. There is no way we can measure in South Vietnam. It is difficult enough to measure here, sometimes; but as Winston Churchill once reminded us, we are not conducting

a foreign policy with a thermometer in one hand and a George Gallup poll in the other. We have to take policy positions because they are fundamental in the national interest.

I doubt very much whether the position of the Montagnards, vis-a-vis the United States, is not to operate their own government.

The instability of the Vietnamese Government is a headache. Its uncertainties create frustrations for us. But it seems to me that that is not the major criterion. The black marketeers and the monarchy were headaches to us in Greece. But that did not deter us from holding off the Communists so that the Greek people themselves could improve their lot and improve their position.

I say that we ought to get our ducks in the right kind of order, to borrow an old cliche; that is, to put first things first. The first thing is to keep the forces from the north from forcibly intruding their influence and the impact of their force on the land to the south.

I suspect that the mistake we made, in part, was in trying to equate Saigon with Washington, in a political sense; trying to imagine that because we have democracy, the Vietnamese can have democracy. They have only recently emerged from generations of colonial domination by one great power after another. On the other hand, democracy is one of the most difficult, sophisticated, and complicated arts of government.

We have been working at it for nearly 200 years ourselves. We still have a little way to go. We tried to spoon-feed democracy to the Germans, who were a very sophisticated political people following World War I. The Weimar regime went down the drain. Democracy is something that one must learn. One must grow up with it.

I submit that the ingredients for democracy will not be present in Vietnam for a long time to come. Probably we shall see in the Senator's lifetime, and mine, little but a succession of one kind of dictatorship after another, in that part of the world.

While we do not like that, in comparison with our own experience, I thing it is a fair substitute to achieve that kind of success, to win them over to preserving their national independence.

I think the Senator has done well to place stress on the importance of keeping first things first.

I have been to Vietnam only twice. Both times I was in the jungles, and in the areas where the fighting was going on. I was struck by the warm reception and almost the worship that many of these Montagnards have for the Americans who are living with them, and helping them meet their day-to-day problems. This is the kind of story that we are not relating frequently enough. I have talked to American boys who have just come back from some of the Vietnamese villages. They want to go back again.

These are matters that are often omitted for the sake of tradition and having a contrast between "good guys" and "bad guys," truth and falsehood, and peace and war. Most of the story is important in that area.

I hope the Senator will pursue, on other fronts, the approach he has taken in the Senate to stress what happens to have gone right in Vietnam, what happens to have been on the constructive and historical side of the picture in terms of making improvement in Vietnam.

These people were not expected to last beyond 1954, when they became independent. They were given 12 months' time, and then they were expected to fold up. But here we are, nearly 11 years later. They are still going forward, and I suspect from the kind of determination that is theirs, and the kind of determination that President Johnson has manifested with regard to his own policy position, that they will be there for all time to come.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming. He has been an outstanding leader in support of the administration's position. He has an unusual understanding of the situation in Vietnam and has taken a remarkably deep interest in our foreign affairs for many years.

The points made by the Senator from Wyoming are correct. I am delighted that he supports my position in this matter.

I stress the main point that I seek to make here. It is a partial answer to the senior Senator from New York; the fact that we have engaged in vast, far-reaching, and successful efforts to help education, health, transportation, and so forth in South Vietnam. This assistance is not the kind of thing that enrages or infuriates people. When they know that they have worked with Americans who helped them train thousands of teachers, develop a pure water system, stop malaria, and so forth, it seems to me that this is an ingredient for support of their position.

The important thing—and here we are in agreement with the Vietnamese—is not to let the problems in Saigon sap our efforts in the deeper struggle against the Communists. The two problems are, of course, related. Victory over the Communists is hard to achieve even with a strong central government. But let us not fall into the Communist propaganda-fed trap of thinking that a coup in Saigon means the South Vietnamese people would rather be governed by the Communists in Hanoi.

This is a mistake which we make because there is a coup resulting from a sharp difference of opinion among military leaders, all of whom agree on vigorously opposing the North Vietnamese and Vietcong. Certainly it seems to me it is not a basis for assuming that our position in South Vietnam is not supported by the South Vietnamese.

It would be the peak of irony if our own will were to weaken as a result of South Vietnam's internal political problems, for this would deliver to the enemy precisely what they desire. The Communists' methods of conquest are political as well as military. Whatever the means, the result is the same, as far as they are concerned: the takeover of South Vietnam, a goal they have sought—and we have opposed—for over 10 years.

If the Communists can take over in South Vietnam by an infiltration, by the Buddhists seizing the Government, they will do it that way. And they are trying to do it that way. If they can take over South Vietnam through a succession of coups, and this discourages us and makes us feel that South Vietnam is not interested enough, that is a Communist victory.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Wisconsin on what I consider to be one of the finest contributions to an understanding of this problem ever made in this Chamber.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, who has obviously given much knowledgeable thought to the problem in Vietnam, and whose remarks on it will be most helpful in leading the people of this country toward a consensus in support of the actions now being taken there by the President.

Further, it seems obvious to me that those who would make history must first study it. The United States is now making history in its actions in South Vietnam. We are faced there with a new type of Communist offensive of infiltration, subversion, and guerrilla activities supported externally. The long view of the study of history indicates that appeasement or withdrawal in the face of aggression has never been conducive to the establishment of a lasting peace.

As the Senator from Wisconsin has so ably pointed out, in our dealings in Vietnam, we must again apply the principle that unless we are willing, now, to take the risks involved—and we are all cognizant of the risks involved—in drawing the line in South Vietnam, we shall have to draw it somewhere. I, for one, would like to see it drawn in South Vietnam, rather than in Thailand, in Malaysia, in the Philippines, in Hawaii, or in San Francisco and Seattle.

For those who have questioned the policy of this country, I believe that it would be well for all Senators, as well as for the people of this country, to recall that Congress in Public Law 88–408, last session, set forth, in speaking of the attacks in South Vietnam:

> Whereas these attacks are part of a deliberate and systematic campaign of aggression that the Communist regime in North Vietnam has been waging against its neighbors and the nations joined with them in the collective defense of our freedom;

In the "Resolved" part of the resolution it is further stated:

> The United States is, therefore, prepared as the President determines to take all necessary steps including the use of armed force to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.

That is what we are doing. As to the question that has been asked as to what we will do in the future, the resolution further states, in section 3:

> This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and

security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, except that it may be terminated earlier by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

The peace in that troubled sector is not secure. The President of the United States is doing what must be done there. The President has clearly pointed out that our policy is one in which we seek no wider war. Over and over again, the President has stated that he will go anywhere, any time, to talk with anyone when there is reasonable hope of success in any kind of peace negotiations or discussion. It is clear to us, or it should be, that negotiations can be fruitful only where, first, we have someone willing to negotiate. In my judgment, we do not have such a situation now. Nor has there been any evidence that there is any intent on the part of our adversaries to arrive at any kind of honorable and dignified solution as a result of negotiations.

Furthermore, there is no sense in negotiation unless there is some reasonable assurance that the people with whom we negotiate toward an agreement will carry out the agreement.

It is obvious from the study of the history of that problem that all that is necessary for peace to come to that troubled area of the world is for the Communists in Hanoi and elsewhere to fulfill the agreements they entered into 1954 and again 1962.

Therefore, I for one, wish to uphold the hand of the President of the United States, who is the leader of the free world. He has a full understanding of the facts, which perhaps many of us do not have, because he has the means by which he can learn them. Furthermore, I am confident that he understands the grave and serious meaning of what is going on in southeast Asia as it relates to the protection of this country's interests and to the protection of the peace and security of the world.

Therefore, I am happy to have the opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, and to commend him for the very lucid explanation of the problem in that area and its history and what needs to be done about it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] for a remarkable statement, impromptu and off the cuff, very thoughtful and well organized, and certainly most appropriate. I deeply appreciate his support in this matter.

AMERICAN GOALS

What then are our goals? As I see it, Mr. President, they are three in number:

First. Peace—an end to the fighting and terror in South Vietnam.

Does anyone question that goal? Why are we there? The only other reason why countries engage in this kind of war is that they want to annex territory, or to gain some kind of economic advantage. We do not want anything of that kind. Does anyone believe that President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, or President Johnson had any other objective at all except to achieve peace and freedom, recognizing that if we do not fight there we shall have to fight elsewhere?

Second. Preservation of the freedom of the South Vietnamese people to develop according to their own wishes, free from outside interference.

No one can say we are dominating the Government of South Vietnam. If we had dominated it, perhaps there would not have been all the coups that have taken place.

We have not attempted to dictate to the Government. No one can charge us with trying to interfere.

Third. An end to the spread of communism by force in southeast Asia—a program fostered and supported by Red China and one which poses a serious threat to our American security.

And this, our own American security, is the final reason, a very practical and the main reason, why we are expending this enormous amount of $2.5 billion over a period of years and losing hundreds of American lives and endangering thousands of American lives in the future.

NO PEACE IN WITHDRAWAL

Mr. President, there are some who suggest that peace can be restored only if we withdraw from South Vietnam. I ask them—peace for whom? For the South Vietnamese? For the millions of others in southeast Asia who have thus far resisted Communist subversion? For the United States, which is committed by treaty to come to the aid of some of the very countries in that part of the world which will undoubtedly be the next target for this type of warfare?

How then can peace be achieved? It can come swiftly just as soon as the other side decides it is in their interest to make it happen. There should be no doubt on this point. Whether or not the authorities in Hanoi actually order each tactical operation—and it is my understanding that to a large extent they do—the key element is that they have the authority to bring the attack to an end.

They direct, supply, organize, and inspire the insurgency; they have the power to halt it. Peace will come when they learn to leave their neighbors alone, in South Vietnam, in Laos, and elsewhere.

Our goal is peace; theirs is conquest. After the years of struggle brought about by these conflicting aims, we have resorted finally to a means that has long been at our disposal, but which we have long refrained from using.

STRICTLY LIMITED U.S. MILITARY ACTION

It was hoped that the threat of airstrikes against North Vietnam would be sufficient to encourage sober thoughts in Hanoi.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Alaska has said, the mere presence of our 7th Fleet there indicates our power and gives us a strong position from which to negotiate. But the presence of any military power can give us no negotiating power unless the other side knows that we have the will to use that power. That is a grim fact, but it is a fact of life.

There had been hints, many of them obviously authoritative, that airstrikes north of the 17th parallel were under consideration. The Communists who rule North Vietnam knew that we had the airpower to inflict grave damage on them. But apparently the lesson had not sunk in.

The scale and frequency of Communist attacks in recent months continued to increase. The rate of infiltration of cadres from the North mounted ever higher. The new boldness took the form of attacks at American facilities. Our ships in the Gulf of Tonkin, the airfield at Bien Hoa, and, most recently, the attack at Pleiku and the destruction of the barracks at Qui Nhon, where 23 Americans lost their lives.

Faced with this escalation by the other side, the President ordered the measured response of U.S. airstrikes at Communist military facilities in North Vietnam. This was not a case of all-out saturation bombing. It was aimed at specific staging areas and depots used by the Communists to reinforce and supply the Vietcong. And the message it carried to Hanoi was clear: "Watch out, you're playing a dangerous game, and there are serious risks for you as well."

On Wednesday, February 24, it was announced that since Thursday, February 18, U.S. jet bombers have attacked the Vietcong. The crews were indeed solely American. Once again the objective was military, strictly and exclusively military. Jet attacks are limited in duration and in size. They are confined to Vietcong, identifiable enemy concentrations, hostile foreign concentrations within South Vietnam territory.

Indeed, we are more directly involved. But once again the involvement is measured, restricted, military in its nature; and, in my judgment, it is consonant with our basic purpose of taking whatever action we have to take—painful as it may be—to achieve the peace.

Mr. President, it was helpful on the part of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] to ask, "Why should we not move in all the way with our military force? Why should we not end the war by using the full force of our Navy, Air Force, and Army, to end it?"

This gives us a chance to emphasize that this is not the policy of the President of the United States, that this Johnson administration policy is a limited effort to do all we can to achieve peace, which will have to be a negotiated and compromised peace, because we will not take over North Vietnam.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR WAR EXPANSION: NORTH VIETNAM

I find it odd that the President should stand accused of "expanding" the war. This war was long since expanded—from the north to the south. These airstrikes were undertaken, in the words of the White House statement, "in response to direct provocation by the Hanoi regime."

Responsibility for the provocations lies north of the 17th parallel. Up to now, our efforts have been concentrated in South Vietnam. Our actions of past weeks have served to make those responsible for the war aware of the consequences it could have for them if it continues unabated.

On August 7, 1964, at the time of the incidents in the Gulf of Tonkin, the

Senate by a vote of 88 to 2 adopted a joint resolution with the stated purpose: "To promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia."

The resolution saw the attacks in the Tonkin Gulf as "part of a deliberate and systematic campaign of aggression that the Communist regime in North Vietnam has been waging against its neighbors" and stated, "That the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression."

What else has the President done? This was a resolution passed with as much unanimity as it is possible to expect on a controversial situation. The vote was 88 to 2. The President is doing precisely what the resolution seeks to do. Virtually every Senator subscribed to that position.

CONGRESSIONAL RESOLUTION SUPPORTED PRESIDENT

How can we in the Senate now ask why we are in South Vietnam? The Senate resolution states it clearly. This is our determination—Republican and Democratic, Liberal and Conservative. A vote of 88 to 2 on any matter is pretty overwhelming and in the case of Vietnam, it surely represented a resounding endorsement of President Johnson's policies.

While we pursue these goals, we must continue to make clear, as President Johnson has repeatedly stated, that our fundamental purpose is peace. We seek no wider war.

What we seek in South Vietnam is no more than a peaceful settlement spelled out in the 1954 Geneva accords which guaranteed the independence and territorial integrity of South Vietnam. But this time we would like to see the accords supported by more effective enforcement machinery, to see that peace will stick. These are the basic ingredients for an end to the fighting.

It does not take a lot of diplomatic sophistication to understand our position. It is logical; it is simple. Above all, it is peaceful. Of course it means an end to the pattern of external aggression carried on by the Hanoi regime from the time it came to power.

CONDITIONS FOR NEGOTIATIONS

There may be a time to talk; all wars end in talk. But for talk to be fruitful the other side must acknowledge the heavy responsibility that is theirs. They must show by their actions that they want peace and will end the aggressive conduct that prevents it.

It would be a grim mistake to move to the conference table before such indications are present. Perhaps the worst outcome of all would be a conference that ended in failure. The war would resume without even the glimmer of hope that the possibility of peace talks always offer.

This is a fact that has not been recognized by those who are pressing for negotiations.

We must be ready always to talk—but we must insist that the conditions for talk are present. We cannot take part in a conference that merely ratifies the fruits of aggression.

Mr. President, we must be prepared to look forward, not merely to many more months, but to many more years, of hard service in South Vietnam, with years of sacrifice and work and dangers and loss of life, years in which we work to assist the people of South Vietnam to build a strong and independent country.

This effort in South Vietnam, if we continue it—and I hope and pray that we do—will not be more popular in the future with the American people. It will become less and less popular. It will take more and more patience. It will take more leadership and courage on the part of Senators and other leaders to speak out to the American people.

The real division is not between those who say get out of South Vietnam now with negotiation, and those who say end the war now by blasting Hanoi and all of North Vietnam off the face of the earth. The realists are on neither side of this argument. The realists oppose both solutions. The realistic policy is to prepare to stay in South Vietnam for years and years and years—no matter how long it takes, to outlast the Communists, to outeducate them, to outwork them, to outserve them in the cause of peace.

The difference is between those who think we have done too much in South Vietnam and the time has come to get out or to mount a full-scale invasion of the North and those who think we have not done enough, and that we have to broaden and deepen our commitments—especially our economic and social commitments in Vietnam.

Mr. President, if we are going to stop Communists in South Vietnam or in Cambodia or Burma or Malaysia or South Korea or the Philippines, it is not going to be easy. Throughout our lifetime and very likely throughout the lifetime of our children there will be no end of struggle and sacrifice, of danger and heavy cost. Not because America wants war, now or ever, in South Vietnam or anywhere else, but because the Communists and especially the Red Chinese have made it clear that they will use war to achieve their ends whenever it suits their purpose and because we will oppose this gradual Communist conquest in defense of freedom.

This world contest against communism is a struggle we are not sure to win. We could lose. But certainly if we help this independent country of South Vietnam to maintain its independence, we enhance the prospect of freedom and of peace surviving.

Which is better, Mr. President, to stay and slug it out in stalemate in South Vietnam or to give in, give up, retreat, fall back, and have to slug it out elsewhere in Asia against an encouraged and victorious Communist enemy?

Does any Senator honestly think that the Communists will stop with South Vietnam, if we give it to them? Does any Senator really think that such a course will discourage the Communists from continuing this successful course until they have all of Asia and push on from there?

And where, Mr. President, is the basis for our negotiation now. What do the Communists offer? Indeed, what will they offer, when they are convinced they are winning?

The plain and perhaps brutal truth, particularly to those who have urged the President to negotiate a settlement, is that the Communist camp has given us nothing to negotiate short of U.S. withdrawal from South Vietnam which would open the door to a takeover by the Hanoi regime.

This is an ultimatum, not a feeler to begin negotiations. The stage for negotiations will be set when the reign of terror—brought about by infiltration, subversion, bombings, and murders—is brought to an end by the North Vietnamese. A truce or cease-fire—call it what you will—brought about by the North will set the stage for talks that can be fruitful.

It seems clear that these conditions do not now exist. So we must carry on with firmness and resolution. We must meet force with force. We must show with patience and determination that we mean to stay in Vietnam—not for a week, or month, but for 1 year or 2 years or 10 years, whatever is required to achieve our goal and carry out our commitment.

And above all, we must be willing to take the military measures necessary to drive home this determination to the North Vietnamese and their Chinese Communist overlords. This can only be done by making their aggressive ventures into South Vietnam so painful and so unprofitable as to be discouraging. If broader airstrikes are required, they must be made. If more determined ground action to cut off infiltration appears necessary, we must be willing to make the sacrifice. If greater use of our superior seapower will meet our needs, then so be it.

It is my view and I believe the view of the administration, that cries for negotiation now have a very, very bad effect on our South Vietnam allies and a highly encouraging effect on the Vietcong.

Let us never forget that our goal is peace. Peace is the clear aim of this administration.

President Johnson's course is not the course of massive full-scale war against North Vietnam. And it is not the course of negotiating now—a negotiation that could only ratify a Communist victory.

It is a harder and wiser course than either. It offers us the best prospect of peace and the best prospect of freedom.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that several recent White House statements, Ambassador Stevenson's February 8 letter to the President of the Security Council, and a most cogent speech by Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East William Bundy, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD together with the Department of State's white paper—the statement on aggression from the north—the record of North Vietnam's campaign to conquer South Vietnam, omitting the appendix, and the excellent letter from

Adlai Stevenson delivering this white paper to the U.N. They state these points—our commitment to peace, our willingness to use whatever means are necessary to achieve it—with more eloquence than I have mustered in this statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). Is there objection?

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

[From the Office of the White House Press Secretary, Feb. 7, 1965]

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Following meetings with the National Security Council, I have directed the orderly withdrawal of American dependents from South Vietnam.

It has become clear that Hanoi has undertaken a more aggressive course of action against both South Vietnamese and American installations, and against Americans who are in South Vietnam assisting the people of that country to defend their freedom. We have no choice now but to clear the decks and make absolutely clear our continued determination to back South Vietnam in its fight to maintain its independence.

In addition to this action, I have ordered the deployment to South Vietnam of a Hawk air defense battalion. Other reinforcements, in units and individuals may follow.

[From the Office of the White House Press Secretary, Feb. 11, 1965]

THE WHITE HOUSE.—On February 11, U.S. air elements joined with the South Vietnamese Air Force in attacks against military facilities in North Vietnam used by Hanoi for the training and infiltration of Vietcong personnel into South Vietnam.

These actions by the South Vietnamese and United States Governments were in response to further direct provocations by the Hanoi regime.

Since February 8, a large number of South Vietnamese and United States personnel have been killed in an increased number of Vietcong ambushes and attacks. A district town in Phuoc Long Province has been overrun, resulting in further Vietnamese and United States casualties. In Qui Nhon, Vietcong terrorists in attack on an American military billet murdered Americans and Vietnamese. In addition, there have been a number of mining and other attacks on the railway in South Vietnam as well as assassinations and ambushes involving South Vietnamese civil and military officials.

The U.S. Government has been in consultation with the Government of South Vietnam on this continuation of aggressions and outrages. While maintaining their desire to avoid spreading the conflict, the two Governments felt compelled to take the action described above.

[From the Office of the White House Press Secretary, Feb. 17, 1965]

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE BOARD AT THE SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I should like to end this visit with you with a word on the very serious situation in Vietnam, which I know must be on the mind of each of you.

As I have said so many, many times, and other Presidents ahead of me have said, our purpose, our objective there is clear. That purpose and that objective is to join in the defense and protection of freedom of a brave people who are under attack that is controlled and that is directed from outside their country.

We have no ambition there for ourselves. We seek no dominion. We seek no conquest. We seek no wider war. But we must all understand that we will persist in the defense of freedom, and our continuing actions will be those which are justified and those that are made necessary by the continuing aggression of others.

These actions will be measured and fitting and adequate. Our stamina and the stamina of the American people is equal to the task.

Thank you.

LETTER DATED FEBRUARY 7, 1965, FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I have the honor to inform you of the following acts which have further disturbed the peace in Vietnam.

In the early morning of February 7, Vietnamese time, Vietcong forces carried out coordinated attacks on South Vietnamese air bases in Pleiku and Tuy Hoa, on two barracks installations in the Pleiku area, and on a number of villages in the area of Tuy Hoa and Nha Trang. Numerous casualties were inflicted, and at least one village was burned.

These attacks by the Vietcong, which operates under the military orders of North Vietnamese authorities in Hanoi, were a concerted and politically timed effort to sharpen and intensify the aggression at a moment designed for broader effect in the field of international politics, and to test the will of the Republic of Vietnam and the United States to resist that aggression.

The Government of the Republic of Vietnam and the Government of the United States immediately consulted and agreed that it was necessary to take prompt defensive action. Accordingly, on the afternoon of February 7, Vietnamese time, United States and South Vietnamese air elements were directed to take joint action against certain military facilities in the southern area of North Vietnam. An attack was carried through against Dong Hoi, which is a military installation and one of the major staging areas for the infiltration of armed cadres of North Vietnamese troops into South Vietnam in violation of international law and of the Geneva accords of 1954.

The Vietcong attacks of February 7 related directly to the central problem in Vietnam. That central problem is not one of a struggle by one element of the population in South Vietnam against the Government. There is, rather, a pattern of military operations directed, staffed, and supplied in crucial respects from outside the country. Up to 34,000 armed and trained soldiers have infiltrated into South Vietnam from the north since 1959. In addition, key items of equipment, such as mortars of the type employed in the attacks of February 7, have come from North Vietnam. During 1964, the infiltration of men and equipment has increased sharply, and virtually all of those now coming in are natives of North Vietnam.

Infiltration in such numbers can hardly be labeled "indirect aggression"—though that form of aggression is illegal, too. What we are witnessing in Vietnam today is a sustained attack for more than 6 years across a frontier set by international agreement.

Members of the Security Council will recall that we discussed in the Council, in August 1964, aggression by the Hanoi regime against naval units of the United States in the Gulf of Tonkin. At that time we described these attacks as part of a pattern which includes the infiltration of armed personnel to make war against the legitimate Government of South Vietnam, the arming of terrorist gangs in South Vietnam, the assassination of local officials as an instrument of policy, the continued fighting in Laos in violation of the Geneva agreements—a pattern, in short, of deliberate systematic and flagrant violations of international agreements by the regime in Hanoi which signed them and which by all tenets of decency, law, and civilized practice, is bound by their provisions.

The Republic of Vietnam, and at its request the Government of the United States and other governments, are resisting this systematic and continuing aggression. Since reinforcement of the Vietcong by infiltrators from North Vietnam is essential to this continuing aggression, countermeasures to arrest such reinforcement from the outside are a justified measure of self-defense.

Mr. President, my Government is reporting the measures which we have taken in accordance with our public commitment to assist the Republic of Vietnam against aggression from the north.

We deeply regret that the Hanoi regime, in its statement of August 8, 1964, which was circulated in Security Council document S/5888, explicity denied the right of the Security Council to examine this problem. The disrespect of the Hanoi regime for the United Nations adds to the concern which any United Nations member state must feel about Hanoi's violation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

Nevertheless, I would remind you, and through you other members of the Security Council and of the United Nations, that our mission in southeast Asia is peace and that our purpose is to insure respect for the peace settlement to which all concerned are committed.

We, therefore, reserve the right to bring this matter to the Security Council if the situation warrants it.

In a statement issued this morning on behalf of President Johnson, the U.S. Government once again emphasized that "we seek no wider war. Whether or not this course can be maintained lies with the North Vietnamese aggressors. The key to the situation remains the cessation of infiltration from North Vietnam and the clear indication by the Hanoi regime that it is prepared to cease aggression against its neighbors."

Our objective is a peaceful settlement. This would require both the self-restraint of the regime to the north and the presence of effective international peacekeeping machinery to make sure that promises are kept.

This is our purpose. But we will not permit the situation to be changed by terror and violence and this is the meaning of our action this weekend.

Accept, etc.

ADLAI E. STEVENSON.

AMERICAN POLICY IN SOUTH VIETNAM AND SOUTHEAST ASIA

(Address by the Honorable William P. Bundy, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, before the Washington Chamber of Commerce, Washington, Mo., Saturday, January 23, 1965)

INTRODUCTION

When my old friend, Senator SYMINGTON, relayed your invitation to come here, I was delighted to accept. I shall make only one partisan statement tonight, and that is to say how fortunate you in Missouri are in your distinguished senior Senator. For the rest, I would like to speak on the topic you have chosen—American Policy in South Vietnam and southeast Asia—totally without regard to partisanship. That topic and the issues it raises concern all of us, as Americans.

I shall talk, if I may, to three related sets of questions:

I. How did we come to be in South Vietnam? How does what we are doing there relate to our wider purposes in the world, to our specific purposes in Asia, and, in a word, to our national interests?

II. What has been the course of events in Vietnam that has brought us to the present situation?

III. What are the key problems, and what can we do to help in solving them and in achieving our objectives?

I

The first question requires a look at history.

Even when the Far East was much more distant than it is today, we Americans had deep concern for developments there. Americans pioneered in trade and missionary effort with China and in opening up Japan to Western influence. In 1898 we became in a sense a colonial power in the Philippines, but began almost at once to prepare the way for independence and self-government there—an independence promised by act of Congress in 1936 and achieved on schedule in 1946. By the 1930's, we had wide interests of many types in the Far East, though only few direct contacts in southeast Asia apart from the individual Americans who had served over decades as political advisers to the independent Kingdom of Thailand.

Events then took a more ominous turn. We became aware that the ambitions of Japanese military leaders to dominate all of Asia were a threat not only to the specific interests of ourselves and other Western nations, but to the peace of the whole area and indeed of the world. China, in which we had taken a lead in dismantling the 19th century system of foreign special privileges, was progressively threatened and large parts overrun. We ourselves were finally attacked at Pearl Harbor and in the Philippines. We responded to aggression by conducting with our allies a major Pacific war that cost the United States alone 272,700 casualties and over $100 billion.

In the end Japanese militarism was defeated, and the way apparently cleared for an Asia of free and independent national states that would be progressively freed of colonialism, that need threaten neither each other nor neighboring states, and that could tackle in their own way the eternal problems of building political and economic structures that would satisfy the aspiration of their peoples.

That kind of Far East was a pretty good definition of our national interests then. It is equally valid today. We cared about the Far East, and we care today, because we know that what happens there—among peoples numbering 33 percent of the world's population, with great talent, past historic greatness, and capacity—is bound to make a crucial difference whether there will be the kind of world in which the common ideals of freedom can spread, nations live and work together without strife, and—most basic of all—we ourselves, in the long run, survive as the kind of nation we are determined to be. Our basic stake in the Far East is our stake in a peaceful and secure world as distinct from a violent and chaotic one. But there were three great flaws in the 1945 picture after the defeat of Japan.

1. In China, a civil war had been raging since the 1920's between the Government, led by Chiang Kai-shek, and the Chinese Communist movement. After a brief and edgy truce during the war against Japan, that civil war was resumed in circumstances where the Government had been gravely weakened. We assisted that Government in every way possible. Mistakes may have been made, but in the last analysis mainland China could not have been saved from communism without the commitment of major U.S. ground and air forces to a second war on the Asian mainland. Faced with a concurrent threat from Soviet Russia against Europe and the Near East, we did not make—and perhaps could not then have made—that commitment. And there came to power on the mainland, in the fall of 1949, a Communist regime filled with hatred of the West, with the vision of a potential dominant role for China, but imbued above all with a primative Communist ideology in its most virulent expansionist form.

2. In Korea, a divided country stood uneasily, half free and half Communist. With our military might sharply reduced after the war, as part of what may have been an inevitable slackening of effort, we withdrew our forces and reduced our economic aid before there was in existence a strong South Korean defense capacity. With Soviet backing North Korea attacked across the 38th parallel in June 1950. With the Soviets then absent from the U.N. Security Council, the U.N. was able to condemn the aggression and to mount a U.N. effort to assist South Korea. The United States played by far the greatest outside role in a conflict that brought 157,530 U.S. casualties, cost us at least $18 billion in direct expenses, and in the end—after Communist China had also intervened—restored an independent South Korea, although it left a unified and free Korea to be worked out in the future.

In retrospect, our action in Korea reflected three elements:

A recognition that aggression of any sort must be met early and head on, or it will have to be met later and in tougher circumstances. We had relearned the lessons of the 1930's—Manchuria, Ethiopia, the Rhineland, Czechoslovakia.

A recognition that a defense line in Asia, stated in terms of an island perimeter, did not adequately define our vital interests—that those vital interests could be affected by action on the mainland of Asia.

An understanding that, for the future, a power vacuum was an invitation to aggression, that there must be local political, economic, and military strength in being to make aggression unprofitable, but also that there must be a demonstrated willingness of major external power both to assist and to intervene if required.

3. In southeast Asia, finally, there was a third major flaw—the difficulty of liquidating colonial regimes and replacing them by new and stable independent governments. The Philippines became independent and with our help overcame the ravages of war and the Communist Huk rebellion. The British, who had likewise prepared India and Burma and made them independent, were in the process of doing the same in Malaya even as they joined with the Malayans in beating back a 12-year Communist subversive effort. Indonesia was less well prepared; it gained its independence too, with our support, but with scars that have continued to affect the otherwise natural and healthy development of Indonesian nationalism.

French Indochina was the toughest case. The French had thought in terms of a slow evolution to an eventual status within some French union of states—a concept too leisurely to fit the postwar mood of Asia. And militant Vietnamese nationalism had fallen to the leadership of dedicated Communists.

We all know the result. Even with substantial help from us, France was unable to defeat the Communist-led nationalist movement. Despite last-minute promises of independence, the struggle inevitably appeared as an attempt to preserve a colonial position. By 1954, it could only have been won, again, by a major U.S. military commitment, and perhaps not even then. The result was the settlement at Geneva. The accords reached there were almost certainly the best achievable, but they left a situation with many seeds of future trouble. Briefly:

1. North Vietnam was militantly Communist, and had developed during the war against the French an army well equipped and highly skilled in both conventional and subversive warfare. From the start, North Vietnam planned and expected to take over the south and in due course Laos and Cambodia, thinking that this would probably happen by sheer decay under pressure, but prepared to resort to other means if needed.

2. South Vietnam had no effective or popular leadership to start with, was demoralized and unprepared for self-government, and had only the remnants of the Vietnamese military forces who had fought with the French. Under the accords, external military help was limited to a few hundred advisers. Apart from its natural self-sufficiency in food, South Vietnam had few assets that appeared to match those of the north in the struggle that was sure to come.

3. Cambodia was more hopeful in some respects, more remote from North Vietnam, with a leader in Prince Sihanouk, a strong historical tradition, and the freedom to accept external assistance as she saw fit. From the start Sihanouk insisted, with our full and continuing support, on a status of neutrality.

4. Laos, however, was less unified and was left under the accords with a built-in and legalized Communist presence, a disrupted and weak economy, and no military forces of significance.

Such was the situation President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles faced in 1954. Two things were clear—that in the absence of external help communism was virtually certain to take over the successor states of Indochina and to move to the borders of Thailand and perhaps beyond, and that with France no longer ready to act, at least in South Vietnam, no power other than the United States could move in to help fill the vacuum.

Their decision, expressed in a series of actions starting in late 1954, was to move in to help these countries. Besides South Vietnam and more modest efforts in Laos and Cambodia, substantial assistance was begun to Thailand.

The appropriations for these actions were voted by successive Congresses, and in 1954 the Senate likewise ratified the southeast Asia treaty, to which Thailand and the Philippines adhered, along with the United States, Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, and Pakistan. Although not signers of the treaty, South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia could call on the SEATO members for help against aggression.

So a commitment was made, with the support of both political parties, that has guided our policy in southeast Asia for a decade now. It was not a commitment that envisaged a U.S. position of power in southeast Asia or U.S. military bases there. We threatened no one. Nor was it a commitment that substituted U.S. responsibility for the basic responsibility of the nations themselves for their own defense, political stability, and economic progress. It was a commitment to do what we could to help these nations attain and maintain the independence and security to which they were entitled, both for their own sake and because we recognized that, like South Korea, southeast Asia was a key area of the mainland of Asia. If it fell to Communist control, this would enormously add to the momentum and power of the expansionist Communist regimes in Communist China and North Vietnam, and thus to the threat to the whole free world position in the Pacific.

I have come at a statement of our policy in the Far East by the route of history, for policy is the fruit of history and experience, seldom of some abstract design from a drawing board. In essence, our policy derives from (1) the fact of the Communist nations of Asia and their policies; (2) the lessons of the thirties and of Korea; (3) the logical extension of that fact and these lessons to what has happened in southeast Asia.

It is possible to define our total policy in Asia, as it has existed at least since 1954, in quite simple terms.

1. Our objectives are those of the free nations of the area—that they should develop as they see fit, in peace and without outside

interference. We would hope that this development will be in the direction of increasingly democratic institutions, and that there will be continued and expanded ties of partnership and contact with ourselves and with the other nations of the free world. Yet we know that Asia will develop as the leaders and peoples of Asia wish it to develop, and we would not have it otherwise.

2. Asia confronts two central problems: The threat of Communist nations whose objective is domination and enslavement, and enormous economic and political problems that would exist in any case. If these two problems cannot be solved over time, the Asia of the future will be the breeding ground of ever more direct threats to our national interest and could be the source of a third world war.

3. To deal with these central problems, the free nations of the area need the help of the United States and of our major allies. Outnumbered in population and in military forces by the Communist nations as they are—by nearly 2 to 1 if you leave out India—the free nations of Asia cannot do the job alone. We cannot do it for them, but we have the resources and the military power to play a crucial role.

4. The peace and security of east and southeast Asia are indivisible. If the Communist powers success in aggression, they will be encouraged, free nations discouraged, and the inevitable process of evolution toward moderation within the Communist countries themselves postponed or perhaps prevented altogether. We have seen the dynamics of Hitlerite Germany and militarist Japan checked and defeated, and the West Germany and Japan of today emerge as respected major nations of the world. Thanks to NATO, our handling of the Cuban crisis, and other actions, something like the same process may be underway with Soviet Russia today. Such a process of moderation will come eventually for the Communist nations of Asia if they are checked. It cannot come if they are not—and any loss of free nations makes the future task that much, and perhaps immensely, more difficult.

So much, then, for how we came to become involved in South Vietnam and how that involvement relates to our wider policies and purposes. In simple terms, a victory for the Communists in South Vietnam would inevitably make the neighboring states more susceptible to Communist pressure and more vulnerable to intensified subversion supported by military pressures. Aggression by wars of national liberation would gain enhanced prestige and power of intimidation throughout the world, and many threatened nations might well become less hopeful, less resilient, and their will to resist undermined. These are big stakes indeed.

II

Let us now wind the reel back to South Vietnam in 1954 and trace the course of events to the present.

From 1954 to 1959, great progress was made. In Ngo Dinh Diem, a stanchly nationalist and anti-Communist leader was found. Against all odds, including the opposition in 1954–55 of old-line military leaders and religious groups, he took hold. Under his rule the nationalist feeling of the newly formed country—which does differ to a significant degree from the north—was aroused, and it soon became and has remained clear that, whatever the extent of their attachment to particular governments in their own country, the great mass of the people of South Vietnam do not wish to be ruled by communism or from Hanoi.

On the economic and social front, education was vastly expanded, major land reforms carried out, and the economy grew at a rapid rate, far outstripping what was happening under the Communist yoke in the north. Instead of decaying and dropping by default into Communism, South Vietnam was in a fair way toward becoming really able to stand on its own feet.

In all this, the United States played a major helping role. On the military side we helped to create a fairly decent army almost from scratch, with a normal military assistance advisory group of a few hundred men. That army was never big enough to threaten the north, nor was it meant to be; it may well have been too much oriented to conventional warfare and not to the handling of a sophisticated guerrilla aggression.

Then, beginning roughly in 1959, two trends got underway that are still today at the heart of the problem.

First, the Diem government, instead of steadily broadening its base and training key groups for responsibility, began to narrow it. More and more the regime became personal in character. Opposition parties, which had previously been active in relatively free elections, were driven underground, and there began a process of repression which, while never drastic by the standards we should apply to governments in new nations, much less by those of Communist countries, nevertheless alienated increasing numbers of the all too small pool of trained men capable of helping to govern effectively.

Second, Hanoi went on the march. Seeing itself thwarted in both South Vietnam and Laos, Hanoi began to send trained guerrillas into the south and increasing cadres to assist the Communist Pathet Lao forces in Laos. In South Vietnam there had been from the start thousands of agents and many pockets of Communist influence left behind in the division of Vietnam, and as early as 1957 a campaign of assassination of local officials had begun that tallies on the map almost exactly with the areas under strongest Communist control today. In 1959, such activity was stepped up, guerrilla units formed, and the real campaign got underway.

That campaign is sometimes referred to as a civil war. But let us not delude ourselves. Discontent there may have been, and local recruiting by the Vietcong, largely through intimidation. But the whole campaign would never have been possible without the direction, personnel, key materiel, and total support coming from Hanoi, and without too the strong moral support, and key materiel when needed, provided by Peiping and, up to 1962 at least, by the Soviet Union. Thousands of highly trained men coming from the north, along with the crucial items of equipment and munitions—these have been from the start the mainspring of the Vietcong insurgency. This has been all along a Communist subversive aggression, in total violation of the Geneva accords as well as general principles of international behavior.

Indeed the true nature of the struggle has been publicly stated many times by Hanoi itself, beginning with a 1960 Communist Party Conference in North Vietnam which declared the policy of, as they put it, "liberating the south."

By early 1961, South Vietnam was clearly in difficulty. President Johnson, then Vice President, visited the country in the spring, and we stepped up our military supplies and tried to turn our training emphasis increasingly to the guerrilla front. Then, in the fall of 1961, a series of key assassinations and raids on Government centers brought South Vietnamese morale to a critical point. Something more was needed. President Kennedy considered and rejected the sending of U.S. combat units to fight the Vietcong.

Instead he responded to the request of the South Vietnamese Government for American military advisers with Vietnamese units, and for Americans to furnish helicopter and air transport lift, combat air training, communications, and in short every possible form of assistance short of combat units.

But the military effort was and is only one aspect of the struggle. The economic front was equally important, and a smaller but extraordinarily dedicated group of civilian Americans went into the dangerous countryside, unarmed and often unescorted, to help in the creation of the fortified hamlets that soon became, and remain, a key feature of strategy, and to bring to the villages the schools, fertilizer, wells, pigs, and other improvements that meant so much and would serve to show the Government's concern for its people.

The basic strategy adopted in early 1962 was sound, and was indeed in key respects the same as the strategy that prevailed against communism in Malaya, Greece, and the Philippines. It is a strategy that takes patience and local leadership, and that takes learning and experience as well. The Vietnamese and we are still learning and changing today, and will go on doing so.

Under the advisory concept, the American strength in South Vietnam rose to 12,000 by mid-1962 (eventually to the present 23,000), and with our help the South Vietnamese began to reverse the slow tide of growing Communist gains. By the spring of 1963, things seemed to be on the upswing, not only in the judgment of senior Americans but in that of experienced observers from third countries.

Yet the unhappy tendencies of the Diem government had persisted, despite all the quiet advice we could give in favor of reforms. The stubbornness and inflexibility which had been his great assets in the early days after 1954 had now become serious drawbacks. The Buddhist uprisings of the spring of 1963 brought the political situation to the forefront again. Now Buddhism as a religion is not nearly as dominant in South Vietnam as it is elsewhere in southeast Asia—Thailand, Laos, and Cambodia. The adherents of Buddhism may not be even a majority of South Vietnamese, and there are significant Catholic and other groups as well as large numbers of adherents to older religious beliefs. Nonetheless, Buddhists are the most numerous faith, they are entitled to fair treatment, and they had some case against the Diem government for personal discrimination, though little, according to the findings of a United Nations commission, for true religious persecution. But these grievances might have been met without serious trouble if they had not been fanned by a small group of leaders who were and are, in fact, politically motivated.

Unfortunately, the Diem government refused to compromise or to redress the areas of legitimate grievance, and in August sent the Army into the pagodas of Saigon and other cities, following up with a drastic campaign of suppression against students and a wide circle of political opponents. As a result, by late September—when I personally accompanied Secretary McNamara to Saigon—it was clear that Diem and his brother, Nhu, had aroused wide popular opposition and, perhaps most crucial, had alienated almost to the breaking point the key trained elements within the government structure itself, both civilian and military.

Although Ambassador Lodge continued to urge reforms that might still have saved the government, Diem did not respond, and on November 1, 1963, he was overthrown, he and Nhu—most unfortunately—killed, and a new military government installed by force.

No one could then tell whether the new government would be better. Clearly, it had to be military in the first instance, and the first military group, under General Minh, had considerable popular backing. Yet it was ineffective and tended to throw out the baby with the bath, replacing so many military and provincial officials that the way was opened for major Vietcong gains. Then in January General Khanh took control in a bloodless coup. He showed ability on the military and economic front, but he, in turn, decided to turn over the government to civil-

ian leaders to be selected by consultation among representatives of the key groups—the Buddhists, the Catholics, the military, labor, the religious sects, the various areas including the considerable body of refugees from the north, past political groupings, and so on.

The result was the present government under Prime Minister Huong, a man of determination and character, dedicated to fairness to all groups. He is wrestling today essentially with the same kind of problems that Diem faced and overcame in 1954, but in the far more difficult internal security crisis brought on by the Vietcong aggression, which has been slowly extending the areas of Communist control in the countryside, and the pace of guerrilla and terrorist activity, even to Saigon itself.

So the political situation today is critical, and its resolution is central to turning the war around and restoring an independent and secure South Vietnam. That task must essentially be done by the Vietnamese people, under Vietnamese civilian and military leaders, all under a Government that unites the divergent political interest groups and that gives orders that can be carried out.

I have dwelt at such length on the political history, because it is this aspect that is today in the headlines, as it is the greatest concern of our representatives in Saigon and of the Vietnamese leaders themselves who must find the answer. (And may I pause here, apropos of the headlines, to say that I think the American people are getting the facts. We in government follow closely what is said in the newspapers and magazines, and on TV; part of our job is to see that these media are properly informed and given access to everything except for those few details that are necessarily matters of security in what is, after all, a war situation. I think we are doing our job, and that the media are doing theirs. The picture that you as thoughtful citizens get is in fact the picture that we have, on all essential points. If that picture is complex or not entirely clear, believe me our picture is the same, for that is the nature of the situation.)

The real point of the political history in South Vietnam is that it should cause us no amazement and no despair. Was it not 7 years between the end of the American Revolution and the making of a lasting constitution, even for a new nation which had united to fight a war and had centuries of British evolution toward democratic self-government behind it? And how many new nations in the world today have found lasting stability in a decade, especially where there had been little preparation under colonialism, where the national historic tradition was remote, and above all where a violent aggressor was striking constantly at the very fabric of government? Take if you will one fact alone—that in the first 8 months of 1964 the Vietcong assassinated more than 400 local officials and kidnaped another 700—and try in your mind to project what an equivalent amount of gangsterism would do to government performance in this country, and then to project that effect in turn, onto the situation in a country such as South Vietnam.

So this is a tough war, and the Vietnamese are a tough people to have stood up under it and to be holding their heads above water after 20 years of violence and uncertainty.

III

How should we now, then, approach this situation, as Americans?

Above all, we must stand firm and be patient. We never thought in 1961, or in 1954, that the task would be easy. North Vietnam had certain advantages:

Experience and sophistication in every aspect of subversion and political warfare;

Dedicated and fanatic agents who for the most part came from the south to fight the French and then returned to areas they knew well;

An open corridor through Laos to keep up the supply of guerrillas and supplies. In the past year, such infiltration has markedly increased, and has included for the first time significant numbers of indigenous North Vietnamese trained in North Vietnam in regular military units;

A numerical ratio of guerrilla forces to Government forces that is well below the ratios of 10 to 1, that have been found necessary for success in past guerrilla wars. There are today in South Vietnam perhaps 35,000 hard-core Vietcong fighters and another 60,000 to 80,000 local Vietcong forces, against roughly 400,000 military and paramilitary forces for the Government, or a ratio of about 4 to 1;

The internal political divisions and above all the inexperience in government of the south itself.

Yet the balance sheet is by no means all one sided.

Our advisory effort, on all fronts, has done great things and, in the wide personal relationships involved, must stand almost unique in the history of relations between an Asian nation under fire and an outside Western nation.

Although there are from time to time signs of anti-American feeling, working relationships at all levels remain close and friendly.

With our help, the Government has been able to maintain economic stability and to move to help areas secured from the Vietcong.

Our military effort and our equipment, supplied to the Vietnamese, have largely offset the unfavorable numerical ratio favoring the Vietcong.

The Vietnamese military forces continue to fight well. Our own military men consider most of them as tough and brave as any in the world. Though there have been military reverses, there have also been significant victories—which sometimes do not make headlines. On the military front, the Vietcong is not capable of anything like a Dienbienphu.

Above all, the Vietnamese people are not voting with their feet or their hearts for communism.

As to our basic policy, the alternatives to our present courses might be, on the one hand, to withdraw or to negotiate on some basis such as what is called neutralization, or, on the other hand, for the Vietnamese and ourselves to enlarge the war, bringing pressure to persuade Hanoi, by force, that the game they are playing is not worth it.

It is also suggested that the United Nations might be of help. There may emerge possibilities for a U.N. role, but it is not clear that the U.N., which has been unable to carry through commitments such the Congo, would be able to act effectively to deal with this far more difficult situation in its present form. And this has been the public judgment of the U.N. Secretary General, Mr. U Thant.

As to the basic alternative, so long as South Vietnam is ready to carry on the fight, withdrawal is unthinkable. A negotiation that produced a return to the essentials of the 1954 accords and thus an independent and secure South Vietnam would of course be an answer, indeed the answer. But negotiation would hardly be promising that admitted communism to South Vietnam, that did not get Hanoi out, or that exposed South Vietnam and perhaps other countries of the area to renewed Communist aggression at will, with only nebulous or remote guarantees.

As for enlarging our own actions, we can not speak surely about the future—for the aggressors themselves share the responsibility for such eventualities. We have shown in the Gulf of Tonkin that we can act, and North Vietnam knows it, and knows its own weaknesses. But we seek no wider war, and we must not suppose that there are quick or easy answers in this direction.

The root of the problem, to repeat, is in South Vietnam. We must persist in our efforts there, with patience rather than petulance, coolness rather than recklessness, and with a continuing ability to separate the real from the merely wished for.

As a great power, we are now and will continue to find ourselves in situations where we simply do not have easy choices, where there simply are not immediate or ideal solutions available. We cannot then allow ourselves to yield to frustration, but must stick to the job, doing all we can and doing it better.

The national interests that have brought us into the Vietnam struggle are valid, and they do not become less so just because the going gets rough and the end is not yet in sight. President Johnson said in his state of the Union message: "Our goal is peace in southeast Asia. That will come only when aggressors leave their neighbors in peace. What is at stake is the cause of freedom. In that cause, we shall never be found wanting."

AGGRESSION FROM THE NORTH—THE RECORD OF NORTH VIETNAM'S CAMPAIGN TO CONQUER SOUTH VIETNAM

"Our purpose in Vietnam is to join in the defense and protection of freedom of a brave people who are under attack that is controlled and that is directed from outside their country." (President Lyndon B. Johnson, February 17, 1965.)

INTRODUCTION

South Vietnam is fighting for its life against a brutal campaign of terror and armed attack inspired, directed, supplied, and controlled by the Communist regime in Hanoi. This flagrant aggression has been going on for years, but recently the pace has quickened and the threat has now become acute.

The war in Vietnam is a new kind of war, a fact as yet poorly understood in most parts of the world. Much of the confusion that prevails in the thinking of many people, and even many governments, stems from this basic misunderstanding. For in Vietnam a totally new brand of aggression has been loosed against an independent people who want to make their own way in peace and freedom.

Vietnam is not another Greece, where indigenous guerrilla forces used friendly neighboring territory as a sanctuary.

Vietnam is not another Malaya, where Communist guerrillas were, for the most part, physically distinguishable from the peaceful majority they sought to control.

Vietnam is not another Philippines, where Communist guerrillas were physically separated from the source of their moral and physical support.

Above all, the war in Vietnam is not a spontaneous and local rebellion against the established government.

There are elements in the Communist program of conquest directed against South Vietnam common to each of the previous areas of aggression and subversion. But there is one fundamental difference. In Vietnam a Communist government has set out deliberately to conquer a sovereign people in a neighboring state. And to achieve its end, it has used every resource of its own government to carry out its carefully planned program of concealed aggression. North Vietnam's commitment to seize control of the South is no less total than was the commitment of the regime in North Korea in 1950. But knowing the consequences of the latter's undisguised attack, the planners in Hanoi have tried desperately to conceal their hand. They have failed and their aggression is as real as that of an invading army.

This report is a summary of the massive evidence of North Vietnamese aggression obtained by the Government of South Vietnam. This evidence has been jointly analyzed by South Vietnamese and American experts.

The evidence shows that the hard core of the Communist forces attacking South Vietnam were trained in the north and ordered into the south by Hanoi. It shows that the key leadership of the Vietcong (VC), the officers and much of the cadre, many of the technicians, political, organizers, and propagandists have come from the north and operate under Hanoi's direction. It shows that the training of essential military personnel and their infiltration into the south is directed by the military high command in Hanoi. (See sec. I.)

The evidence shows that many of the weapons and much of the ammunition and other supplies used by the Vietcong have been sent into South Vietnam from Hanoi. In recent months new types of weapons have been introduced in the VC army, for which all ammunition must come from outside sources. Communist China and other Communist States have been the prime suppliers of these weapons and ammunition, and they have been channeled primarily through North Vietnam. (See sec. II.)

The directing force behind the effort to conquer South Vietnam is the Communist Party in the north, the Lao Dong (Workers) Party. As in every Communist State, the party is an integral part of the regime itself. North Vietnamese officials have expressed their firm determination to absorb South Vietnam into the Communist world. (See sec. III.)

Through its central committee, which controls the government of the north, the Lao Dong Party directs the total political and military effort of the Vietcong. The military high command in the north trains the military men and sends them into South Vietnam. The Central Research Agency, North Vietnam's central intelligence organization, directs the elaborate espionage and subversion effort. The extensive political-military organization in the north which directs the Vietcong war effort is described in section IV.

Under Hanoi's overall direction the Communists have established an extensive machine for carrying on the war within South Vietnam. The focal point is the Central Office for South Vietnam with its political and military subsections and other specialized agencies. A subordinate part of this Central Office is the Liberation Front for South Vietnam. The front was formed at Hanoi's order in 1960. Its principal function is to influence opinion abroad and to create the false impression that the aggression in South Vietnam is an indigenous rebellion against the established government. (See sec. IV.)

For more than 10 years the people and the Government of South Vietnam, exercising the inherent right of self-defense, have fought back against these efforts to extend Communist power south across the 17th parallel. The United States has responded to the appeals of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam for help in this defense of the freedom and independence of its land and its people.

In 1961 the Department of State issued a report called "A Threat to the Peace." It described North Vietnam's program to seize South Vietnam. The evidence in that report had been presented by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to the International Control Commission (ICC). A special report by the ICC in June 1962 upheld the validity of that evidence. The Commission held that there was "sufficient evidence to show beyond reasonable doubt" that North Vietnam had sent arms and men into South Vietnam to carry out subversion with the aim of overthrowing the legal government there. The ICC found the authorities in Hanoi in specific violation of four provisions of the Geneva accords of 1954.[1]

Since then, new and even more impressive evidence of Hanoi's aggression has accumulated. The Government of the United States believes that evidence should be presented to its own citizens and to the world. It is important for freemen to know what has been happening in Vietnam, and how, and why. That is the purpose of this report.

I. HANOI SUPPLIES THE KEY PERSONNEL FOR THE ARMED AGGRESSION AGAINST SOUTH VIETNAM

The hard core of the Communist forces attacking South Vietnam are men trained in North Vietnam. They are ordered into the south and remain under the military discipline of the military high command in Hanoi. Special training camps operated by the North Vietnamese Army gave political and military training to the infiltrators. Increasingly the forces sent into the south are native North Vietnamese who have never seen South Vietnam. A special infiltration unit, the 70th Transportation Group, is responsible for moving men from North Vietnam into the south via infiltration trails through Laos. Another special unit, the maritime infiltration group, sends weapons and supplies and agents by sea into the south.

The infiltration rate has been increasing. From 1959 to 1960, when Hanoi was establishing its infiltration pipeline, at least 1,800 men, and possibly 2,700 more, moved into South Vietnam from the north. The flow increased to a minimum of 3,700 in 1961 and at least 5,400 in 1962. There was a modest decrease in 1963 to 4,200 confirmed infiltrators, though later evidence is likely to raise this figure.

For 1964 the evidence is still incomplete. However, it already shows that a minimum of 4,400 infiltrators entered the south, and it is estimated more than 3,000 others were sent in.

There is usually a time lag between the entry of infiltrating troops and the discovery of clear evidence they have entered. This fact, plus collateral evidence of increased use of the infiltration routes, suggests strongly that 1964 was probably the year of greatest infiltration so far.

Thus, since 1959, nearly 20,000 VC officers, soldiers, and technicians are known to have entered South Vietnam under orders from Hanoi. Additional information indicates that an estimated 17,000 more infiltrators were dispatched to the south by the regime in Hanoi during the past 6 years. It can reasonably be assumed that still other infiltration groups have entered the south for which there is no evidence yet available.

To some the level of infiltration from the north may seem modest in comparison with the total size of the Armed Forces of the Republic of Vietnam. But one-for-one calculations are totally misleading in the kind of warfare going on in Vietnam. First, a high proportion of infiltrators from the north are well-trained officers, cadres, and specialists. Second, it has long been realized that in guerrilla combat the burdens of defense are vastly heavier than those of attack. In Malaya, the Philippines, and elsewhere a ratio of at least 10 to 1 in favor of the forces of order was required to meet successfully the threat of the guerrillas hit-and-run tactics.

In the calculus of guerrilla warfare the scale of North Vietnamese infiltration into the south takes on a very different meaning. For the infiltration of 5,000 guerrilla fighters in a given year is the equivalent of marching perhaps 50,000 regular troops across the border, in terms of the burden placed on the defenders.

Above all, the number of proved and probable infiltrators from the north should be seen in relation to the size of the VC forces. It is now estimated that the Vietcong number approximately 35,000 so-called hard-core forces, and another 60,000 to 80,000 local forces. It is thus apparent that infiltrators from the north—allowing for casualties—make up the majority of the so-called hard-core Vietcong. Personnel from the north, in short, are now and have always been the backbone of the entire VC operation.

It is true that many of the lower level elements of the VC forces are recruited within South Vietnam. However, the thousands of reported cases of VC kidnapings and terrorism make it abundantly clear that threats and other pressures by the Vietcong play a major part in such recruitment.

A. The infiltration process

The infiltration routes supply hard-core units with most of their officers and noncommissioned personnel. This source helps fill the gaps left by battle casualties, illness, and defection and insures continued control by Hanoi. Also, as the nature of the conflict has changed, North Vietnam has supplied the Vietcong with technical specialists via the infiltration routes. These have included men trained in armor and ordnance, antiaircraft, and communications as well as medical corpsmen and transport experts.

There is no single infiltration route from the north to South Vietnam. But by far the biggest percentage of infiltrators follow the same general course. The principal training center for North Vietnamese Army men assigned to join the Vietcong has been at Xuan Mai near Hanoi. Recently captured Vietcong have also reported an infiltration training camp at Thanh Hoa. After completion of their training course—which involves political and propaganda work as well as military subjects—infiltrating units are moved to Vinh on the east coast. Many have made stopovers at a staging area in Dong Hoi where additional training is conducted. From there they go by truck to the Laos border.

Then, usually after several days' rest, infiltrators move southward through Laos. Generally they move along the Laos-South Vietnam border. Responsibility for infiltration from North Vietnam through Laos belongs to the 70th Transportation Group of the North Vietnamese Army. After a time the infiltration groups turn eastward, entering South Vietnam in Quang Nam, Quang Tri, Thua Thien, Kontum, or another of the border provinces.

The Communists have established regular lanes for infiltration with way stations established about 1 day's march apart. The way stations are equipped to quarter and feed the Vietcong passing through. Infiltrators who suffer from malaria or other illnesses stay at the stations until they recover sufficiently to join another passing group moving south.

The map on page 4 [not shown in RECORD] shows the infiltration route from North Vietnam to the south followed by VC Sgt. Huynh Van Tay and a group of North Vietnamese Army officers and men in September 1963. Tay was captured during an engagement in Chuong Thien Province in April 1964.

Local guides lead the infiltration groups along the secret trails. Generally they direct the infiltrators from halfway between two stations, through their own base station, and on halfway to the next supply base. Thus the guides are kept in ignorance of all but their own way stations. Only group leaders are permitted to talk with the guides in order to preserve maximum security. The men are discouraged from asking where they are or where they are going.[2]

[1] For the text of pertinent sections of the ICC report, see app. A.

[2] For additional maps of the routes taken by VC infiltrators into South Vietnam, see app. B.

The same system of trails and guides used along the Lao infiltration routes is used within South Vietnam itself. Vietcong infiltrators may report directly to a reassignment center in the highlands as soon as they enter South Vietnam. But in the past year or more some groups have moved down trails in South Vietnam to provinces along the Cambodian border and near Saigon before receiving their unit assignment. Within South Vietnam infiltration and supplies are handled by VC units such as the Nam Son Transportation Group.

At the Laos border crossing point infiltrators are reequipped. Their North Vietnamese Army uniforms must be turned in. They must give up all personal papers, letters, notebooks, and photographs that might be incriminating. Document control over the infiltrators has been tightened considerably over the past 2 years. A number of Vietnamese infiltrators have told of being fitted out with Lao neutralist uniforms for their passage through Laos.

Infiltration groups are usually issued a set of black civilian pajama-like clothes, two unmarked uniforms, rubber sandals, a sweater, a hammock, mosquito netting, and waterproof sheeting. They carry a 3- to 5-day supply of food. A packet of medicines and bandages is usually provided.

The size of infiltration groups varies widely. Prisoners have mentioned units as small as 5 men and as large as 500. Generally the groups number 40 to 50. When they arrive in South Vietnam these groups are usually split up and assigned to various VC units as replacements, although some have remained intact.

B. Military personnel

The following are individual case histories of North Vietnamese soldiers sent by the Hanoi regime into South Vietnam. They are only an illustrative group. They show that the leadership and specialized personnel for the guerrilla war in South Vietnam consists in large part of members of the North Vietnam armed forces, trained in the North and subject to the command and discipline of Hanoi.

1. Tran Quoc Dan

Dan was a VC major, commander of the 60th Battalion (sometimes known as the 34th Group of the Thon-Kim Battalion). Disillusioned with fighting his own countrymen and with communism and the lies of the Hanoi regime, he surrendered to the authorities in South Vietnam on February 11, 1963.

At the age of 15 he joined the revolutionary army (Viet Minh) and fought against the French forces until 1954 when the Geneva accords ended the Indochina war. As a regular in the Viet Minh forces, he was moved to North Vietnam. He became an officer in the so-called people's army.

In March 1962 Major Dan received orders to prepare to move to South Vietnam. He had been exposed to massive propaganda in the north which told of the destitution of the peasants in the south and said that the Americans had taken over the French role of colonialists. He said later that an important reason for his decision to surrender was that he discovered these propaganda themes were lies. He found the peasants more prosperous than the people in the north. And he recognized quickly that he was not fighting the Americans but his own people.

With the 600 men of his unit, Major Dan left Hanoi on March 23, 1962. They traveled through the Laos corridor. His group joined up with the Vietcong 1st Regiment in central Vietnam.

The 35-year-old major took part in 45 actions and was wounded once in an unsuccessful VC attack on an outpost. As time passed he became increasingly discouraged by his experience as a VC troop commander. Most of all, he said, he was tired of killing other Vietnamese. After several months of soul-searching he decided to surrender to the authorities of the Republic of Vietnam. He has volunteered to do "anything to serve the national cause" of South Vietnam.

2. Vo Thoi

Sgt. Vo Thoi (Communist Party alias Vo Bien) was an assistant squad leader in the VC Tay Son 22d Battalion. On the night of October 7, 1963, his unit attacked An Tuong village in Binh Dinh Province. After overrunning the village, Vo's company was assigned to set up an ambush against Republic of Vietnam troops rushing to defend the village. In the ensuing fight Vo was seriously wounded. He was picked up by local farmers and turned over to the authorities.

Vo's life and experiences were similar to those of thousands of Vietcong. Born in Quang Ngai Province in 1932, he went through 5 years of school and then worked on his parents' small farm. During the war against the French he joined the Viet Minh forces. When the fighting ended, he was transferred to North Vietnam with his unit, the 210th Regiment. He remained in the North Vietnamese Army until 1960 when he was sent to work on a state farm in Nghe An Province. Vo said 3,000 men and women worked on the farm, of whom 400 were soldiers. In September 1962 Vo was told he must join the newly activated 22d Battalion. All the members of the battalion came from provinces in South Vietnam, from Quang Tri to Phu Yen. But it was not an ordinary battalion; two-thirds of its members were cadre with ranks up to senior capitain.

The group was put through an advanced training course that lasted 6 months. The training program included combat tactics for units from squad to company and the techniques of guerrilla and counterguerrilla fighting. There were heavy doses of political indoctrination.

On March 5, 1963, the 22d Battalion received orders to move south. They were transported in trucks from Nghe An Province to Dong Hoi in Quang Binh, just north of the 17th parallel. From there the unit was moved westward to the Lao border. Then the more than 300 men began walking to the south following mountain trails in Laos and the Vietnam border area. They marched by day, rested at night. Every fifth day they stopped at a way station for a full day's rest. One company dropped off at Thua Thiem Province. Vo and the remainder of the group marched on to Pleiku Province. Two fully armed companies from a neighboring province were assigned to the battalion. The assignment given to the battalion was to harass strategic hamlets in the Hoai An district of Binh Dinh, to round up cattle and rice, to kill or kidnap cadre of the Government forces, and to recruit local youth for service with the Vietcong.

3. Nguyen Thao

Nguyen Thao was a VC weapons technician. A native of Khanh Hao Province in South Vietnam, he joined the Viet Minh in 1950. He worked at a secret arsenal manufacturing weapons for use by the guerrilla forces. He went to North Vietnam after the Geneva accords were signed in 1954. In North Vietnam he attended a technical school specializing in arms and manufacture. He received special training in foreign small arms and artillery.

At the end of 1962 he was ordered to Ha Dong to attend a special course of political training in preparation for infiltrating into South Vietnam. On completion of the training course he was assigned to a group of 14 men who would move to the south together. Nguyen Thao said the group was composed of four armament specialists, two chemical engineers, and eight middle-level technical cadre.

They left Ha Dong in March 1963, crossed into Laos, and reached their destination in the northern part of South Vietnam in May. Nguyen Thao went to work at a secret VC arsenal near the Quang Ngai border. Fifty men, some local workers, manned the arsenal weapons section. The group manufactured mines and grenades for the VC units in the area and repaired weapons.

Nguyen Thao said he soon realized from talking with the local workers at the arsenal that most of what he had heard in the North about conditions in South Vietnam was wrong. He said the Communists had deceived him. Two months after his arrival at the arsenal he decided to defect. He asked permission to rejoin his family and to work in a national defense factory and continue his studies.

4. Nguyen Viet Le

This VC soldier was born in Quang Nam Province in South Vietnam. He served with the 305th Division of the Viet Minh and moved to North Vietnam in 1954. In April 1961, Nguyen Viet Le and his unit, the 50th Battalion, moved into Laos. He said the unit remained in Laos for 2 months, during which it fought in four battles alongside the Pathet Lao. During these engagements one of the battalion's four companies was badly mauled and had to be returned to North Vietnam.

The other three companies were assigned to South Vietnam. They arrived in Quang Ngai Province in the summer of 1961. For a month they rested and waited for orders. They took part in a major action against an outpost of the Government of South Vietnam in September. Nguyen Viet Le was captured during a battle in Quang Ngai Province in April 1962.

5. Nguyen Truc

Corp. Nguyen Truc was born in 1933, the son of a farmer in Phu Yen Province in South Vietnam. From 1949 to 1954 he served as a courier and then as a guerrilla fighter with the Viet Minh. In early 1955 he boarded a Soviet ship and moved with his unit, the 40th Battalion, to North Vietnam. He remained in the army, but in 1959, bothered by illness, he went to work on a state farm.

In August 1962 Nguyen Truc was notified that he was back in the army and that he was being sent to South Vietnam. He reported to the Xuan Mai training center and underwent 6 months of military and political reeducation. His unit was the newly activated 22d Battalion. The training course was completed in February 1963, but departure for South Vietnam was delayed until April.

For infiltration purposes the battalion was divided into two groups. On April 27, Nguyen Truc and his group boarded trucks at Xuan Mai. They went first to Vinh, then on to Dong Hoi, and finally to the Laos-North Vietnam border. There they doffed their North Vietnamese army uniforms and put on black peasants' clothing. The march to the south began, sometimes in Lao territory, sometimes in Vietnam. They passed through Thua Thien Province, then Quang Nam, Quang Tin, and Quang Ngai, and finally to their destination, Pleiku. Each day they had a new guide, generally one of the mountain people of the area.

Nguyen said that he and most of the troops who were sent north after the Indochina war wanted to return to their homes and rejoin their families. In August 1963 Nguyen Truc was sent out on a foraging expedition to find food for his unit. He took the opportunity to defect to Government forces at An Tuc in Binh Dinh Province.

6. Nguyen Cam

Cam is the son of a farmer in Quang Tin Province. Born in 1929, he joined the Vietminh youth group in his home village in 1946. In 1 year he became a guerrilla fighter. In 1954, as the Indochina war was drawing to a close, he was serving with the Vietminh 20th Battalion. In May 1955 he went to North Vietnam with his unit.

Ill health caused his transfer to an agricultural camp in 1958. By 1960 he was back in uniform, serving in the 210th Regiment. In May of that year he was assigned to a small group that was to set up a metallurgical workshop. Early in 1961 he was sent to a metallurgical class in Nghe An Province. They were taught a simple form of cast iron production, simple blast furnace construction, and similar skills. Their instructor was an engineer from the Hanoi industrial department.

Their special course completed, Cam and his group of 35 men prepared to go to South Vietnam. They went by truck from their training center at Nghe An to the Lao border. After 19 days marching through Laos, they arrived in the vicinity of Tchepone. There they waited for 3 days until food supplies could be airdropped by a North Vietnamese plane. Nineteen days of walking took them to the Laos-South Vietnam border.

Delayed en route by illness, Cam finally reached his destination in November 1961. It was a secret VC iron foundry in Kontum Province. Several iron ore deposits were nearby, and the hill people had long used the iron to make knives and simple tools. Cam's job was building kilns to smelt the ore. The Vietcong hoped to use the iron for mines and grenades.

On August 4, 1963, Sergeant Cam went to a nearby village to buy salt for his group. On his return he found his comrades had gone to one of their cultivated fields to gather corn, and he joined them. The group was interrupted at their work by a Vietnamese ranger company. After a brief fight Cam was taken prisoner.

7. Nguyen Hong Thai

Thai, 32 years old, was born and grew up in Quang Nkai Province in South Vietnam. After service with the Vietminh we was moved to North Vietnam in 1954. After 3 years of military service he was assigned to a military farm. In December 1961 he was recalled to his former unit, the 305th Division, and went to the special training camp at Xuan Mai in preparation for fighting with the Vietcong in South Vietnam.

Training began in January 1962 and lasted for 4 months. The training group, designated the 32d Battalion, was composed of 650 men who came from various branches of the North Vietnamese Army—engineers, artillery, airborne, transport, marines, and some factory workers and students. Three-fourths of the training was military (guerrilla tactics, ambushes, sabotage, etc.) and one-fourth was political. In the latter, heavy emphasis was laid on the necessity for armed seizure of power in the south.

Group 32 was divided into sections and began infiltrating to the south on July 14, 1962. It moved in three groups. Thai said it took his group more than 55 days to travel from North Vietnam through Laos to Quang Ngai Province in the south. He reported that all the communications and liaison stations on the route to South Vietnam are now operated by the Army of North Vietnam. Soon after his arrival in South Vietnam, Thai was promoted to the rank of lieutenant. He was made a platoon leader in the 20th Vietcong Highland Battalion. In February 1963 the unit moved from Quang Nam to Kontum Province.

Combat conditions and the rigors of guerrilla life began to depress Thai. He said he wanted only to rejoin his family and live in peace. In September he asked and received permission to visit his family in Quang Ngai. When he got home, he surrendered to a South Vietnamese Army post.

8. Dao Kien Lap

Lap is a civilian radio technician. He has been a member of the Communist Party in North Vietnam since 1955. In February 1963 he was selected for assignment to South Vietnam where he was to work with the Liberation Front. He infiltrated into South Vietnam with a group of about 70 civilian specialists. They included doctors, pharmacists, union organizers, radio specialists, propagandists, and youth organizers. One of the infiltrators in Dao's group was a man named Binh, publisher of the newspaper Labor of the Lao Dong Party. Another was a member of the city soviet of Hanoi.

The specialists in Dao's group received 3 months of basic military training at Son Tay, and then departed for the south in mid-June. Their orders were to report to the central office of the Vietcong in South Vietnam where they would be assigned according to their individual specialties. Dao and Binh were to help run a radio station of the Liberation Front.

They traveled through Laos and along the Vietnam border. They had to stop for several weeks in Quang Nam Province to recuperate from their travels. On October 1 they were directed by guides to a VC station in Ban Me Thuot.

Dao said he had by then decided to defect to the government authorities in the south. He set off with one companion, but they were separated as they crossed a swiftly flowing river. Dao gave himself up at a government post in Ban Me Thuot on October 13, 1963.

9. Tran Ngoc Linh

Linh was a Vietcong senior sergeant, leader of a reconnaissance platoon. He is the son of a middle-class farm family in Tay Ninh Province. He served with the Viet Minh against the French and moved to North Vietnam in 1954. He spent the next 7 years in the North Vietnamese Army. In September 1962 Linh was assigned to the Xuan Mai training center at Ha Dong to prepare for duty in South Vietnam. His group was given a 4-month refresher course in infantry tactics with emphasis on guerrilla fighting. Then he received 6 months of special training in the use of machineguns against aircraft. Antiaircraft training has become an increasingly important part of the preparation of North Vietnamese troops assigned to the Vietcong.

Linh and about 120 others made up the 406th Infiltration Group commanded by Senior Capt. Nguyen Van Do. They were divided into four platoons. During the final 2 weeks of preparation each member of the group was issued new equipment—black pajama-like uniforms, a khaki uniform, a hammock, mosquito netting, rubber sandals, and other supplies, including two packets of medicine.

In the early morning hours of July 4, 1963, his group started its journey from the Xuan Mai training center outside Hanoi. The convoy of six Molotov trucks moved south along Highway 21 to Nghe An Province and then on to Quang Binh. On July 7 they arrived at the final processing station near the Laos-North Vietnam border. There they turned in their North Vietnamese Army uniforms as well as all personal papers and anything else that might identify them as coming from the north. But their departure for the south was delayed for several weeks. In August they set off through Laos.

Twice along the way Linh had to stop at liaison stations because of illness. When the infiltrators recovered from their illnesses, they were formed into special groups to continue their penetration into South Vietnam. Linh reported being delayed once for 8 days, and the second time for 10 days.

Finally, in the first week of November 1963, Linh was sufficiently recovered to begin the final leg of his journey to a VC center where he was to be assigned to a combat unit. He and three others who had been similarly delayed by attacks of malaria and other sickness made up a group. They moved through the jungles of Quang Duc Province near the Cambodian border. On the morning of November 9 they crossed the Srepok River. There they ran into a unit of the South Vietnamese Army. One of the infiltrators was killed, Linh was taken prisoner, and the other two Vietcong escaped.

These are typical Vietcong. There are many other officers like Tran Quoc Dan, technicians like Nguyen Thao, and simple soldiers like Nguyen Truc. They were born in South Vietnam, fought against the French, and then went north and served in the army of North Vietnam. They were ordered by the Communist rulers in Hanoi to reenter South Vietnam. Violating the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962, they used the territory of neighboring Laos to infiltrate into the South. They are the means by which Communist North Vietnam is carrying out its program of conquest in South Vietnam.[3]

C. Infiltration of native North Vietnamese

The Communist authorities in Hanoi are now assigning native North Vietnamese in increasing numbers to join the VC forces in South Vietnam. Heretofore, those in charge of the infiltration effort have sought to fill their quotas with soldiers and others born in the south. The 90,000 troops that moved from South Vietnam to the north when the Geneva accords ended the Indochina War have provided an invaluable reservoir for this purpose. Now, apparently, that source is running dry. The casualty rate has been high, and obviously many of those who were in fighting trim 10 years ago are no longer up to the rigors of guerrilla war.

In any case, reports of infiltration by native North Vietnamese in significant numbers have been received in Saigon for several months. It is estimated that as many as 75 percent of the more than 4,400 Vietcong who are known to have entered the south in the first 8 months of 1964 were natives of North Vietnam.

Vo Thanh Vinh was born in Nghe An Province in North Vietnam in 1936. He was captured by South Vietnamese forces on May 5, 1964. He described himself as a military security officer. He infiltrated into South Vietnam in April 1964 with a group of 34 police and security officers from the north.

Another native North Vietnamese captured in the south was VC Pfc. Vo Quyen. His home was in Nam Dinh Province. He was a member of the 2d Battalion of the North Vietnamese Army's 9th Regiment. He said the entire battalion had infiltrated into South Vietnam between February and May last year. He was captured in an action in Quang Tri Province on July 4. He told interrogators that the bulk of his unit was composed of young draftees from North Vietnam.

Le Pham Hung, also a private, first class, was captured on July 7 in Thua Thien Province. He is a native of Nam Dinh in North Vietnam. Drafted for military service in May 1963, he was in the 324th Division. His group, consisting solely of 90 North Vietnamese draftees, infiltrated into South Vietnam in May 1964. He reported that another company of the North Vietnamese entered the south at the same time as his unit.

A former member of the 90th VC Battalion reported that his unit had been reinforced by native North Vietnamese troops earlier this year. Le Thua Phuong, an information cadre and a native of Quang Ngai Province in the south, surrendered to Government forces on April 23, 1964. He said that the 90th Battalion had received 80 North Vietnamese replacements in February.

A medical technician named Hoang Thung was captured in Thua Thien Province on July 4, 1964. He said he had infiltrated into the south in late 1963 with a group of 200

[3] See app. C for additional details on military infiltrators.

Vietcong, the majority of whom were ethnic northerners, 120 of them draftees.

These reports destroy one more fiction which the authorities in Hanoi have sought so long to promote—that the fighting in the south was a matter for the South Vietnamese. They underline Hanoi's determination to press its campaign of conquest with every available resource.

D. Infiltration of Vietcong agents

No effort to subvert another nation as elaborate as that being conducted by the Ho Chi Minh regime against South Vietnam can succeed without an intelligence-gathering organization. Recognizing this, the authorities in Hanoi have developed an extensive espionage effort. An essential part of that effort is the regular assignment of secret agents from the north to South Vietnam.

The heart of the VC intelligence organization is the Central Research Agency in Hanoi. (See sec. IV, C.) Communist agents are regularly dispatched from North Vietnam, sometimes for brief assignments but often for long periods. Many of these agents move into South Vietnam along the infiltration trails through Laos; others are carried by boats along the coasts and landed at prearranged sites. A special maritime infiltration group has been developed in North Vietnam, with its operations centered in Ha Tinh and Quang Binh Provinces just north of the 17th parallel.

1. Maritime Infiltration

The following case illustrates the methods of maritime infiltration of secret agents used by the Communist regime of North Vietnam.

In July 1962 a North Vietnamese intelligence agent named Nguyen Viet Duong began training to infiltrate South Vietnam. A native southerner, he had fought against the French and had gone to North Vietnam after the war ended. Selected for intelligence work, he was assigned to the Central Research Agency in 1959.

After a period of intensive instruction in radio transmission, coding and decoding, and other skills of the intelligence trade, he was given false identity papers and other supplies and was transported to the south. His principal task was to set up a cell of agents to collect military information. He flew from Hanoi to Dong Hoi, and from there the Maritime infiltration group took him by boat to South Vietnam. That was in August 1962.

In January 1963 Duong reported to Hanoi that he had run into difficulties. His money and papers had been lost, and he had been forced to take refuge with VC contacts in another province. Another agent was selected to go to South Vietnam. One of his assignments was to contact Duong, find out details of what happened to him, and help Duong reestablish himself as a VC agent. The man selected for the task was Senior Captain Tran Van Tan of the Central Research Agency.

Tan had already been picked to go to the South to establish a clandestine VC communications center. Making contact with Duong was one of his secondary assignments. After intensive preparations Tan was ready to move to South Vietnam in March. He was transferred to an embarkation base of the maritime infiltration group just north of the 17th parallel.

He was joined by three other VC agents and the captain and three crewmen of the boat that would take them south. All were given false identity papers to conform to their false names. They also were provided with fishermen's permits, South Vietnamese voting cards, and draft cards or military discharge papers. The boat captain received a boat registration book, crew lists, and several South Vietnamese permits to conduct business.

The agents and boatmen were given cover stories to tell if captured. Each man had to memorize not only the details of his own story but the names and some details about each of the others. The agents had to become familiar with simple boat procedures so they could pass as legitimate fishermen.

The expedition left the embarkation port on April 4. In addition to the four agents the boat carried six carefully sealed boxes containing a generator, several radios, some weapons, and a large supply of South Vietnamese currency. They also carried some chemicals and materials for making false identification papers. Their destination was a landing site on the coast of Phuoc Tuy Province.

Soon after leaving North Vietnam the VC boat encountered high winds and rough seas. On April 7 the storm became violent. The boat tossed and threatened to capsize. Strong northeasterly winds forced it ever closer to shore. Finally the boat captain, Nguyen Xit, ordered that the six boxes be thrown overboard. This was done, and the boat then was beached. The eight men decided to split up into pairs and try to make contact with VC forces. They buried their false papers and set out. Six of the eight were captured almost immediately by authorities in Thua Thien Province, and the other two were taken several days later.

2. Student Propaganda Agents

The student population of South Vietnam is an important target group for VC propagandists. These agents seek to win adherents for the Communist cause among young workers, students in high schools and universities, and the younger officers and enlisted men in the armed forces of the Republic of Vietnam.

Typical of the agents sent into South Vietnam for this purpose is Nguyen Van Vy, a 19-year-old VC propagandist. He is a native of the Vinh Linh District in North Vietnam, just north of the demilitarized zone. He was a member of a Communist Party youth group in his native village. He was recruited for propaganda work in the south in the fall of 1962. He was one of 40 young persons enrolled in a special political training course given by the Communist Party in his district.

The first phase of the training consisted of political indoctrination covering such subjects as the advance of communism, the North Vietnamese plan for winning control of the country, the responsibility of youth in furthering this plan, the war in the south, and the need for propaganda supporting the Liberation Front.

Those who successfully completed the first phase were selected for the second level of training, the so-called technical training phase. In this the trainees were given their mission in the south. Vy was told he should infiltrate into South Vietnam and there surrender to the authorities, describing himself as a defector who was "tired of the miserable life in the north." He was to say he wanted to complete his schooling, which was impossible in the north. He was told to ask to live with relatives in the south so he could go to school. Once his story was accepted and he was enrolled in a school, he was to begin his work of propagandizing other students. He was to wait for 3 or 4 months, however, until he was no longer the subject of local suspicion. He was assigned to work under an older agent to whom he had to report regularly.

A third member of the team was a younger man who was to assist Vy. The three were to infiltrate into South Vietnam separately and to meet there at a rendezvous point.

At first Vy was to do no more than to observe his fellow students carefully, collecting biographical data on them and studying their personalities, capabilities, and aspirations. He was then to select those he thought might be most influenced by Communist propaganda and try to make friends with them.

Once he had selected targets, he was to begin to influence them favorably toward the north and to implant Communist propaganda. He was responsible then for bringing into his organization those he had influenced effectively. These individuals were to be given their own propaganda assignments to work on other students.

Students who wanted to evade military service in the Government forces were considered prime targets. Where possible, Vy was to help them get to North Vietnam. He was also told to make contact with any students who had been picked up by the authorities for suspected Communist activities. These, too, were to be helped to escape to North Vietnam. Any useful information concerning developments in the south or military activities were to be reported through his superior, Nguyen Van Phong.

In case he became suspect, he was either to make his own way back to North Vietnam or to go into the jungle and try to contact a VC unit.

Vy entered South Vietnam on January 2, 1963, by swimming across the Ben Hai River. He encountered an elderly farmer who led him to the local authorities in Hai Gu. There he told his story but it was not believed. He then admitted his true mission.

3. Other Agents

The Communist authorities in North Vietnam send their agents into South Vietnam by a wide variety of means. A few like Nguyen Van Vy cross the demilitarized zone, more infiltrate by sea, and still more along the infiltration routes through Laos. But there are other methods for entering South Vietnam. VC espionage agent Tran Van Bui attempted one such method.

Bui was a graduate of the espionage training school in Haiphong, North Vietnam. He completed a special 6-month course in July 1962. The training included political indoctrination, but most of the time was spent on such things as use of weapons, preparing booby traps, and methods of sabotage. He was also given instruction in methods for enlisting help from hoodlums, draft dodgers, and VC sympathizers. Once in South Vietnam, he was to organize a small unit for sabotage and the collection of information. On specific assignment by his superiors he was to be ready to sabotage ships in Saigon harbor and to blow up gasoline and oil storage points and Vietnamese Army installations. He was told to be prepared to assassinate Vietnamese officials and American personnel.

In September 1962 Bui was given his mission assignment. He was to hide aboard a foreign ship. When discovered, he was to claim to be a refugee who wanted to escape to South Vietnam. He was given an automatic pistol with silencer, some explosive devices, and a small knife that could inject poison into the body of a victim.

Bui stole aboard a foreign ship in Haiphong harbor. After 3 days at sea—when he was sure the ship would not turn around—Bui surrendered to the ship's captain. When the ship arrived in Bangkok, Bui was turned over to the Thai authorities. They in turn released him to the South Vietnamese as he had requested. But in Saigon his true mission was disclosed and he made a full confession.

II. HANOI SUPPLIES WEAPONS, AMMUNITION, AND OTHER WAR MATERIEL TO ITS FORCES IN THE SOUTH

When Hanoi launched the VC campaign of terror, violence, and subversion in earnest in 1959, the Communist forces relied mainly on stocks of weapons and ammunition left over from the war against the French. Supplies sent in from North Vietnam came largely from the same source. As the military

campaign progressed, the Vietcong depended heavily on weapons captured from the Armed Forces in South Vietnam. This remains an important source of weapons and ammunitions for the Vietcong. But as the pace of the war has quickened, requirements for up-to-date arms and special types of weapons have risen to a point where the Vietcong cannot rely on captured stocks. Hanoi has undertaken a program to reequip its forces in the south with Communist-produced weapons.

Large and increasing quantities of military supplies are entering South Vietnam from outside the country. The principal supply point is North Vietnam, which provides a convenient channel for materiel that originates in Communist China and other Communist countries.

An increasing number of weapons from external Communist sources have been seized in the south. These include such weapons as 57-millimeter and 75-millimeter recoilless rifles, dual-purpose machineguns, rocket launchers, large mortars, and antitank mines.

A new group of Chinese Communist-manufactured weapons has recently appeared in VC hands. These include the 7.62 semiautomatic carbine, 7.62 light machinegun, and the 7.62 assault rifle. These weapons and ammunition for them, manufactured in Communist China in 1962, were first captured in December 1964 in Chuong Thien Province. Similar weapons have since been seized in each of the four corps areas of South Vietnam. Also captured have been Chinese Communist antitank grenade launchers and ammunition made in China in 1963.

One captured Vietcong told his captors that his entire company had been supplied recently with modern Chinese weapons. The reequipping of VC units with a type of weapons that require ammunition and parts from outside South Vietnam indicates the growing confidence of the authorities in Hanoi in the effectiveness of their supply lines into the south.

Incontrovertible evidence of Hanoi's elaborate program to supply its forces in the south with weapons, ammunition, and other supplies has accumulated over the years. Dramatic new proof was exposed just as this report was being completed.

On February 16, 1965, an American helicopter pilot flying along the South Vietnamese coast sighted a suspicious vessel. It was a cargo ship of an estimated 100-ton capacity, carefully camouflaged and moored just offshore along the coast of Phu Yen Province. Fighter planes that approached the vessel met machinegun fire from guns on the deck of the ship and from the shore as well. A Vietnamese Air Force strike was launched against the vessel, and Vietnamese Government troops moved into the area. They seized the ship after a bitter fight with the Vietcong.

The ship, which had been sunk in shallow water, had discharged a huge cargo of arms, ammunition, and other supplies. Documents found on the ship and on the bodies of several Vietcong aboard identified the vessel as having come from North Vietnam. A newspaper in the cabin was from Haiphong and was dated January 23, 1965. The supplies delivered by the ship—thousands of weapons and more than a million rounds of ammunition—were almost all of Communist origin, largely from Communist China and Czechoslovakia, as well as North Vietnam. At least 100 tons of military supplies were discovered near the ship.

A preliminary survey of the cache near the sunken vessel from Hanoi listed the following supplies and weapons:

Approximately 1 million rounds of small-arms ammunition; more than 1,000 stick grenades; 500 pounds of TNT in prepared charges; 2,000 rounds of 82-millimeter mortar ammunition; 500 antitank grenades; 500 rounds of 57-millimeter recoilless rifle ammunition; more than 1,000 rounds of 75-millimeter recoilless rifle ammunition; one 57-millimeter recoilless rifle; 2 heavy machineguns; 2,000 7.95 Mauser rifles; more than 100, 7.62 carbines; 1,000 submachineguns; 15 light machineguns; 500 rifles; 500 pounds of medical supplies (with labels from North Vietnam, Communist China, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Soviet Union, and other sources).

The ship was fairly new and had been made in Communist China. Documents aboard the ship included three North Vietnamese nautical charts (one of the Haiphong area and one of Hong Gay, both in North Vietnam, and one of the Tra Vinh area of South Vietnam). The military health records of North Vietnamese soldiers were found. One man had a political history sheet showing he was a member of the 338th Division of the North Vietnamese Army. (See app. E.)

Also abroad the North Vietnamese ship were: an instruction book for a Chinese Communist navigational device; postcards and letters to addresses in North Vietnam; snapshots, including one of a group of men in North Vietnamese Army uniforms under a flag of the Hanoi government.

Members of the ICC and representatives of the free press visited the sunken North Vietnamese ship and viewed its cargo. The incident itself underlined in the most dramatic form that Hanoi is behind the continuing campaign of aggression aimed at conquering South Vietnam. It made unmistakably clear that what is happening in South Vietnam is not an internal affair but part of a large-scale carefully directed and supported program of armed attack on a sovereign state and a free people.

There have been previous seizures of large stocks of ammunition and weapons and other military supplies that could only have come from Communist sources outside South Vietnam. In December 1963, a Republic of Vietnam force attacked a VC stronghold in Dinh Tuong Province southwest of Saigon. A large cache of VC equipment was seized. Included in the captured stocks were the following weapons and ammunition, all of Chinese Communist manufacture:

One 90-millimeter rocket launcher; 2 carbines (type 53); 120 rounds of 75-millimeter recoilless rifle ammunition; 120 detonating fuses for recoilless rifle ammunition; 14,000 rounds of 7.62 (type P) ammunition; 160,000 rounds of 7.62 carbine ammunition; 150 fuses for mortar shells; 100,000 rounds of 7.92 Mauser-type ammunition; 110 pounds (approximate) of TNT; two 60-millimeter mortars.

These weapons and ammunition are the same as those used in the North Vietnamese Army. Some of the 7.62-millimeter ammunition was manufactured as recently as 1962.[4]

Materiel is sent into South Vietnam from the North by a variety of methods—overland, by river and canal, and by sea. In one instance Vietnamese troops discovered a cache in which the 75-millimeter ammunition alone weighed approximately 1½ tons. It has been estimated that it would require more than 150 porters to carry this quantity of ammunition over rough terrain. However, a few sampans, each manned by a few men, could transport it with little difficulty. It is worth noting, in this connection, that the delta where the cache of materiel was seized has 460 miles of seacoast as well as 2,500 miles of canals navigable by large watercraft and another 2,200 miles of canals over which sampans can move easily. Much of the transport of large stocks of ammunition is undoubtedly waterborne for at least much of its travel into South Vietnam.[5]

Large quantities of chemical components for explosives have been sent into South Vietnam for the Vietcong. During 1963 there were at least 15 incidents in which boats, junks, or sampans were seized with explosives aboard. More than 20 tons of potassium chlorate or nitrate were captured. All these cases were in the delta area, and the majority were on or near the Mekong River. Red phosphorus made in Communist China has been among the chemicals captured from the Vietcong.

The Communists have shown extreme sensitivity to exposure of the fact that war material is going to the Vietcong from North Vietnam, Communist China, and other Communist countries. A secret document captured from a VC agent last year reflected this sensitivity. The document was sent from VC military headquarters in Bien Hoa Province to subordinate units. It ordered them to "pay special attention to the removal of all the markings and letters on weapons of all types currently employed by units and agencies and manufactured by friendly East European democratic countries or by China." It said incriminating marking should be chiseled off "so that the enemy cannot use it as a propaganda theme every time he captures these weapons."

III. NORTH VIETNAM: BASE FOR CONQUEST OF THE SOUTH

The Third Lao Dong Party Congress in Hanoi in September 1960 set forth two tasks for its members: "to carry out the socialist revolution in North Vietnam" and "to liberate South Vietnam."

The resolutions of the congress described the effort to destroy the legal Government in South Vietnam as follows: "The revolution in the South is a protracted, hard, and complex process of struggle, combining many forms of struggle of great activity and flexibility, ranging from lower to higher, and taking as its basis the building, consolidation, and development of the revolutionary power of the masses."

At the September meeting the Communist leaders in the north called for formation of "a broad national united front." Three months later Hanoi announced creation of the "Front for Liberation of the South." This is the organization that Communist propaganda now credits with guiding the forces of subversion in the south; it is pictured as an organization established and run by the people in the south themselves. At the 1960 Lao Dong Party Congress the tone was different. Then, even before the front existed, the Communist leaders were issuing orders for the group that was being organized behind the scenes in Hanoi. "This front must rally"; "The aims of its struggle are"; "The front must carry out"—this is the way Hanoi and the Communist Party addressed the Liberation Front even before its founding.

The Liberation Front is Hanoi's creation; it is neither independent nor southern, and what it seeks is not liberation but subjugation of the south.

In his address to the Third Lao Dong Party Congress, party and government leader Ho Chi Minh spoke of the necessity "to step up the Socialist revolution in the north and, at the same time, to step up the national democratic people's revolution in the south."

The year before, writing for Red Flag, the Communist Party newspaper of Belgium, Ho had said much the same thing: "We are building socialism in Vietnam, but we are building it in only one part of the country,

[4] On Jan. 29, 1964, the Government of the Republic of Vietnam supplied the International Control Commission with a list of weapons, ammunition, and other equipment of Communist origin captured in South Vietnam since June 1962. The list is summarized in app. D.

[5] Photographs of additional Vietcong weapons and ammunition of Communist origin are contained in app. E.

while in the other part we still have to direct and bring to a close the middle-class democratic and anti-imperialist revolution."

In the same vein, the commander in chief of the North Vietnamese armed forces, Vo Nguyen Giap, spoke at the 1960 party congress of the need to "step up the national democratic people's revolution in the south." Earlier in the year, writing for the Communist Party journal Hoc Tap in Hanoi, General Giap described the north as "the revolutionary base for the whole country."

Le Duan, a member of the Politburo and first secretary of the Lao Dong Party, was even more explicit when he talked at the party congress about the struggle in the south and the party's role. After noting the difficulties involved in overthrowing the existing order in South Vietnam, Le Duan said: "Hence the southern people's revolutionary struggle will be long, drawn out, and arduous. It is not a simple process but a complicated one, combining many varied forms of struggle—from elementary to advanced, legal and illegal—and based on the building, consolidation, and development of the revolutionary force of the masses. In this process, we must constantly intensify our solidarity and the organization and education of the people of the south."

Another high official of the Hanoi regime, Truong Chinh, writing in the party organ Hoc Tap in April 1961, expressed confidence in the success of the struggle to remove the legal government in South Vietnam because: "North Vietnam is being rapidly consolidated and strengthened, is providing good support to the South Vietnamese revolution, and is serving as a strong base for the struggle for national reunification."

He outlined the steps by which the Communists expect to achieve control over all Vietnam as follows: The Liberation Front would destroy the present Government in the south; a coalition government would be established; this government would agree with the North Vietnamese government in Hanoi regarding national reunification under one form or another. It takes little imagination to understand the form that is intended.

"Thus," wrote Truong Chinh, "though South Vietnam will be liberated by nonpeaceful means, the party policy of achieving peaceful national reunification is still correct."

The official government radio in Hanoi is used both overtly and covertly to support the Vietcong effort in South Vietnam. Captured agents have testified that the broadcasts are used sometimes to send instructions in veiled code to Vietcong representatives in the south.

Hoc Tap stated frankly in March 1963: "They [the authorities in South Vietnam] are well aware that North Vietnam is the firm base for the southern revolution and the point on which it leans, and that our party is the steady and experienced vanguard unit of the working class and people and is the brain and factor that decides all victories of the revolution."

In April 1964 the Central Committee of the Lao Dong Party issued a directive to all party echelons. It stated: "When the forces of the enemy and the plots of the enemy are considered, it is realized that the cadres, party members, and people in North Vietnam must * * * increase their sense of responsibility in regard to the South Vietnam revolution by giving positive and practical support to South Vietnam in every field."

Nguyen Chi Thanh, writing in a Hanoi newspaper in May 1963, underlined the importance of the role of the North Vietnamese Army in Hanoi's plans to unify Vietnam under Communist rule: "Our party set forth two strategic tasks to be carried out at the same time: to transform and build socialism in the north and to struggle to unify the country. Our army is an instrument of the class struggle in carrying out these two strategic tasks."

IV. ORGANIZATION, DIRECTION, COMMAND, AND CONTROL OF THE ATTACK ON SOUTH VIETNAM ARE CENTERED IN HANOI

The VC military and political apparatus in South Vietnam is an extension of an elaborate military and political structure in North Vietnam which directs and supplies it with the tools for conquest. The Ho Chi Minh regime has shown that it is ready to allocate every resource that can be spared—whether it be personnel, funds, or equipment—to the cause of overthrowing the legitimate Government in South Vietnam and of bringing all Vietnam under Communist rule.

A. Political organization

Political direction and control of the Vietcong is supplied by the Lao Dong Party, i.e. the Communist Party, led by Ho Chi Minh. Party agents are responsible for indoctrination, recruitment, political training, propaganda, anti-Government demonstrations, and other activities of a political nature. The considerable intelligence-gathering facilities of the party are also at the disposal of the Vietcong.

Overall direction of the VC movement is the responsibility of the Central Committee of the Lao Dong Party. Within the central committee a special reunification department has been established. This has replaced the committee for supervision of the south mentioned in intelligence reports 2 years ago. It lays down broad strategy for the movement to conquer South Vietnam.

Until March 1962 there were two principal administrative divisions in the VC structure in the south. One was the interzone of South-Central Vietnam (sometimes called interzone 5); the other was the Nambo region. In a 1962 reorganization these were merged into one, called the central office for South Vietnam. The central committee, through its reunification department, issues directives to the central office, which translates them into specific orders for the appropriate subordinate command.

Under the central office are six regional units (V through IX) plus the special zone of Saigon/Cholon/Gia Dinh. A regional committee responsible to the central office directs VC activities in each region. Each regional committee has specialized units responsible for liaison, propaganda, training, personnel, subversive activities, espionage, military bases, and the like.

Below each regional committee are similarly structured units at the province and district levels. At the base of the Communist pyramid are the individual party cells, which may be organized on a geographic base or within social or occupational groups. The elaborateness of the party unit and the extent to which it operates openly or underground is determined mainly by the extent of VC control over the area concerned.

1. The Liberation Front: The National Front for the Liberation of South Vietnam is the screen behind which the Communists carry out their program of conquest. It is the creature of the Communist Government in Hanoi. As noted above, the Communist Party in the North demanded establishment of such a front 3 months before its formation was actually announced in December 1960. It was designed to create the illusion that the Vietcong campaign of subversion was truly indigenous to South Vietnam rather than an externally directed Communist plan.

The front has won support primarily from the Communist world. Its radio faithfully repeats the propaganda themes of Hanoi and Peiping. When its representatives travel abroad, they do so with North Vietnamese passports and sponsorship.[6] The front's program copies that of the Lao Dong Party in North Vietnam.

In late 1961, in still another effort to conceal the extent of Communist domination of the front, the Communists announced formation of a new Marxist political unit, the People's Revolutionary Party (PRP). This mechanism provided a way to explain the Communist presence in the front while at the same time making it appear that the Communist voice was only one of several affiliated organizations in the front. The PRP itself claimed direct descent from the original Indochinese Communist Party and from the North Vietnamese Communist Party in Hanoi.[7]

B. Military organization

Military affairs of the Vietcong are the responsibility of high command of the People's Army of North Vietnam and the Ministry of Defense, under close supervision from the Lao Dong Party. These responsibilities include operational plans, assignments of individuals and regular units, training programs, infiltration of military personnel and supplies, military communications, tactical intelligence, supplies, and the like. The six military regions are the same as those of the VC political organization.

The military structure of the Vietcong is an integral part of the political machinery that controls every facet of VC activity in South Vietnam under Hanoi's overall direction. Each political headquarters from the central office down to the village has a military component which controls day-to-day military operations. Similarly, each military headquarters has a political element, an individual or a small staff. This meshing of political and military activity is designed to insure the closest cooperation in support of the total Communist mission. It also gives assurance of political control over the military.

Associated with the central office, believed to be located in Tay Ninh Province, is a military headquarters. Through this headquarters, as well as through other channels, Hanoi maintains direct contact with its principal military units in the south.

In addition to its supervision of the general military effort of the VC, the military section of the central office is believed to have direct command of two regimental headquarters and a number of security companies.

The hard core of the VC military organization is the full-time regular unit usually based on a province or region. These are well-trained and highly disciplined guerrilla fighters. They follow a rigid training schedule that is roughly two-thirds military and one-third political in content. This compares with the 50–50 proportion for district units and the 70 percent political and 30 percent military content of the village guerrilla's training.

The size of the Vietcong regular forces has grown steadily in recent years. For example, the Vietcong have five regimental headquarters compared with two in 1961. And the main VC force is composed of 50 battalions, 50 percent more than before. There are an estimated 139 VC companies. Hardcore VC strength now is estimated at about 35,000, whereas it was less than 20,000 in 1961.

The main force battalions are well armed with a variety of effective weapons including 75-millimeter recoilless rifles and 81–82-millimeter mortars. The companies and smaller units are equally well equipped and have 57-millimeter recoilless rifles and 60-millimeter mortars in their inventory. It is estimated that the Vietcong have at least

[6] Pictures of North Vietnamese passports and travel documents used by front officials are in app. F. [Not printed in RECORD.]

[7] For evidence that the People's Revolutionary Party in the south and the Communist Lao Dong Party in the north are one party, see app. G.

130 81-millimeter mortars and 300 60-millimeter mortars. There is no precise estimate for the number of recoilless rifles in their hands, but it is believed that most main force units are equipped with them. In at least one recent action the Vietcong employed a 75-millimeter pack howitzer. This mobile weapon, which has a range of 8,500 yards, will increase the Vietcong capabilities to launch long-range attacks against many stationary targets in the country.

Supporting the main force units of the Vietcong are an estimated 60,000–80,000 part-time guerrillas. They are generally organized at the district level where there are likely to be several companies of 50 or more men each. These troops receive only half pay, which means they must work at least part of the time to eke out a living.

Below the irregular guerrilla forces of the district are the part-time, village-based guerrillas.

They are available for assignment by higher headquarters and are used for harassment and sabotage. They are expected to warn nearby VC units of the approach of any force of the legal government. They provide a pool for recruitment into the VC district forces.

The record shows that many of the village guerrillas are dragooned into service with the Vietcong. Some are kidnapped; others are threatened; still others join to prevent their families from being harmed. Once in the Vietcong net, many are reluctant to leave for fear of punishment by the authorities or reprisal by the Communists.

Lam Van Chuoi is a typical example. He was a member of the village civil defense force in his home village in Kien Giang province. In March 1960, he was kidnapped by the Vietcong and kept a prisoner in the highlands for 1 month. There he was subjected to intense propaganda and indoctrination. He was returned to his village but kept under close observation and steady pressure. Finally, he was convinced he must join the VC. Later, he was transferred to a Communist military unit in another province. After learning of the Government's open arms program, he decided to defect from the VC. In May 1964, he walked into a Government outpost and asked for protection.

Money to pay the regular VC units comes from a variety of sources. Funds are sent from Hanoi. "Taxes" are extorted from the local population. Landowners and plantation operators often must pay a tribute to the VC as the price for not having their lands devastated. Similarly, transportation companies have been forced to pay the VC or face the threat of having their buses or boats sabotaged. Officials and wealthy people have been kidnaped for ransom. The VC have often stopped buses and taken the money and valuables of all on board.

For the most part, the VC have concentrated their attention on individuals, isolated or poorly defended outposts, and small centers of population. They have mercilessly killed or kidnaped thousand of village chiefs and other local officials. But over the past year the VC have moved into larger unit operations. Their ability to operate on a battalion level or larger has substantially increased.

C. Intelligence organization

A key element in the Vietcong effort is an elaborate organization in Hanoi called the Central Research Agency (CRA) (Cuc Nghien-Cuu Trung-Uong). Though it handles Hanoi's intellience effort on a worldwide scale, the main focus of its operation is on South Vietnam. This agency is able to draw on the intelligence capabilities of both the Lao Dong Party and the North Vietnamese armed forces for information, personnel, and facilities.

The CRA reportedly operates under the close personal scrutiny of Ho Chi Minh himself. Some of the top officials in the Hanoi government reportedly sit on its directing committee, including Premier Pham Van Dong, Deputy Premier Truong Chinh, and Defense Minster Vo Nguyen Giap.

Considerable information on the organization of the CRA has become available from captured Vietcong agents and from the work of intelligence agents of the Republic of Vietnam. Much of this information cannot be made public for security reasons, but it is possible to describe the CRA organization and its operations in broad outline.

The headquarters of the CRA in Hanoi is divided into six main sections, not including a special code unit. The six sections are responsible for administration, cadres, communications, espionage, research, and training. Each section has units to handle the specialized activities of its particular area of responsibility. The research section, for example, has subsections that handle political, economic, and military affairs respectively.

CRA headquarters directs a number of special centers for oversea operations. One such center maintains intelligence channels to oversea areas. It operates through special units at Haiphong and at Hongay.

A second special center is responsible for VC intelligence operations in Cambodia and Laos. A third center handles activities along the "demarcation line," the border with South Vietnam. This unit, based in Vinh Linh in southeast North Vietnam, is responsible for sending agents and supplies to the south by sea. It also cooperates with the North Vietnamese army in planning and carrying out infiltration. The CRA maintains intelligence bases in Laos and other countries.

Inside South Vietnam the Vietcong have a large intelligence network. Some of its units are responsible for receiving and sending on agents arriving from the North. They feed and give instructions to groups infiltrating into South Vietnam. They take delivery of equipment and supplies received from the North and relay them to Vietcong units in the south.

Many Vietcong agents have been captured in Saigon. They have exposed the extensive effort by the CRA to penetrate all Republic of Vietnam Government agencies, foreign embassies, and other specialized organizations. Party and military intelligence units and agents work closely with the CRA.

Each of the main centers operating under CRA headquarters has its own sections and units designed to carry out its main functions. The center at Vinh Linh, responsible for the main infiltration effort of the Vietcong, has separate sections for radio communications, coding, documentation and training, and liaison. It also has specialized units for infiltration through the mountains, infiltration by sea, and "illegal action" in the mountain area.

The CRA maintains a large and expanding radio communications network. Agents also are used to carry messages, usually in secret writing or memorized.

Taken as a whole, the North Vietnamese intelligence operation in support of the Vietcong is one of the most extensive of its kind in the world.[8]

V. A BRIEF HISTORY OF HANOI'S CAMPAIGN OF AGGRESSION AGAINST SOUTH VIETNAM

While negotiating an end to the Indochina war at Geneva in 1954, the Communists were making plans to take over all former French territory in southeast Asia. When Vietnam was partitioned, thousands of carefully selected party members were ordered to remain in place in the south and keep their secret apparatus intact to help promote Hanoi's cause. Arms and ammunition were stored away for future use. Guerrilla fighters rejoined their families to await the party's call. Others withdrew to remote jungle and mountain hideouts. The majority, an estimated 90,000, were moved to North Vietnam.

Hanoi's original calculation was that all of Vietnam would fall under its control without resort to force. For this purpose, Communist cadres were ordered to penetrate official and nonofficial agencies, to propagandize and sow confusion, and generally to use all means short of open violence to aggravate war-torn conditions and to weaken South Vietnam's government and social fabric.

South Vietnam's refusal to fall in with Hanoi's scheme for peaceful takeover came as a heavy blow to the Communists. Meantime, the Government had stepped up efforts to blunt Vietcong subversion and to expose Communist agents. Morale in the Communist organization in the south dropped sharply. Defections were numerous.

Among South Vietnamese, hope rose that their nation could have a peaceful and independent future, free of Communist domination. The country went to work. The years after 1955 were a period of steady progress and growing prosperity.

Food production levels of the prewar years were reached and surpassed. While per capita food output was dropping 10 percent in the north from 1956 to 1960, it rose 20 percent in the south. By 1963 it had risen 30 percent, despite the disruption in the countryside caused by intensified Vietcong military attacks and terrorism. The authorities in the north admitted openly to continuing annual failures to achieve food production goals.

Production of textiles increased in the south more that 20 percent in 1 year (1958). In the same year, South Vietnam's sugar crop increased more than 100 percent. Despite North Vietnam's vastly larger industrial complex, South Vietnam's per capita gross national product in 1960 was estimated at $110 a person while it was only $70 in the North.

More than 900,000 refugees who had fled from Communist rule in the North were successfully settled in South Vietnam. An agrarian reform program was instituted. The elementary school population nearly quadrupled between 1956 and 1960. And so it went—a record of steady improvement in the lives of the people. It was intolerable for the rulers in Hanoi; under peaceful conditions, the south was outstripping the north. They were losing the battle of peaceful competition and decided to use violence and terror to gain their ends.

After 1956 Hanoi rebuilt, reorganized, and expanded its covert political and military machinery in the South. Defectors were replaced by trained personnel from party ranks in the north. Military units and political cells were enlarged and were given new leaders, equipment, and intensified training. Recruitment was pushed. In short, Hanoi and its forces in the South prepared to take by force and violence what they had failed to achieve by other means.

By 1958 the use of terror by the Vietcong increased appreciably. It was used both to win prestige and to back up demands for support from the people, support that political and propaganda appeals had failed to produce. It was also designed to embarrass the Government in Saigon and raise doubts about its ability to maintain internal order and to assure the personal security of its people. From 1959 through 1961, the pace of Vietcong terrorism and armed attacks accelerated substantially.

The situation at the end of 1961 was so grave that the Government of the Republic of Vietnam asked the United States for increased military assistance. That request was met. Meantime, the program of strategic hamlets, designed to improve the peasant's livelihood and give him some protection against Vietcong harassment and pressure, was pushed energetically.

[8] Charts of the VC organizational structure are in app. H.

But the Vietcong did not stand still. To meet the changing situation, they tightened their organization and adopted new tactics, with increasing emphasis on terrorism, sabotage, and armed attacks by small groups. They also introduced from the North technicians in fields such as armor and antiaircraft. Heavier weapons were sent in to the regular guerrilla forces.

The military and insurgency situation was complicated by a quite separate internal political struggle in South Vietnam, which led in November 1963 to the removal of the Diem government and its replacement with a new one. Effective power was placed in the hands of a Military Revolutionary Council. There have been a number of changes in the leadership and composition of the Government in Saigon in the ensuing period.

These internal developments and distractions gave the Vietcong an invaluable opportunity, and they took advantage of it. Vietcong agents did what they could to encourage disaffection and to exploit demonstrations in Saigon and elsewhere. In the countryside the Communists consolidated their hold over some areas and enlarged their military and political apparatus by increased infiltration. Increasingly they struck at remote outposts and the most vulnerable of the new strategic hamlets and expanded their campaign of aggressive attacks, sabotage, and terror.

Any official, worker, or establishment that represents a service to the people by the Government in Saigon is fair game for the Vietcong. Schools have been among their favorite targets. Through harassment, the murder of teachers, and sabotage of buildings, the Vietcong succeeded in closing hundreds of schools and interrupting the education of tens of thousands of youngsters.

Hospitals and medical clinics have often been attacked as part of the anti-Government campaign and also because such attacks provide the Vietcong with needed medical supplies. The Communists have encouraged people in rural areas to oppose the Government's antimalaria teams, and some of the workers have been killed. Village and town offices, police stations, and agricultural research stations are high on the list of preferred targets for the Vietcong.

In 1964, 436 South Vietnamese hamlet chiefs and other Government officials were killed outright by the Vietcong and 1,131 were kidnaped. More than 1,350 civilians were killed in bombings and other acts of sabotage. And at least 8,400 civilians were kidnaped by the Vietcong.[9]

Today the war in Vietnam has reached new levels of intensity. The elaborate effort by the Communist regime in North Vietnam to conquer the South has grown, not diminished. Military men, technicians, political organizers, propagandists, and secret agents have been infiltrating into the Republic of Vietnam from the north in growing numbers. The flow of Communist-supplied weapons, particularly those of large caliber, has increased. Communications links with Hanoi are extensive. Despite the heavy casualties of 3 years of fighting, the hard-core VC force is considerably larger now than it was at the end of 1961.

The Government in Saigon has undertaken vigorous action to meet the new threat. The United States and other free countries have increased their assistance to the Vietnamese Government and people. Secretary of State Dean Rusk visited Vietnam in 1964, and he promised the Vietnamese: "We shall remain at your side until the aggression from the north has been defeated, until it has been completely rooted out and this land enjoys the peace which it deserves."

President Johnson has repeatedly stressed that the U.S. goal is to see peace secured in southeast Asia. But he has noted that "that will come only when aggressors leave their neighbors in peace."

Though it has been apparent for years that the regime in Hanoi was conducting a campaign of conquest against South Vietnam, the Government in Saigon and the Government of the United States both hoped that the danger could be met within South Vietnam itself. The hope that any widening of the conflict might be avoided was stated frequently.

The leaders in Hanoi chose to respond with greater violence. They apparently interpreted restraint as indicating lack of will. Their efforts were pressed with greater vigor and armed attacks and incidents of terror multiplied.

Clearly the restraint of the past was not providing adequately for the defense of South Vietnam against Hanoi's open aggression. It was mutually agreed between the Governments of the Republic of Vietnam and the United States that further means for providing for South Vietnam's defense were required. Therefore, air strikes have been made against some of the military assembly points and supply bases from which North Vietnam is conducting its aggression against the South. These strikes constitute a limited response fitted to the aggression that produced them.

Until the regime in Hanoi decides to halt its intervention in the South, or until effective steps are taken to maintain peace and security in the area, the Governments of South Vietnam and the United States will continue necessary measures of defense against the Communist armed aggression coming from North Vietnam.

VI. CONCLUSION

The evidence presented in this report could be multiplied many times with similar examples of the drive of the Hanoi regime to extend its rule over South Vietnam.

The record is conclusive. It establishes beyond question that North Vietnam is carrying out a carefully conceived plan of aggression against the South. It shows that North Vietnam has intensified its efforts in the years since it was condemned by the International Control Commission. It proves that Hanoi continues to press its systematic program of armed aggression into South Vietnam. This aggression violates the United Nations Charter. It is directly contrary to the Geneva Accords of 1954 and of 1962 to which North Vietnam is a party. It shatters the peace of southeast Asia. It is a fundamental threat to the freedom and security of South Vietnam.

The people of South Vietnam have chosen to resist this threat. At their request, the United States has taken its place beside them in their defensive struggle.

The United States seeks no territory, no military bases, no favored position. But we have learned the meaning of aggression elsewhere in the postwar world, and we have met it.

If peace can be restored in South Vietnam, the United States will be ready at once to reduce its military involvement. But it will not abandon friends who want to remain free. It will do what must be done to help them. The choice now between peace and continued and increasingly destructive conflict is one for the authorities in Hanoi to make.

APPENDIX A

FINDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONTROL COMMISSION

On June 2, 1962, the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam (ICC) sent a special report to the Governments of the United Kingdom and of the Soviet Union in their role as cochairmen of the Geneva Conference on Indochina. The ICC is composed of delegates from India (chairman), Canada, and Poland.

In its report the ICC noted the following finding of the Commission's Legal Committee:

"Having examined the complaints and the supporting material sent by the South Vietnamese mission, the committee has come to the conclusion that in specific instances there is evidence to show that armed and unarmed personnel, arms, munitions, and other supplies have been sent from the zone in the north to the zone in the south with the object of supporting, organizing, and carrying out hostile activities, including armed attacks, directed against the armed forces and administration of the zone in the south. These acts are in violation of articles 10, 19, 24, and 27 of the agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Vietnam.

"In examining the complaints and the supporting material in particular documentary material sent by the South Vietnamese mission, the Committee has come to the further conclusion that there is evidence to show that the PAVN (people's army of Vietnam) has allowed the zone in the north to be used for inciting, encouraging and supporting the hostile activities in the zone in the south, aimed at the overthrow of the administration in the south. The use of the zone in the north for such activities is in violation of articles 19, 24, and 27 of the agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Vietnam.

The ICC report then stated:

"The Commission accepts the conclusions reached by the Legal Committee that there is sufficient evidence to show beyond reasonable doubt that the PAVN has violated articles 10, 19, 24, and 27 in specific instances. The Polish delegation dissents from these conclusions. On the basis of the fuller report, that is being prepared by the Legal Committee covering all the allegations and incidents, the Commission will take action as appropriate in each individual case."

The full text of the ICC reports is contained in a publication, "Special Reports to the Cochairmen of the Geneva Conference on Indochina" issued by the Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs of the Department of State on July 2, 1962.

APPENDIX B

INFILTRATION OF MILITARY PERSONNEL FROM NORTH VIETNAM INTO SOUTH VIETNAM

(See sec. I, B.)

(Maps showing infiltration routes not printed in the RECORD.)

APPENDIX C

DETAIL ON MILITARY INFILTRATION WITH CASE STUDIES

(See sec. I, B, and C.)

The following table shows the scale of infiltration of military personnel from North Vietnam into the South since 1959. The confirmed list is based on information on infiltration groups from at least two independent sources.

Year	Confirmed	Estimated additional	Total
1959–60	1,800	2,700	4,500
1961	3,750	1,650	5,400
1962	5,400	7,000	12,400
1963	4,200	3,200	7,400
1964	4,400	3,000	7,400
Total	19,550	17,550	37,100

Brief case histories of typical Vietcong who were sent into South Vietnam by the authorities in Hanoi follow:

Name: Le Van Thanh.

Alias: Huu Tam.

Date and place of birth: July 12, 1936, Hoa Hao hamlet, Cat Tai village, Phu Cat district (Binh Dinh).

[9] For additional details of VC terrorism, see app. I.

Rank and position in North Vietnam: Lieutenant, formerly platoon leader of signal platoon of 3d Battalion, 90th Regiment, 324th Division.

VC position in South Vietnam: Platoon leader of signal platoon of 95th Battalion, 2d Regiment, 5th Inter-Region.

Date entered South Vietnam: Departed November 27, 1961, arrived Do Xa station early February 1962.

Date, place, and circumstance of defection: Rallied to government at Nhon Loc post, Nghia Hanh district (Quang Ngai), May 24, 1962.

Name: La Thanh.

Alias: Nguyen Ba Tong—La Giau.

Date and place of birth: 1928, Can Tho city (Phong Dinh).

Rank and position in North Vietnam: Senior sergeant, formerly squad leader in charge of construction of barracks for 338th Division.

VC position in South Vietnam: Squad leader, 8th Squad, 3d Platoon, 3d Company, 218B Battalion (War Zone D).

Date entered South Vietnam: Accompanied Infiltration Group 15; departed April 4, 1962, arrived War Zone D early August 1962.

Date, place, and circumstance of defection: Rallied at Cau Song Be (bridge) post September 8, 1962, with 1 MAS 36.

Name: Le Van Quyen.

Alias: Ho Hai, Hong Thanh.

Date and place of birth: 1929, Tan Binh Than village, Cho Gao district (My Tho).

Rank and position in North Vietnam: Lieutenant, formerly assigned to 388th Brigade as instructor on heavy weapons such as 57 mm. recoilless rifle and machinegun.

VC position in South Vietnam: Platoon leader, 2d Platoon, 2d Company, Infiltration Group 15.

Date entered South Vietnam: Accompanied Infiltration Group 15; departed April 3, 1962, arrived Suoi Da (War Zone D) September 10, 1962.

Date, place, and circumstance of defection: Rallied at Hieu Liem district (Phuoc Thanh) October 7, 1962.

Name: Nguyen Van Do.

Party name: Thanh Minh.

Infiltration alias: Nguyen Thuan.

Date and place of birth: 1923, Thuan Giao village, Lai Thieu district (Binh Duong).

Rank and position in North Vietnam: Senior captain (battalion commander) 1st Battalion, 338th Brigade.

VC position in South Vietnam: Subject was to be appointed commander of Phuoc Tuy Province Main Force Battalion.

Date entered South Vietnam: Commander of Infiltration Group H. 26; departed Xuan Mai, Ha Dong (North Vietnam) July 4, 1963; arrived Ban Me Thuot October 23, 1963.

Date, place, and circumstance of defection: Rallied at Ban Don post, Ban Me Thout, October 23, 1963, while guiding Group H. 26 to Hai Yen Zone.

Name: Nguyen Thanh Phi.

Party name: Hung Phuong.

Infiltration alias: Nguyen Tu.

Date and place of birth: November 16, 1926, Thanh Van village, Thanh Chuong district (Nghe An).

Rank and position in North Vietnam: Doctor, chief of internal disease section, Tiep Viet Hospital.

VC position in South Vietnam: Doctor, health team leader, 5th Region base construction group (Do Xa).

Date entered South Vietnam: March 1962.

Date, place, and circumstance of capture: Captured by South Vietnamese armed forces May 4, 1963, with one 12-millimeter Colt pistol and five rounds.

Name: Le Van Net.

Party name: Le Hung Tien.

Infiltration alias: Le Na.

Date and place of birth: 1924, Tan Hiep village, Go Cong, Dinh Tuong.

Rank and position in North Vietnam: Discharged lieutenant, served in Co Dinh chromite mine (Thanh Hoa) with grade of senior sergeant.

VC position in South Vietnam: Senior sergeant, 6th Squad, 2d Platoon, Infiltration Group H. 26.

Date entered South Vietnam: Late June 1963 with Infiltration Group H. 26.

Date, place, and circumstance of capture: Captured November 16, 1963, by inhabitants in strategic hamlet in Ban Me Thout (Darlac) with one Communist Chinese rifle and 70 rounds.

Name: Van Cong Khanh.

Narty name: Pham Tien.

Date and place of birth: 1924, An Hoi village, Chau Thanh district (Kien Hoa).

Rank and position in North Vietnam: Discharged and reassigned to Co Dinh chromite mine (Thanh Hoa) as senior sergeant.

VC position in South Vietnam: Aspirant, leader of 7th Squad, 3d Platoon, 608th Engineer Company subordinate to Headquarters Region 7.

Date entered South Vietnam: Accompanied Group 49, infiltrated into South Vietnam, March 18, 1962.

Date, place, and circumstance of capture: captured November 23, 1962, in Bung Dia hamlet.

Name: Nguyen Thanh Hoa.

Party name: Quoc.

Infiltration alias: Nguyen Quoc Trung.

Date and place of birth: 1917, Phong Coc village, Ha Nam canton (Quang Yen).

Rank and position in North Vietnam: Captain, discharged and reassigned to Chi Ne agricultural camp May 1957.

VC position in South Vietnam: Commander, 4th Main Force Battalion.

Date entered South Vietnam: Accompanied Infiltration Group 52; departed Xuan Mai, April 13, 1961, arrived about August 1961.

Date, place, and circumstance of capture: Captured by South Vietnamese Armed Forces with 1 PA 38 (pistol) in Quon Long (Dinh Tuong) August 1962.

Name: Tran van Khoa.

Alias: Tran Hong Hai.

Date and place of birth: 1935, Giong Gach hamlet, An Hiep village, Ba Tri district, Ben Tre Province (Kien Hoa).

Rank and position in North Vietnam: Sergeant, formerly driver of Transportation Group 3 of (Hanoi) Logistical Bureau.

VC position in South Vietnam: Member of 46th Infiltration Company; cover designation V. 2 (infiltrated unit).

Date entered South Vietnam: Accompanied the 46th Infiltration Company; departed for South Vietnam, April 17, 1962.

Date, place, and circumstance of capture: Captured by South Vietnamese Rangers in ambush (after being wounded) along with one MAS 36, July 7, 1962, in Phuoc Long Province.

APPENDIX D

LIST OF COMMUNIST WEAPONS CAPTURED IN SOUTH VIETNAM

(See sec. II.)

On January 29, 1964, the Government of Vietnam submitted to the International Control Commission a list of weapons and other military equipment which had been captured from the Vietcong. The weapons and equipment came from Communist sources outside South Vietnam and obviously had been introduced clandestinely into the country in support of the Vietcong campaign of conquest directed by Hanoi.

I. Chinese Communist origin

Type	Quantity	Date of capture	Place
75-millimeter recoilless rifle	1	Sept. 10, 1963	An Xuyen Province.
Do	1	Dec. 2-6, 1963	Do.
Do	1	Dec. 22, 1963	Dinh Tuong.
Total	3		
57-millimeter recoilless gun	1	Nov. 25, 1962	Phuoc Chau in Quang Tin (1 gun and 7 gun carriages).
Do		Dec. 5, 1962	Phu Bon (1 gun carriage).
Do	2	Aug. 31, 1963	Province of Quang Ngai.
Total	13		
Shells for 75-millimeter gun (shells bear markings in Chinese characters. On some shells, markings were scratched out and replaced by "American" markings.)	8	Nov. 24, 1963	Province of An Xuyen.
Do	120	Dec. 22, 1963	Operation Duc Thang at Dinh Tuong.
Total	128		
Shells for 57-millimeter gun	49	Nov. 25, 1962	Phuoc Chau, Province of Quang Tin.
Do	8	Feb. 20, 1963	Vietcong attack on the post of Ben Heo (Tay Ninh).
Do	33	May 24, 1963	On a Vietcong vessel on the Bassac River.
Do	6	Aug. 31, 1963	Quang Ngai.
Do	1	Oct. 8, 1963	Province of Bihn Dinh.
Do	58	Dec. 22, 1963	Dinh Tuong.
Total	155		
80-millimeter mortar	1	Mar. 25, 1963	Province of Tay Ninh.
60-millimeter mortar	1	Jan. 7, 1963	Phuoc Thanh.
Do	2	Dec. 22, 1963	Dinh Tuong.
Total	3		

I. Chinese Communist origin—Continued

Type	Quantity	Date of capture	Place
Shells for 60-millimeter mortar	18	Sept. 10, 1963	Province of An Xuyen.
Do	165	Dec. 23, 1963	Dinh Tuong.
Total	183		
90-millimeter bazooka	1	Dec. 22, 1963	Do.
Caliber 27-millimeter rocket launcher	2	June 10, 1962	Provinces of Quang Ngai and Quang Duc.
Total	3		
Caliber 7.92-millimeter model 08 Maxim machinegun	2	Sept. 10, 1963	Province of An Xuyen.
Do	4	Dec. 21, 1963	Chuong Thien.
Total	6		
MP-82 rocket	142	Apr. 24, 1963	Quang Ngai.
TNT explosives (charges)	365	June 13, 1962	Quang Duc.
Do	43	Nov. 25, 1962	Phuoc Chau (Quang Tin).
Do	29	May 7, 1963	Can Tho.
Do	140	Dec. 22, 1963	Dinh Tuong.
Total	577		
Red phosphorous (kilograms)	5	Apr. 19, 1963	Province of Kien Phong.
Potassium chlorate (tons)	17	September 1962	On a Vietcong vessel at Phu Quoc.
Do	2	Apr. 19, 1963	Province of Kien Phong.
Potassium chlorate (kilograms)	150	July 10-15, 1963	Phu Quoc.
Total:			
Tons	19		
Kilograms	155		
Cartridges for 7.92-millimeter machinegun	100,000	Dec. 22, 1963	Dinh Tuong.
Detonating fuses for 60-millimeter mortar shell	150	do	Do.

[1] Guns plus 8 gun carriages.

II. Soviet origin

Type	Quantity	Date of capture	Place
MP-82 rifle		May 10, 1962	Binh Dinh.
Launching cartridges		do	Do.
Mossin Nagant carbine (with automatic bayonet)	1	June 13, 1963	Kien Phong.
Do	2	July 13, 1963	Long An.
Do	5	July 20, 1963	Dinh Tuong.
Do	7	Sept. 8, 1963	Do.
Total	15		
Rifles	6	Oct. 6, 1963	Long An.
Do	1	Oct. 19, 1963	Dinh Tuong.
Do	11	Nov. 6, 1963	Vinh Binh.
Do	1	Nov. 17, 1963	Dinh Tuong.
Do	1	Nov. 25, 1963	Hau Nghia.
Do	1	Dec. 6, 1963	Dinh Tuong.
Do	8	Dec. 7, 1963	Phong Dinh.
Do	1	Dec. 12, 1963	Kien Tuong.
Do	1	Dec. 13, 1963	An Xuyen.
Do	1	Dec. 16, 1963	Kien Giang.
Do	1	do	Ba Xuyen.
Do	3	do	An Xuyen.
Do	1	Dec. 17, 1963	Phong Dinh.
Do	1	Dec. 20, 1963	Kien Hoa.
Do	6	Dec. 21, 1963	Chuong Thien.
Do	2	Dec. 22, 1963	Dinh Tuong.
Total	46		
Automatic pistol	1	Oct. 19, 1963	Phan Thiet.
Grenades	5		Long An.
Rifle cartridges	160,000	Dec. 22 1963	Dinh Tuong.
Submachinegun (machine pistol)	2	Sept. 23, 1963	Long Xuyen.

III. Czech origin

Type	Quantity	Date of capture	Place
7.65-millimeter automatic pistol	1	Jan. 2, 1963	On person of Vietcong leader arrested at Phu Yen.
K-50 submachinegun	2	Nov. 25, 1962	Quang Tin.
Do	1	Nov. 29, 1962	Phuoc Long.
Do	7	Apr. 24, 1963	Quang Ngai.
Do	5	May 9, 1963	Quang Tin.
Do	2	July 11, 1963	Operation Hau Giang.
Do	3	Aug. 31, 1963	Quang Ngai.
Do	1	Sept. 8, 1963	Dinh Tuong.
Do	1	Sept. 16, 1963	Long An.
Do	1	Oct. 17, 1963	Quang Nam.
Do	2	Nov. 13, 1963	Phu Yen.
Do	1	do	At Huế.
Do	9	Oct. 8, 1963	Binh Dinh.
Do	1		Operation Phuoc Binh Thang.
Do	1	Dec. 30, 1963	Kien Hoa.
Do	1	Dec. 26 1963	Chuong Thien.
Do	1	Dec. 17, 1963	Long Xuyen.
Total	40		

III. Czech origin—Continued

Type	Quantity	Date of capture	Place
Rifles	9	Sept. 10, 1963	An Xuyen.
Do	1	Oct. 19, 1963	Chuong Thien.
Do	1	Nov. 6, 1963	Ba Xuyen.
Do	2	Nov. 9, 1963	Chuong Thien.
Do	3	Nov. 13, 1963	Kien Giang.
Do	1	Nov. 17, 1963	Ba Xuyen.
Do	2	Nov. 26, 1963	Hau Nghia.
Do	1	Dec. 2, 1963	Phong Dinh.
Do	6	Dec. 21, 1963	Chuong Thien.
Total	26		
Machinegun cartridges	14,000	Dec. 22, 1963	Dinh Tuong.
Grenade launcher	1	July 14, 1963	Long An.
3.5 antitank bazooka	1	Dec. 22, 1963	Din Tuong.

IV. (a) Weapons and ammunition modified by the Regular Army of North Vietnam

Type	Quantity	Date of capture	Place
Modified MAT-49	16	Nov. 25, 1962	Quang Tin.
Do	2	Dec. 5, 1963	Phu Bon.
Do	6	Nov. 13, 1963	
Total	24		
12.7-millimeter machinegun	2	Nov. 24, 1963	Operation at Duc Hoa.

IV. (b) Material and equipment of North Vietnamese manufacture

Type	Quantity	Date of capture	Place
Uniform		Dec. 21, 1962	Phuoc Thanh.
Helmets	16	Oct. 8–10, 1963	Kien Hoa.
Socks	(1)	Dec. 21, 1962	Phuoc Thanh.
Sweaters (made in Ha Dong)	(1)		Do.
Belts (made in Hanoi)	(1)		Do.
Mess Kits (made in Haiphong)	(1)		Do.

[1] No number given.

APPENDIX E

PHOTOS OF CAPTURED VIETCONG WEAPONS AND AMMUNITION FROM EXTERNAL COMMUNIST SOURCES

(See sec. II.)

The following are photographs of some of the many weapons and the large stocks of ammunition supplied to the Vietcong in South Vietnam from external Communist sources (not printed in the RECORD).

APPENDIX F

NORTH VIETNAMESE PASSPORTS AND TRAVEL DOCUMENTS USED BY LIBERATION FRONT OFFICIALS

(See sec. IV, A, 1.)

Huynh Van Nghia and Nguyen Van Tien are officials of the "National Liberation Front of South Vietnam." Though they profess to be citizens of South Vietnam, their ties are with and their support comes from North Vietnam and the Communist regime in Hanoi. In 1963, when the two men traveled abroad on front business, they traveled as North Vietnamese with passports and other documents issued by the Hanoi regime.

Photographs of these documents follow (not printed in the RECORD).

APPENDIX G

THE PEOPLE'S REVOLUTIONARY PARTY (SOUTH) AND THE LAO DONG PARTY (NORTH) ARE ONE COMMUNIST PARTY

(See sec. IV, A.)

In May 1962 a military force of the Government of Vietnam captured a number of Vietcong documents in Ba Xuyen Province. One of these documents contained instructions from the provincial committee of the Lao Dong Party (Communist Party) in Ba Xuyen to the party's district committees concerning formation of the new People's Revolutionary Party (PRP).

Pertinent sections of the instruction, dated December 7, 1961, follow:

"To D2 and K:

"In regard to the foundation of the People's Revolutionary Party of South Vietnam, the creation of this party is only a matter of strategy; it needs to be explained within the party; and, to deceive the enemy, it is necessary that the new party be given the outward appearance corresponding to a division of the party (Lao Dong) into two and the foundation of a new party, so that the enemy cannot use it in his propaganda.

"Within the party, it is necessary to explain that the founding of the People's Revolutionary Party has the purpose of isolating the Americans and the Ngo Dinh Diem regime, and to counter their accusations of an invasion of the South by the North. It is means of supporting our sabotage of the Geneva agreement, of advancing the plan of invasion of the South, and at the same time permitting the Front for Liberation of the South to recruit new adherents, and to gain the sympathy of nonalined countries in southeast Asia.

"The People's Revolutionary Party has only the appearance of an independent existence; actually, our party is nothing but the Lao Dong Party of Vietnam (Vietminh Communist Party), unified from North to South, under the direction of the central executive committee of the party, the chief of which is President Ho. * * *

"During these explanations, take care to keep this strictly secret, especially in South Vietnam, so that the enemy does not perceive our purpose. * * *

"Do not put these explanations in party bulletins."

Another party circular of the same date said:

"The reasons for the change in the party's name must be kept stricly secret. According to instructions of the Central Committee, one must not tell the people or party sympathizers that the People's Revolutionary Party and the Lao Dong Party of Vietnam are one. One must not say that it is only a tactic, because it would not be good for the enemy to know."

A third party circular, dated December 8, 1961, said:

"Study the instructions so that you will be able to execute them. In passing them to D2V, D2, and K, be very careful that the documents do not fall into enemy hands. After D2N/C has passed to the sections, destroy the written documents immediately."

The originals and translations of the above documents were submitted to the International Control Commission by the Government of Vietnam on May 30, 1962.[1]

In 1964 new rules and regulations were promulgated for the People's Revolutionary Party. A copy of the new rules was captured from the Vietcong in Chuong Thien Province in November 1964. A photograph of the captured document appears on the next page. Key portions of the instructions said that new rules and regulations had been approved for the PRP, "but the real nature of those rules and regulations is that they still are the rules and regulations of the Vietnam Lao Dong Party (in North Vietnam)."

The instructions added: "* * * we should realize that our country is one country, that

[1] For picture of captured documents and text, see the white paper "Communist Vietminh Aggressive Policy," published by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam, Saigon, July 1962.

the Vietnamese People's Revolutionary Party and the Vietnam Lao Dong Party are one party. * * * There is nothing different between the two parties."

APPENDIX H

CHARTS OF THE VIETCONG ORGANIZATION, NORTH AND SOUTH

(See sec. IV.)

Lines of control, political and military, from the Hanoi regime to the Vietcong in South Vietnam (charts not printed in the RECORD).

APPENDIX I

DETAIL ON VIETCONG TERRORISM

(See section V.)

The following table lists the Government officials and other civilians killed, wounded, or missing as a result of Vietcong terrorist activities during 1964. Combat casualties are not included:

Village, district, and other Government officials

	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
Killed	47	34	49	30	25	31	45	36	46	48	21	24
Wounded	14	16	24	9	8	9	14	15	13	10	22	7
Kidnaped	93	113	91	67	74	132	93	103	144	69	52	100
Total	154	163	164	106	107	172	152	154	203	127	95	131

Other civilians

	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
Killed	111	110	138	115	105	110	181	103	132	100	66	88
Wounded	146	174	239	218	163	173	194	122	203	90	94	154
Kidnaped	694	590	1,531	647	727	483	964	834	778	477	200	498
Total	951	874	1,908	980	995	766	1,339	1,059	1,113	667	360	740

The following table shows the number of incidents of Vietcong terrorism, sabotage, forced propaganda sessions, and armed attacks during 1964:

	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
Attacks	223	217	203	220	175	140	184	113	118	83	60	96
Terrorism	1,244	1,389	1,632	1,738	1,418	1,390	2,123	1,775	1,938	1,790	1,391	1,719
Sabotage	129	201	158	169	217	176	286	315	482	480	247	318
Propaganda	174	271	167	157	140	162	224	173	178	197	109	128

Some of the consequences of Vietcong terrorism are shown in the accompanying photographs (not printed in the RECORD).

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL

(Signed by A. Stevenson)

(Circular No. 1589, dated February 27.)

For the information of members of the Security Council, I am transmitting a special report entitled "Aggression from the North, the Record of North Vietnam's Campaign To Conquer South Vietnam," which my Government is making public today. It presents evidence from which the following conclusions are inescapable:

First, the subjugation by forces of the Republic of Vietnam by the regime in northern Vietnam is the formal, official policy of that regime; this has been stated and confirmed publicly over the past 5 years.

Second, the war in Vietnam is directed by the Central Committee of the Lao Dong Party (Communist) which controls the government in northern Vietnam.

Third, the so-called Peoples Revolutionary Party in the Republic of Vietnam is an integral part of the Lao Dong Party in North Vietnam.

Fourth, the so-called Liberation Front for South Vietnam is a subordinate unit of the Central Office for South Vietnam, an integral part of the governmental machinery in Hanoi.

Fifth, the key leadership of the Vietcong—officers, specialists, technicians, intelligence agents, political organizers and propagandists—has been trained, equipped and supplied in the north and sent into the Republic of Vietnam under Hanoi's military orders.

Sixth, most of the weapons, including new types recently introduced, and most of the ammunition and other supplies used by the Vietcong, have been sent from North to South Vietnam.

Seventh, the scale of infiltration of men and arms, including regular units of the Armed Forces of North Vietnam, has increased appreciably in recent months.

Eighth, this entire pattern of activity by the regime in Hanoi is in violation of general principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations, and is in direct violation of the Geneva accord of 1954. Such a pattern of violation of the treaty obligations undertaken at Geneva was confirmed by a special report of the International Control Commission in 1962 and it has been greatly intensified since then.

These facts about the situation in Vietnam make it unmistakably clear that the character of that conflict is an aggressive war of conquest waged against a neighbor—and makes nonsense of the cynical allegation that this is simply an indigenous insurrection.

I request that you circulate copies of the report, together with copies of this letter, to the delegations of all member states as a Security Council document.

In making this information available to the Security Council, my Government wishes to say once more that peace can be restored quickly to Vietnam by a prompt and assured cessation of aggression by Hanoi against the Republic of Vietnam. In that event, my Government—as it has said many times before, would be happy to withdraw its military forces from the Republic of Vietnam and turn promptly to an international effort to assist the economic and social development of southeast Asia.

In the meantime, my Government awaits the first indication of any intent by the Government in Hanoi to return to the ways of peace and peaceful resolution of this international conflict.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to read to the Senate the concluding sentences of Mr. Stevenson. They are very brief; it seems to me they state something which has not been expressed to the world:

In making this information available to the Security Council, my Government wishes to say once more that peace can be restored quickly to Vietnam by a prompt and assured cessation of aggression by Hanoi against the Republic of Vietnam. In that event, my Government—as it has said many times before, would be happy to withdraw its military forces from the Republic of Vietnam and turn promptly to an international effort to assist the economic and social development of southeast Asia.

In the meantime, my Government awaits the first indication of any intent by the government in Hanoi to return to the ways of peace and peaceful resolution of this international conflict.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CANNON. I congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin for a very fine and excellent outline of our goals in South Vietnam and what we have been trying to do to assist the people of South Vietnam.

Most important of all, the fact is that all we desire is peace, an end to the fighting and terror in South Vietnam, and the preservation of the freedom of the South Vietnamese people or any other people to make their own determination as to the kind of government under which they wish to live. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that this is no time to talk about negotiation, because even a discussion of the possibility of negotiation leads our allies to believe that we perhaps are getting into a position of thinking about abandoning them and to pull out of southeast Asia. In my opinion, if we were to pull out of South Vietnam and, in effect, turn over all of southeast Asia to communism, it would certainly constitute surrender.

I again congratulate the Senator for a very fine outline and a very fine speech on the subject.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada very much. I deeply appreciate his supporting statment.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. While I did not hear the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin deliver his speech, I have had an opportunity to read a considerable portion of it. I commend the Senator from Wisconsin, not only for his forthright approach, but also the fact that he has clarified the big question which people frequently ask. That is, Why are we in South Vietnam?

The question has been asked of me by any number of people. The Senator's

speech helps greatly to answer the question. I have discussed the subject with the President. I have had the benefit of the most candid kind of briefing. For the first time in my experience, the present President of the United States not only gave us a briefing, but invited questions, which he offered to answer himself. I think this is better than the equivalent of the British system, under which there is a question period on the floor of Parliament. We were not only complimented by that procedure, but we were immensely helped, because we posed to the President rather pointed questions and we received answers with which I found myself in agreement.

The President has made it perfectly clear—and I am referring, now, not to briefings but to public statements—that he intends to stay in North Vietnam until our responsibilities and objectives have been achieved.

As the Senator from Wisconsin himself has said in his speech, we seek nothing of material advantage. We are there at great sacrifice. Our future policies there must be not only to preserve our commitment but to seek in every way we can to reduce casualties. In my considered judgment—and I ask the Senator if he agrees with it—the surest way to reduce casualties in South Vietnam is not to negotiate from weakness, which is not to say that we may in the future be in a position to negotiate from strength, should the aggressor at some point sue for it. To negotiate from weakness would merely transfer the war from South Vietnam to Thailand, which the Communists have already indicated is next on their list, a country which has been independent for a thousand years, a country which has never been occupied colonially. If Thailand goes and Burma goes, and if India comes under the guns, the question seems to me to be, When do we stop running?

I do not believe the American people are yet aware that if we withdraw from southeast Asia, the Communists would not give up a single objective, which is to expand their empire—their materialistic, imperialistic empire—to include all of the islands, including the fifth largest country in the world, Indonesia. If that happened, the 7th Fleet would in time retreat. We would be faced with the loss of Okinawa. Under those circumstances, we would have to move our fleet from the area of Formosa and would cease to be a Pacific power. We would then have left the world in a state of the most dangerous imbalance in all history; certainly in all modern history. We would then be forced back upon Guam, as our farthest outpost, and the Hawaiian Islands.

The President has strongly indicated that arguments urging that we withdraw from Vietnam at a time when we are in the worst possible position for negotiation have increased, and the diplomatic corps in Washington tell their nations at home that the President does not have the support of the Senate and the House of Representatives. They are wrong, but I know a number of those ambassadors, and I am aware of what they are saying. Does not the Senator from Wisconsin agree that eventually we shall have to come to a place where we shall have to stop running and stand and face this aggressor?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree wholeheartedly with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. Also, I am most grateful to him, as I am sure the President is, for his graceful reference to the President's conferences and to his responding to questions. I have also participated in those conferences. They are most informative and helpful.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is an outstanding leader of the Republican Party, and has been for many years. He speaks in a completely bipartisan sense when he says that we must recognize that if we do not stand in South Vietnam, we shall have to fight under worse conditions, under conditions in which we will have encouraged the Communists and on territory closer to home. We shall have to fight under conditions in which they will have been strengthened. Our danger is increasingly this kind of subversive operation. The Communists have the opportunity to send infiltrators into Vietnam according to the new Communist military strategy which Khrushchev and his successors have said is to be the wave of the future, so far as communism is concerned. They may not rely on nuclear weapons; they will move with subversion, terror, and violence. If they can achieve success in South Vietnam with this, we shall be in terrible danger.

Mr. SCOTT. Does not the Senator agree with me that certain things have happened which may demand the careful attention of the American people generally, in that we are moving now determined, at least, to improve our position in South Vietnam? The most important thing that happened recently was the decision to use our planes in South Vietnam. Certainly this will save lives. It will save the lives of the South Vietnamese by protecting them from the people who have terorrized them. Also, by the use of new jet planes, we shall more successfully make a response to the rather damaging sorties of the enemy than we have heretofore.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree. It is one thing to have military power; it is something else to be willing to use it.

Mr. SCOTT. Exactly.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No matter how great our power may be, if the enemy thinks we are afraid to use it, that power counts as nothing. The fact that we have used it, used it in a limited way, used it responsibly, and have not tried to extend it in any broad way, but have confined it to military targets, has, I believe, enhanced our position and greatly strengthened the position of the South Vietnamese.

Mr. SCOTT. I have spoken with members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as well as with the President. Without any attempt to quote them, except as they have publicly confirmed some of the things they have said, they have answered to my satisfaction the common, rather unthinking statement that the South Vietnamese people are not with us; that they want us out of their country. Their reply has been quite to the contrary.

I have said, for example, that some have argued that the Vietnamese are a good deal like the Laotians. The Laotians, it is argued, are like Ferdinand the Bull. They want to smell the flowers, have picnics, loll around the temples, and do things of that kind. Whether that be true of the Laotians or not—and there is some evidence that some of that trait exists—these informed and qualified experts have said to me, first, that the South Vietnamese have some excellent fighting men, as do the North Vietnamese; that there is a trait or a quality of the Vietnamese which makes them good fighting men.

In South Vietnam, hundreds of thousands have escaped from communism, have become refugees, have taken their lives and their future in their hands to defy communism, and are now living in South Vietnam.

If we were to leave the country, we would turn over to the Communists all of those refugees who have "voted with their feet," as the saying goes; who by their actions have rendered themselves vulnerable to total annihilation by an enemy that knows that they are there. So how can we consider abandoning a nation which has opted for freedom, and whose people, in my opinion, except to the degree to which they have been terrorized in the fields, are just as anti-Communist as we are, perhaps even more so? I think the maxim prevails that the closer one is to communism, the more he dislikes the possibility of having to participate in it. I well recall the large numbers of Chinese and North Korean soldiers who defected from the Panmunjom armistice Communists.

It seems to me that we are reading the whole picture wrong in thinking that the Vietnamese do not want to fight, because if we extrapolate, to use a State Department word—and I also know how to use "vis-a-vis"—the casualties sustained in Vietnam, North and South, relating their population to ours, would compare with about 325,000 people in the United States. That is more than the number of casualties we sustained in the Korean war.

It seems to me that not only would a nation that has been willing to fight on and on in the cause of freedom feel abandoned; but the word would get around through all of Asia and probably pretty well through Europe that the Americans are a "paper tiger"; that we make high-sounding statements; that we sign treaties, as we have with Thailand; that we are strong on promises and talk; but that whenever imperialism—that is, the Communist menace—really presses us, we say we are no longer interested.

Mao Tse-tung has predicted the same thing. He said to a correspondent not long ago that the Americans will tire and give up. That is obviously what they are waiting for.

I commend the Senator again. I regret that I have taken up so much time. I thank the Senator for the opportunity he has given me—as well as for the excellence of his own statement—to show that the loyal opposition is a responsible opposition.

I have not criticized the President in this Congress in any way on any part of his present foreign policy. As a matter of fact, I have not yet criticized him for any part of his domestic policy. But I assume that in time I shall get around to that.

I speak for every Republican Senator. We support the President and uphold him. We recognize that he has proceeded with dignity and discretion. But, so far as guaranteeing peace is concerned, we have not only the freedom of South Vietnam to consider, but also the freedom of this country. I think that freedom, like peace, is indivisible.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. I say once again that I deeply appreciate his superlative expression of bipartisan support for the President's position.

I know it makes a difference not only to President Johnson, but also to our forces in southeast Asia, that a leader of the Republican Party, who has freely criticized when he decides the policy is incorrect, is supporting the President.

Senator SCOTT has demonstrated a great capacity for constructive and positive criticism in the past. He is very effective, sometimes too effective for our comfort. But in this crisis, the great spokesman and statesman for the Republican Party has expressed an unqualified and all-out support for the President's policy in South Vietnam.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have heard the speech of the Senator from Wisconsin, and I have read all of his prepared text. I congratulate the Senator on a very excellent speech and a very significant speech, particularly in view of the fact that the speech is made by the senior Senator from Wisconsin, whom I know to be completely independent. He has not been satisfied to follow anyone's leadership unless he thought it to be right, and he has at times taken that position at considerable cost to himself. He has not been willing to take that lead if he thought it was in error. His speech supporting the administration and the President on Vietnam is especially significant in view of that fact. I congratulate him.

The Senator from Wisconsin has brought out a number of facts which I, even as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, was not completely aware of.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his contribution. I believe his speech will prove to be one of the most constructive contributions to the debate over Vietnam.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I appreciate what the distinguished assistant majority leader has said. It is very encouraging to hear him say that.

THE MESS IN VIETNAM—V

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] for his comprehensive, well organized, well knit, sincere presentation in defense of the course which the administration has been pursuing to date. I do not, as I have sought to make clear for the past year, agree with it and with him.

"What are our goals?" my able colleague asks, and he answers, there are three, and the first is "Peace. An end to the fighting and terror in South Vietnam." Peace.

I recall the words of the prophet who castigated those who cried "Peace, peace, when there is no peace." I refer those who cry "Peace, peace," and support the extension and escalation of the undeclared war and of the fighting not merely in South Vietnam, but beyond, to the fact that we have been in South Vietnam militarily and financially, for 10 years. We continue to cry "Peace, peace, when there is no peace." I have for a year advocated a peaceful approach, a new approach, an effort at least which has never been made to try to enlist the United Nations and to wage peace at least as vigorously as we have waged war.

Now, what has happened in the past 48 hours since the Senate adjourned on Friday?

The State Department has issued a "white paper" over the weekend. It certainly adds no new facts to the already muddied waters of Vietnam.

Of course, North Vietnam is and has been aiding the South Vietnamese Vietcong. That is nothing new. But the fact does remain that we have been aiding the South Vietnamese on a scale far surpassing the aid given by the North Vietnamese. The fact remains that there is a civil war in South Vietnam, with father fighting son and brother fighting brother. The fact remains that the vast majority of the Vietcong—however much training they have received from the North Vietnamese—are from South Vietnam.

The "white paper" goes to elaborate pains to give the impression that we are fighting a Korean-type war in South Vietnam. This is definitely not the case. In Korea we had the majority of the South Koreans fighting alongside American fighting men. The majority of South Vietnamese—however differently they may have felt when first our so-called advisers were sent to South Vietnam—are not on our side fighting earnestly and fiercely for their freedom. And also, in Korea, it was the United Nations forces with the troops of 11 other nations side by side with ours against the North Koreans—it was not, as it is in Vietnam, Americans only and South Vietnamese against the South Vietnamese Vietcong augmented by some North Vietnamese infiltrators.

In the Saturday Review for February 27, 1965, Mr. Norman Cousins, in his leading editorial entitled "Vietnam and the American Conscience," states:

> It is tragic that most of the debate over Vietnam has vibrated between total war and total withdrawal. It is made to appear that the only choice is between absolute victory and absolute defeat. There is an alternative—if our main objective is to promote the stability and security of the area. And that alternative is to involve the United Nations, with all its limitations, to the fullest possible extent.

I have been advocating that course of action since I first spoke on this tragic subject on March 10, 1964—almost a full year ago.

The dangerous course upon which we are now embarked in Vietnam was pointed out in the New York Times on February 28 in an editorial entitled "Storm Signals Over Asia," in which it stated:

> Washington and Peiping are in bizarre tendem as the only major capitals in the free or Communist worlds openly resistant to seeking a negotiated settlement of the Vietnamese conflict now. It is not too late for the President to make it plain that the United States is ready to talk as well as fight, and thus leave China isolated as the obstructor of any attempt to achieve a sound and enforcible peace.

In his article in the Washington Post on February 28, 1965, entitled "Vietnam Fallacies," Mr. Drew Pearson noted, as I have done repeatedly, that the crisis in Vietnam is one which President Johnson inherited and which he should not have assumed.

Mr. Pearson notes three fallacies in popular thinking about the situation in Vietnam:

First. He says:

> We contend that we are in South Vietnam at the request of the popular government, to protect freedom. This is pure bunk. The government has changed so often that no one can keep track of whether Big Minh, Little Minh, or Minnie Mouse is in power.

Second. Mr. Pearson notes:

> We believe that the best way to stop Vietnamese fighting is by retaliatory raids against the North. There are many indications that this also is pure bunk.

Third. Mr. Pearson notes:

> The United States has told our allies privately that we are ready to negotiate a settlement in Indochina but that we want to negotiate from strength. Unfortunately, the longer we remain in South Vietnam the more our strength deteriorates.

There has been speculation in the newspapers about what the polls are showing concerning popular support for an escalation of the war in South Vietnam. Of course, part of the validity of any poll lies in the manner in which the questions on the poll are asked. All I know is that my mail runs over 300 to 1 in favor of the position I have taken, that the Vietnam crisis should be taken to the conference table before it escalates into a major or possibly a thermonuclear war.

As further evidence of the feeling of what I believe to be the vast majority of the American people, two open letters to the President were published in the New York Times for February 28, 1965, and March 1, 1965. These letters are signed by faculty members from numerous universities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial published in the Saturday Review for February 27, 1965, the editorial entitled "Storm Signals Over Asia," from the New York Times for February 28, 1965, the articles by Mr. Drew Pearson, published in the Washington Post for February 26, 27,

and 28, and the two open letters to President Johnson published in the New York Times of February 28 and March 1, 1965, printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in its excellent editorial on February 27, 1965, the New York Times ably points out that if we undertake negotiations on the situation in Vietnam at this point we will not be negotiating from weakness, but from strength. As the New York Times puts it:

> The United States has an immense concentration of naval and air power close to the coast of southeast Asia. It is capable of expanding that power many times over. This fact, with the potential consequences it implies, is well understood in North Vietnam. It is well understood in Moscow. It is well understood, despite all talk of paper tigers, in Peiping.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial published in the New York Times for February 27, 1965, entitled "Mr. Nixon's Totem Pole" be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Saturday Review]

VIETNAM AND THE AMERICAN CONSCIENCE

Vietnam is profoundly complex, but it is not so complex as to defeat the American intelligence or disable the American conscience. Some facts and implications are clear, no matter how murky the general situation.

The first fact is that the United States today does not have the backing of the Vietnamese people in whose name it went into Vietnam in the first place and whom it is seeking to save today. The U.S. military forces have had to cope not just with secret agents from North Vietnam but with the growing opposition of the populace as a whole. In briefings of new U.S. military personnel, the point is stressed that most Vietnamese are either sympathizers with or secret members of the Vietcong. The retaliatory bombings by the United States of North Vietnam targets do not meet the problem represented by internal opposition within South Vietnam itself.

The second fact is that most of the military equipment used against American and South Vietnam military forces has come neither from Communist China nor North Vietnam but from the United States. It is ludicrous to talk about bombing supply lines from North Vietnam as a means of shutting off the flow. According to some estimates, up to 80 percent of the military equipment used by the Vietcong originates in the United States. In largest part, it is either captured by the Vietcong or turned over by supposedly loyal South Vietnamese. No one knows how much of the equipment finds its way to Communist China. A Chinese official interviewed in Peiping several months ago said he was almost reluctant to see the Americans leave; they had contributed so heavily to the Chinese arsenal.

The third fact is that the legal justification invoked by the United States for its involvement in Vietnam has long since been nullified. Under the terms of the 1954 Geneva Agreement, all foreign forces and military equipment were to stay out of Indochina. The United States came with military force into Indochina, most notably in Laos, South Vietnam, and Thailand, declaring it had done so at the request of the governments involved, which was not a violation of the treaty. But nothing in the treaty gave the United States the right to finance revolutionary movements or to participate in undercover subversion. (In Laos in 1960 and 1961, the United States financed and equipped the effort of Gen. Phoumi Nosavan to overthrow the only elected government in the history of Laos. At the same time, the United States continued to pay the salaries of loyalist forces and to furnish their supplies. Thus the United States was in the astonishing position of underwriting both sides of a civil war. Eventually, the situation was restored to its prerevolutionary status, but only after many thousands of civilians were killed or became homeless.)

In South Vietnam, the inability of the Diem government to maintain the support of its own people constituted a severe drag on the war effort. Eventually, the Diem government was overthrown and the Premier assassinated. Later, Frederick E. Nolting, Jr., former Ambassador to South Vietnam, said the United States had been directly involved in the anti-Government plot. Whether Premier Diem was or was not authoritarian and backward is beside the point; the American people have never given their Government a warrant to engage in subversion or murder. Since Diem regimes in South Vietnam have come and gone; which of them has enjoyed genuine legitimacy it is difficult to say. In any case, what is the legal basis for our presence now? Our presence was requested by a government no longer in existence, and one that our own ex-Ambassador said we helped to overthrow.

The fourth fact is that our policy in Vietnam in particular and Asia in general has not been of a piece. Basically, an important objective of our foreign policy is to keep the Soviet Union and Communist China from coming together in a unified and massive ideological and military coalition. But our policy in Vietnam is producing exactly the effect we seek to avoid. Nothing that has happened since the original rupture between the two major Communist powers has done more to bring the Soviet Union and Communist China together again than recent American actions in Vietnam. The Communist Chinese have long argued that the Russian idea of coexistence was an anti-Marxist and antihistorical notion that could only be advanced by naive sentimentalists. They claim war is inevitable because of the nature of capitalism. As evidence, they assert that the United States, despite its claim that it sought only to promote the internal stability of Indochina, was actually pursuing a war against Asian peoples as an extension of the very imperialism Asians had fought so hard to expel. The Soviet Union, which is no less concerned than the United States about Chinese expansion throughout Asia, also has to be concerned about its standing in the world Communist community. It cannot allow itself to appear indifferent to military action involving a member of that community. Any expansion of the war by the United States into North Vietnam would force the Soviet Union to identify itself with North Vietnam and thus with China. In any event, in pursuit of one goal the United States appears to be losing a larger one. If the Communist Chinese had deliberately set a trap for the United States, they could not have more effectively achieved the result they sought.

The fifth fact is that American newsmen have had a more difficult time in getting unmanipulated news out of Vietnam than out of almost any crisis center in recent years. James Reston, associate editor of the New York Times, testifying before a congressional investigating committee in 1963, said the news in Vietnam was being managed in a way inconsistent with the traditions of this society. In the past 2 years there has been some improvement in news policy on Vietnam but the American public has yet to be fully informed about the nature of the American involvement, the degree to which U.S. arms have been sustaining the attackers, the extent of the popular opposition, and the inability of the South Vietnam Government to mount an effective response against the guerrillas.

The sixth fact is that President Johnson has genuinely tried to keep the military lid on in Vietnam, recognizing the ease with which the hostilities could mushroom into a general war; but he has been under extravagant pressure, much of it political, to translate American military power into a dramatic solution. The national frustration about Vietnam has far exceeded the national comprehension of the problem, for much of which the Government has only itself to blame. In any event, there has been comparatively little counterpressure in support of a policy of restraint and an eventual nonmilitary settlement—a failing that the American people have it within their means to change whenever they wish to do so.

The United States is concerned, and properly so, that the loss of South Vietnam would lead to grave consequences—territorial, political, psychological—throughout Asia and indeed most of the world. Already, the fact of developing atomic power in China has made a deep impression on many nations whose histories have pitted them against Western outsiders. American policymakers fear that United States withdrawal from Vietnam or even a reluctance to press the war would weaken or destroy the image of the United States as a resolute, dependable, and successful foe of aggressive communism in the world. These are not illogical or nonhistorical fears, but it is equally logical and historical to raise questions about the damaged image of the United States that is emerging from the present actions in Vietnam. There has been an outpouring of anti-American sentiment not just in Asia but throughout the world—and it would be a mistake to charge it all to Communist manipulation or propaganda. Even among our friends in France, Great Britain, and West Germany there has been a sense of shock and outrage. If we thought we were building prestige by taking to the air and dropping bombs in Vietnam, we have built strangely indeed.

It is tragic that most of the debate over Vietnam has vibrated between total war and total withdrawal. It is made to appear that the only choice is between absolute victory and absolute defeat. There is an alternative—if our main objective is to promote the stability and security of the area. And that alternative is to involve the United Nations, with all its limitations, to the fullest possible extent. Any general war growing out of the combustibles in Vietnam would bring catastrophe to most of the world's peoples. On the principle of no extermination with out representation, they have a right to ask that they be consulted now, while there may yet be time.

The situation in Vietnam is far more complicated than it was in Korea, but no one can say that no good can come out of a U.N. effort similar to one existing in Korea. Korea has had numerous truce violations and difficulties, but because of the U.N., Korea at least is not aflame today. Secretary General U Thant has provided an opening for such an effort by calling not just for restraint but for "shifting the quest for a solution away from the field of battle to the conference table." To the extent that the United Nations could be brought into this quest, the chances for a constructive outcome will be increased.

There are no easy answers to Vietnam. But some answers may be less volatile and more morally imaginative than others.

Moreover, at some time soon the United States will have to recognize that a military policy without a full ideological and social program will not only fall short of its goal but may actually boomerang. In any case, the prospect for finding a workable answer to Vietnam will increase, not decrease, in direct proportion to the unblocking of an American conscience and the activation of an informed debate.—N.C.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 28, 1965]

STORM SIGNALS OVER ASIA

The Johnson administration seems to be conditioning the American people for a drastic expansion of our involvement in Vietnam. The State Department's white paper accuses North Vitnam of intensified aggression and stresses that military efforts aimed solely at the Vietcong guerrillas in the south no longer suffice.

The logic of all this is that the United States, which only last week moved from the role of "adviser" to active and undisguised combatant in South Vietnam, now feels free to strike at will—whether by air, sea or land—at any targets it chooses in North Vietnam. In the 3 tense weeks since the Vietcong attack on Pleiku, American policy has plunged dangerously beyond the one enunciated then by the President and Secretary McNamara of limiting ourselves to retaliatory action and shunning a wider war.

And what has happened to alter our policy? The assertion that North Vietnam is a principal supplier of men and munitions to the Vietcong is certainly not new, nor is the charge that the extent of its support is increasing. Such activity by Hanoi constitutes the sole reason for our being in South Vietnam, and has since the United States moved in the vacuum left by the French withdrawal in 1954.

Apparently, the major new evidence of a need for escalating the war, with all the hazard that this entails, was provided by the sinking in a South Vietnamese cove earlier this month of a 100-ton cargo ship loaded with Communist-made small arms and ammunition. A ship of that size is not much above the oriental junk class. The standard Liberty or Victory ship of World War II had a capacity of 7,150 to 7,650 tons.

Page after page of similarly minuscule detail about Communist infiltration from the north merely raise anew the question of whether massive air strikes would accomplish anything except large-scale civilian casualties in industrial centers and ports. The question is made sharper by the absence of any stable government in Saigon to fight or even to speak in the name of the South Vietnamese people.

Communist China, the nation whose imperialist ambitions the world has most to worry about, will be a clear gainer from the ill timing and judgment of our warning to North Vietnam. It comes just as the Soviet Union is about to begin an international meeting of Communist parties in Moscow—a meeting originally called to pronounce Peiping a renegade from Marxist-Leninism. Washington is now doing precisely what that most sophisticated of Kremlinologists, George F. Kennan, former U.S. Ambassador to Moscow, cautioned against in his Senate testimony Friday: Forcing the Soviet Union to come down on the side of Communist China.

Washington and Peiping are in bizarre tandem as the only major capitals in the free or Communist worlds openly resistant to seeking a negotiated settlement of the Vietnamese conflict now. It is not too late for the President to make it plain that the United States is ready to talk as well as fight, and thus leave China isolated as the obstructor of any attempt to achieve a sound and enforcible peace.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 26, 1965]

PLEIKU ATTACK NOT A HANOI PLOT

(By Drew Pearson)

Shortly after the Vietcong raid on Pleiku that caused the United States to retaliate with its first definite large-scale bombing raids on North Vietnam, this column reported that the United States had been mousetrapped and that the Pleiku attack was the result of a Chinese or North Vietnamese plot deliberately staged while Premier Kosygin was visiting Hanoi.

More complete information, now available from the battlefront, shows this column was in error. The Vietcong attack was staged by a bedraggled handful of 100 men, or half a company, which was able to achieve success only because of sheer stupidity and lack of alertness by the Americans and the South Vietnamese. The attackers had no idea that they would be able to penetrate to the very center of the American installation as they did.

That it was no Hanoi-conceived plot is obvious from the fact that Hanoi could not have planned to have all South Vietnamese personnel and all Americans asleep.

A little band of Vietcong passed through two villages before reaching Pleiku. The South Vietnamese in the villages are supposedly friendly to the United States but they sounded no alarm. The attackers cut the barbed wire around Pleiku completely undisturbed, and walked right into the center of the installation to place bombs alongside the barracks where Americans were sleeping and alongside planes which were completely unguarded. They retreated without an American or a South Vietnamese wounding a single one.

SUCCESS UNEXPECTED

There were some Vietcong casualties, but only from their own mortar fire. Their commander had never expected them to penetrate so far inside, therefore aimed mortars into the center of the American installation—another indication that there was no Hanoi plot.

Secretary McNamara, one of the most level-headed executives ever to boss the Pentagon, was mousetrapped when he got out of his sickbed to hold an emergency press conference and defended the American forces as victims of a "sneak attack." Obviously he knew that some of the great military victories of American history have resulted from sneak attacks, as when George Washington sneaked across the Delaware to surprise carousing Hessians in Trenton. McNamara also knew that his own men were being trained in the art of the sneak attack at the very time he held the news conference.

Only on a few occasions have American troops telegraphed their attacks in advance, as when General Pickett sent a Confederate flag at the head of his troops in the famous charge at Gettysburg—a charge, incidentally, in which his defeat turned the tide of the Civil War.

Those who were really mousetrapped as a result of the Pleiku incident were not only McNamara but President Johnson and, momentarily, the State Department. Since then, Acting Secretary of State George Ball has tried to restore some reason and sanity to our mousetrapped thinking, which could have precipitated nuclear world war.

What happened was that Ambassador Taylor, an able but severely harassed man who has seen his hitherto great prestige gradually eroded in Vietnam, seized this opportunity to recommend retaliatory raids. He sincerely believed this was a Hanoi plot. Ordinarily his recommendation might have been discounted in Washington, but it happened that McGeorge Bundy, White House adviser on security matters, was in Saigon at precisely that time.

WHITE HOUSE PRESSURED

Bundy's brother William is Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East and has long advocated a stronger hand in Vietnam, including bombing the North. When McGeorge Bundy, therefore, joined Taylor in rushing back a premature, exaggerated account of the Pleiku raid, the White House finally yielded to advice which the Bundy brothers had been giving for some time and which has now caused serious loss of American prestige, demonstrations against American embassies around the world, even in pro-West counties and eroded the better understanding Mr. Johnson had personally built up with the new leaders in the Kremlin.

What the American public has a right to expect is a congressional investigation or the court-martial of American officers asleep at Pleiku. The Pentagon alibi is that they are highly trained men who are not supposed to stand guard, which is correct. But the fact remains that no one, not even South Vietnamese, was on guard and, as a result, approximately 100 wounded, and several million dollars worth of planes destroyed.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 27, 1965]

UNITED STATES SHOULD GET OUT OF VIETNAM

(By Drew Pearson)

When Senator DICK RUSSELL of Georgia visited the LBJ ranch to confer on Vietnam, right after the November elections, he remarked:

"We made a mistake in going in there, but I can't figure any way to get out without scaring the rest of the world."

There are a lot of reasons to support Senator RUSSELL as to why we should get out, one being that the longer we stay in the stronger the Chinese become. For centuries the Chinese were hated and feared in this part of the world. Now it's the United States.

To understand why, consult Father Hoa, the strongly anti-Communist Catholic priest, a Vietnamese, who says:

"How can we explain to a mother when her child is burned by napalm? And how can we claim to be for the people when we burn their homes simply because their houses happen to be in Vietcong-controlled territory?

Another reason we should get out of Vietnam is because it has caused us to lose the propaganda war abroad.

Another reason supporting Senator RUSSELL is the drain on the American dollar, as pointed out by R. V. Roosa, the man in charge of watching the dollar balance until he recently retired as Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Finally, there is the statement of Gen. Maxwell Taylor, the sincere, harassed American Ambassador to South Vietnam: "Military action outside the country, just as pure military action inside the country, will not win."

With all these factors supporting Senator RUSSELL, the question is how we get out.

While I agree with the Senator from Georgia that the answer is not easy, there are certain factors putting President Johnson in a stronger position than his predecessors.

As Vice President, for instance, he was urging social reforms rather than military support for President Diem at the very time President Kennedy was beating the tomtoms for all-out intervention.

Finally, the President knows as perhaps no other man that the United States has the power to destroy the world but not the power to make it obey us. For the moment, though not for long, he leads from a certain amount of strength. His retaliation against the north has put him in a stronger bargaining position.

SOLUTION FOR VIETNAM

He has, therefore, the following alternatives for getting out of the Indochinese peninsula:

1. He can do what President de Gaulle did in Algeria and pull American forces out without any face-saving formulas, but simply by admitting we made a mistake. When De Gaulle did this he faced rebellion in the French army and was almost assassinated. But France has been stronger, more prosperous, more respected ever since De Gaulle stopped the Algerian drain on French money and manpower.

2. The President can call for the fulfillment of the pledge signed at Geneva in 1954 for an election on the unification of North and South Vietnam. This election, was supposed to be held in 18 months. It has not been held because it was known that the North Vietnamese would win, just as we know that in any German election on unification the West Germans would win.

However, we can't demand an election in Germany yet deny one in Indochina. And even if the North Vietnamese do win, it doesn't necessarily mean the area will line up with the Chinese Communists. There's a lot of Titoism in southeast Asia.

3. The President can throw the Vietnamese problem into the arms of the United Nations and thereby help to resuscitate that gasping organization. A request that the Assembly settle Vietnam while simultaneously demanding that only those nations which have paid their dues can vote would put the Russian and French nonpayers in an extremely awkward position.

Once before when Russia absented itself from the U.N. the Korean crisis came before the Assembly. Russia doesn't want to make that mistake again. Certainly, if so vital a problem as Indochina came before the U.N., which we have always kept away from the U.N. in the past, the Communist bloc nations could not afford to be sitting on the sidelines.

Senator RUSSELL has raised the question of scaring the other nations of the Pacific which fear the encroachment of Red China. He is right. However, President Johnson has already promised the protection of the American nuclear umbrella to these countries, and he could make this formal by a treaty similar to the NATO pledge of support in Europe. The nations most worried about Chinese encroachment—Thailand the Philippines, India—already have and can get more American aid and support.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 28, 1965]

VIETNAM FALLACIES—JOHNSON INHERITED SITUATION IN WHICH UNITED STATES INSTEAD OF FRANCE IS IN TROUBLE

(By Drew Pearson)

There are three important fallacies to be considered regarding the Vietnam crisis which President Johnson inherited.

1. We contend that we are in South Vietnam at the request of the popular government, to protect freedom. This is pure bunk. The government has changed so often that no one can keep track of whether Big Minh, Little Minh, or Minnie Mouse is in power. There have been 14 changes of government since January 30, 1964, which is an average of one government per month. The government is of the military, by the military, and for the military, and Vietnamese civilians have no illusions about it.

2. We believe that the best way to stop Vietnamese fighting is by retaliatory raids against the north. There are many indications that this also is pure bunk. First, the North Vietnamese are led by Ho Chi Minh, a tough guerrilla fighter who battled against the French for 8 years and defeated the cream of the French Army, totaling 380,000 men, backed by $4 billion of American money. Ho now has an army of 270,000 men and if he wants to move south our bombing raids would never be able to halt him. History shows airplanes cannot find troops on foot in the jungle.

However, it is highly doubtful that Ho could call off the Vietcong war against us in South Vietnam even if he wanted to. You have to remember that the Vietcong were part of the force that also fought for 8 years, with implacable will, to get the French out of Indochina, and we have merely substituted ourselves for the French. The Vietcong are equally determined today to get all white men out.

After the French evacuated Indochina under the terms of the 1954 Geneva agreement, there were approximately 90,000 Viet Minh pro-Communists guerrilla fighters left. They became the Vietcong. Already tough revolutionaries, they are now doubly effective because they have seized new, modern American arms.

American intelligence shows that very few of the Vietcong infiltrated down from the North until last year. It is estimated that in 1964 between 4,000 and 5,000 men moved in. Therefore, Ho Chi Minh would have little control over them, even if he wanted to yell "uncle" as a result of the U.S. retaliatory raids.

Our intelligence also shows that the Vietcong is composed of about 35,000 hard-core fighters, plus 65,000 militiamen—a total of about 100,000. This is enough, given support from the countryside, to engage in hit-and-run operations indefinitely.

3. The United States has told our allies privately that we are ready to negotiate a settlement in Indochina but that we want to negotiate from strength. Unfortunately, the longer we remain in South Vietnam the more our strength deteriorates.

When we had 1,000 American advisers in Vietnam, as in the early days of the Eisenhower administration, we were probably stronger than today. President Kennedy boosted the number of Americans to 20,000 and President Johnson has raised the total to 23,500, but we are in a weaker position to negotiate because today the Vietcong occupy about two-thirds of the country.

The real problem of strength is the local South Vietnamese Government, and the more the generals concentrate on their own personal ambition rather than the welfare of the country, the weaker becomes our strength to negotiate.

WHAT NEXT?

The above three points are the heart and soul of the Vietnamese problem. What, therefore, are the alternatives facing the United States?

They are: To place the matter before the United Nations Security Council, which has never been given the Indochina problem in the past; or to continue bombing farther and farther north.

In the latter event, the Communist world is in an extremely strong position to retaliate in four widely separated areas:

1. Ho Chi Minh can move his well-trained army from the north.

2. The Red Chinese could move in on the islands of Quemoy and Matsu, which lie only 3 and 12 miles respectively from their coast, and take them fairly easily, since most of the U.S. 7th Fleet is tied up in the Gulf of Tonkin.

3. The Chinese could accelerate hostilities in Korea where South Korea is still protected only by a truce.

4. If the Russians wanted to enter the picture they could exert a squeeze on Berlin with another blockade, thus requiring the United States to divide its attention between Asia and Europe.

These are some of the problems the State Department is beginning to pose for the White House now that Secretary Rusk has recovered from his illness.

The alternative of putting the crisis before the United Nations would put the Russians in an extremely awkward position as to whether they ought to use the veto. The United Nations would probably call for a cease-fire and appoint a commission to study the situation.

The best long-range hope for the United States in Indochina is Titoism. Ho Cho Minh could be another Tito if we don't drive him into the hands of the Chinese as we have been doing. It is important to remember that the Thais, Vietnamese, and Burmese have hated and feared the Chinese for centuries. If given a chance for independence they don't want to come under the domination of the Chinese dragon.

These are not happy alternatives, but this is the situation which the Johnson administration has inherited from 18 years of erosion.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 1, 1965]

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON ON VIETNAM

Each day we hear fresh news from Vietnam, news both strange and grim. We strike by air in reprisal against North Vietnam because our soldiers, sent as armed technicians and advisers to an army which cannot yet guard them well, have been attacked in their barracks in the very heart of South Vietnam. We have widened the war—how wide will it become?

Fear of escalation of this undeclared war against North Vietnam mounts with each sudden report of renewed violence. Unless the situation is very different from what it appears to be, we have lost the political initiative in Vietnam and are attempting to substitute military actions for political ones. We face grave risks in Vietnam. Americans have faced even graver risks for good and high cause, Mr. President, but we must first understand why we must take such risks. What are our goals in Vietnam? Are they just? Can they be accomplished? Are they truly worth what they are bound to cost in dollars and human lives?

With whom are we allied in Vietnam? Are our soldiers fighting side by side with troops of a representative and legitimate national government, or are we embroiled in defense of an unpopular minority in a fierce and costly civil war? Our representatives assure us that we and the Saigon government have the overwhelming support of the Vietnamese people. How can this be so? On the same day that Mr. McNamara said sneak attacks upon our soldiers cannot be prevented, an American officer on the scene in Vietnam declared that "any of the people in the hamlet over there could have warned us that the Vietcong were around, but they did not warn us." The weapons used against us are most often American weapons, captured from or surrendered by the South Vietnamese Army. Mr. President, we submit that weak field intelligence in South Vietnam and a steady loss of workable weapons to the enemy, are deep symptoms of an unpopular cause.

Why are we fighting in Vietnam? Mr. President, we think we understand why we went into Vietnam after the French withdrew. It was because this Nation hoped to encourage the development of a popular, stable, and democratic government which would help to lead all southeast Asia toward lasting peace. Historical, political, social, religious, and sectional factors have prevented this development. The original assumptions are no longer valid. We have become increasingly unwelcome everywhere in southeast Asia. Our presence seems to deepen, rather than to relieve, the bitterness and hostility of the people. It was only 10 years ago that the Vietnamese defeated a French Army of nearly half a million men. Will the same battles occur again?

Can we win in Vietnam? Mr. President, we know that our Nation has sufficient fire power to destroy the entire world. We also know that you do not wish to call upon this awesome power. How can we possibly win and yet prevent a widening of this conflict? How can we win in Vietnam with less than 30,000 advisers when the French could not win with an army of nearly half a million fighting both north and south of the present dividing frontier?

Is it worth the cost? The French defeat in Indochina cost them 172,000 casualties. Yet, before their final bloody defeat at Dienbienphu, the French generals and diplomats spoke with the same toughness and optimism, the same assurances we now hear from our leaders.

The French had overwhelming numbers and firepower but they lost in Vietnam because they lacked the support of the population. Do we face the same prospect, or are there facts which the public does not know which show our situation to be clearly different?

Mr. President, we are aware that you have secret information which cannot be shared with us. But could such information completely refute the picture of events and the political insights provided to us by serious newspapermen who have been in the area for years?

All we can see is a seemingly endless series of demonstrations and riots in Saigon and Hue, of military coups, of threats and challeges to the dignity of our Ambassador and our other representatives by the very men we seek to sustain in power.

We have lost the initiative in Vietnam. A few guerrillas can trigger American reactions that widen the war. The events of the past weeks are leading step by step along the path to war with China.

Would it not be both prudent and just to take the initiative toward peace in Vietnam? If we are not to widen the war beyond all conscience, as reasonable men we must initiate negotiations while there is still time.

Andover-Newton Theological School: Herbert Gezork, ethics (plus four signers, Feb. 16).

Boston University: Irwin E. Chase, psychiatry; William A. Hire, psychology; Francis Johnson, chemistry; Philip E. Kubzansky, psychology; Louis Lowy, social work; S. Joseph Nemetz, medical school; Irwin I. Portner, medical school; Henry N. Rosenberg, medical school (plus 24 signers Feb. 16).

Brandeis University: Stanley Deser, physics;; Harry Rand, psychiatry (plus 55 signers, Feb. 16).

Bryn Mawr College: Warner Berthoff, English; Paul R. Brass, political science; T. R. S. Broughton, Latin; Fredericka de Laguna, anthropology; R. B. De Boff, economics; Mary Dunn, history; Alice F. Emerson, political science; Rosalie Hoyt, physics; Mabel Lang, Greek; Richard Lattimore, Greek; Gertrude Leighton, political science; A. K. Michels, Latin; Eleanor Pauker, Spanish; Robert Patten, English; Kyle Phillips, archeology; Eugene Schneider, sociology; Laurence Stapleton, English.

Drexel Institute of Technology: Joel Balsham, English; William Hollis, English; David Holtz, English; Sol M. Kipnes, chemistry; Samuel S. McNeary, mathematics; James A. Richards, Jr., physics; Eugene J. Rosenbaum, chemistry; Cecil O. Smith, Jr., history; J. W. Smith, sociology; John A. Taylor, physics; Stanley A. Wasson, history.

Haverford College: Edwin Bronner, history; Dean Burnham, political science; John Cary, German; Aldo Caselli, Italian; Thomas D'Andrea, psychology; William Davidon, physics; Paul Desjardins, philosophy; Alfred Diamant, political science; Irving Finger, biology; Lewis Green, astronomy; Elizabeth Green, biology; Theodore Hetzel, engineering; Dietrich Kessler, biology; Lewis Kosman, philosophy; Wallace MacCaffrey, history; Sidney Perloe, psychology; Melvin Santer, biology; Ralph Sargent, English; Alfred Satterthwaite, English.

Harvard University: Sidney Alexander, medical school; Daniel S. Bernstein, medical school; Martin A. Berezin, medical school; Donnell W. Boardman, medical school; Louis S. Chase, medical school; Sidney Coleman, physics; Lincoln H. Day, public health; Daniel Deykin, medical school; Frank R. Ervin, medical school; Sanford Gifford, medical school; Lester Grinspoon, medical school; George Grosser, medical school; Calvin Leeman, medical school; Sidney Levin, medical school; John E. Mack, medical school; Jack H. Mendelson, medical school; David L. Rabin, public health; Peter Reich, medical school; Samuel Silverman, medical school; Harold J. Stein, medical school; Myron Stocking, medical school; Anna K. Wolff, medical school; Stephan Thernstrom, history; Norman E. Zinberg, medical school (plus 42 signers, February 16).

Institute for Advanced Study: Felix Gilbert, history; Harold Cherniss, classics.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Nesmyth C. Ankeny, mathematics (plus 66 signers February 16).

Princeton University: Oakes Ames, physics; Carlos Baker, English; Elmer Beller, history; G. E. Bentley, English; David Berlinsky, philosophy; David Bien, history; Arthur L. Bigelow, engineering graphics; Jerome Blum, history; R. Bon de Sousa Pernes, philosophy; E. B. O. Borgerhoff, romance languages; Boruch Brody, philosophy; G. E. Brown, physics; Joseph Brown, school of architecture; Nicholas R. Clifford, history; W. R. Conner, classics; John I. Dalland, psychology; Willard Dalrymple, M.D., university health services; M. L. Diamond, religion; William S. Dix, librarian; Martin Duberman, history; R. A. Faulkner, politics; Joel Feinberg, philosophy; George B. Field, astrophysical sciences; John V. A. Fine, classics; Charles K. Fish, English; Robert Freeman, music; Sam Glucksberg, psychology; F. R. B. Godolphin, classics; Ernest Gordon, dean, university chapel; M. B. Gottlieb, astrophysical sciences; Claudio Guillen, romance languages; Stirling Haig, romance languages; Richard F. Hamilton, sociology; W. F. Hanrieder, politics; John A. Hanson, classics; Frederick Harbison, economics; Gilbert H. Harman, philosophy; C. G. Hempel, philosophy; Laurence B. Holland, English; John B. Hughes, romance languages; Edmund Keeley, English; Earl Kim, music; Edmund L. King, romance languages; Arthur C. Kirsch, English; Axel Kornfuehrer, history; Thomas Kuhn, history; Victor Lange, German; Donald R. Larson, romance languages; Sue Larson, philosophy; Rensselaer W. Lee, art and archaeology; Michael Lipsky, politics; A. Walton Litz, English; Duane Lockard, politics; L. H. Lockwood, music; John Rupert Martin, art and archaeology; Arno J. Mayer, history; Arthur Mendel, music; Dimitri Mihalas, astrophysical sciences; George Paul Mras, art and archaeology; R. Nozick, philosophy; A. B. Pardee, biology; George Pepe, classics; George Pitcher, philosophy; James K. Randall, music; L. I. Rebhun, biology; Thomas P. Roche, Jr., English; Remington E. Rose II, English; Robert Rosenblum, art and archaeology; Israel Rosenfield, politics; G. S. Rousseau, English; Charles A. Ryskamp, English; Joseph Schraibman, romance languages; John Schrecker, history; Roger Sessions, music; J. E. Seigel, history; Steve M. Slaby, engineering graphics; Philip Solomon, astrophysical sciences; Kimberly Sparks, German; Stanley Stein, history; Stephen P. Stich, philosophy; John H. Strange, politics; Edward D. Sullivan, romance languages; George F. Thomas, religion; Lawrence R. Thompson, English; A. Richard Turner, art and archaeology; Jack A. Vernon, psychology; A. N. Wahl, politics; Peter S. Walch, art and archaeology; Michael Walzer, politics; Sam Willis, romance languages; Franklin W. Young, religion; P. R. Zilsel, physics.

Princeton Theological Seminary: George S. Hendry, theology; Cullen I. K. Story, Biblical studies; Charles C. West, Christian ethics.

Rider College: C. C. Pratt, psychology; Stephen Vuglen, economics.

Rutgers—The State University: Eliahu Abrahams, physics; Robert F. Allen, director, language laboratory; Samuel L. Baily, history; Howard Ball, political science; Saul Barshay, physics; John E. Bebout, director, urban studies center; F. Kenneth Berrien, psychology; Gerald Bertin, romance languages; Paul Bertram, English; Werner W. Boehm, dean, graduate school of social work; Harry C. Bredemeier, urban studies center; David J. Bredin, physics; Vernon Bryson, microbiology; John L. Cammett, history; Peter L. Carlton, psychology; Sandi E. Cliadakis, history; Bertram D. Cohen, psychology; George H. Collier, psychology; Michael R. Curtis, political science; Michael R. D'Amato, psychology; James E. Durkin, Jr., psychology; Thomas R. Edwards, Jr., English; Richard M. Fontera, political science; Paul Fussell, Jr., English; Ralph Garber, social work; Lloyd C. Gardner, history; Bertram E. Garskof, psychology; Joseph N. Ginocchio, physics; Bernard G. Guerney, psychology; Robert Gutman, sociology; Nelson G. Hanawalt, psychology; Don F. Heisel, urban studies center; David J. M. Higgins, English; Daniel F. Howard, English; Solomon Leader, mathematics; Hannah Levin, psychology; Donald J. Lewis, psychology; Peter Lindenfeld, physics; Ernest Lynton, physics; Martin Manosevitz, psychology; Simon Marcson, sociology; David Markowitz, physics; John O. McCormick, English; Donald C. Mell, Jr., English; William G. Miller, archivist, library; Carol Ann Millsom, psychology; Edith D. Neimark, psychology; Gerald Pomper, political science; David Popenoe, urban studies center; Donald H. Riddle, Eagleton Institute of Politics; Glorianne Robbi, Eagleton Institute of Politics; Allen B. Robbins, physics; Amelie O. Rorty, philosophy; Claire Rosenfield, English; William A. Rust, Jr., political science; Anne Saxon, English; Frank R. Scarpitti, sociology; Norman E. Spear, psychology; Marshall Stalley, urban studies center; Charles H. Stember, sociology; Siegfried A. Streufert, psychology; Warren I. Susman, history; Frank Tachau, political science; Paul Tillett, Eagleton Institute of Politics; Jackson Toby, sociology; Jack Undank, romance languages; Rudolph J. Vecoli, history; David R. Weimer, English; Virginia P. Whitney, urban studies center; Seymour T. Zenchelsky, chemistry.

Rockefeller Institute: Lawrence Eisenberg, electronics; Rollin D. Hotchkiss, genetics; Dorothy Lane, Alexander Mauro, biophysics; Richard Novick, genetics; Priscilla J. Ortiz, genetics; Muriel Roger, genetics; Paul Rosen, electronics; Robert L. Schoenfeld, electronics; Norton D. Zinder, genetics.

Simmons College: Ina M. Granara, chemistry; Henry J. Halko, history; Edith F. Helman, Spanish; Lawrence L. Langer, English; Ruth S. Leonard, library science; Samuel T. Leverich, mathematics; Manfred Klein, German; William M. Manly, English; Carroll F. Miles, government; George W. Nitchie, English; John A. Timm, chemistry; Roy M. Tollefson, government; Wylie Sypher, English; Robert C. Vernon, physics; Marion I. Walter, mathematics (plus eight signers last week).

Swarthmore College: Monroe Beardsley, philosophy; Thompson Bradley, modern languages; Alburt Roseberg, natural science; Jerome A. Schaffer, philosophy.

Syracuse University: Norman Balabanian, electrical engineering; Elias Balbinder, microbiology; David H. Bennett, American studies; Peter G. and Margot Bergmann, physics; Joshua Goldberg, physics; N. Horwitz, physics; Gordon Kent, electrical engineering; H. Richard Levy, biochemistry; Rajendra P. Nanavati, electrical engineering; Bernard Silverman, electrical engineering; Ralph Slepecky, microbiology; Edward P. Stabler,

electrical engineering; Ralph Swalm, industrial engineering.

Tufts Univesity: Louis Geller, medical school; Charles E. Magraw, medical school (plus 31 signers February 16).

University of Pennsylvania: Lee Benson, history; Derk Bodde, oriental studies; Walter Bonner, Johnson Foundation; Herbert Callen, physics; Max I. Caspari, physics; Alan Cassels, history; Hilary Conroy, history; Paul Davidoff, city planning; Allan R. Day, chemistry; Helen C. Davies, microbiology; Thomas J. Davy, Fels Institute; Elizabeth Flower, philosophy; Sherman Frankel, physics; Harold S. Ginsberg, microbiology; Sol. H. Goodgal, microbiology; Joseph S. Gotz, microbiology; Britton Harris, city planning; Walter P. Hempfling, Johnson Foundation; Henry Hiz, linguistics; Arthur Kowalsky, Johnson Foundation; A. Klein, physics; Norman R. Kleinman, microbiology; Fred Karush, microbiology; J. S. Leigh, Jr., Johnson Foundation; Lawrence Levine, Fels Institute; Irma S. Lustig, English; Morton Lustig, Fels Institute; John Marshall, anatomy; Anshell Melamed, Fels Institute; Albert S. Mildvan, Johnson Foundation; Grace Milgram, Institute for Urban Studies; Dennis Palumbo, Fels Institute; Jean Piatt, anatomy; Berton C. Pressman, Johnson Foundation; Charles C. Price, chemistry; Henry Primakoff, physics; W. A. Rickett, oriental studies; Robert Rutman, chemistry; Abraham M. Stein, chemistry; E. Dale Saunders, oriental studies; Franklin C. Southworth, South Asia regional studies; C. W. Ufford, physics; Walter D. Wales, physics; Roger H. Walmsley, physics; G. T. Wood, physics.

Wellesley College: Sigmund Abeles, art; Lillian Anderson, art; Allen Eister, sociology; Barbara B. Green, political science; Eleanor L. McLaughlin, history; Annemarie Shimony, sociology; Owen S. Stratton, political science; Kathryn Turner, history; W. Warren Wagar, history (plus 4 signers February 16).

Others: Stringfellow Barr, writer and lecturer; Everett Gendler, Rabbi, Princeton; Eric Kahler, writer and lecturer; Richard Jeffrey, CCNY; Ashley Montagu, writer and lecturer; Carol C. B. Savage, Ben Shahn, artist; Ernest Young, Dartmouth.

(Institutional affiliation for purposes of identification only.)

If you approve of this statement, write or wire President Lyndon B. Johnson, White House, Washington, D.C.

This open letter was published and signed as an advertisement in the New York Times of February 16, 1965, by some 400 faculty members of universities and colleges of the Greater Boston area. Because of the interest and support it aroused, it was circulated again, chiefly in the Philadelphia-Princeton-New Brunswick area and is being republished as an advertisement paid by the signers. Comments and contributions toward cost should be sent to Ad Hoc Committee for Open Letter on Vietnam, 552 Ewing Street, Princeton, N.J., Prof. Arno J. Mayer, chairman; Prof. Paul Tillett, treasurer.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 28, 1965]

OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON ON VIETNAM

We, as members of the academic community, feel impelled to raise publicly with you, Mr. President, the question of our Government's present policy toward South Vietnam. We ask you to reconsider our present course of action in view of the following facts:

We are intervening unilaterally in support of a succession of undemocratic regimes that are opposed by a majority of the South Vietnamese people.

We are waging an immoral and inhumane war that has brought untold suffering to the people of South Vietnam.

Our recent air attacks on North Vietnam intensify the danger that a local conflict will develop into a major war.

It is maintained that the United States is protecting a popularly supported government against foreign subversion. We maintain, Mr. President, that the evidence available to the Congress and to the public does not support this interpretation of the Vietnamese conflict.

The fact is that the United States is maintaining regimes which are not supported by the bulk of the rural population. How else explain a situation in which 35,000 Vietcong regulars have been able to make increasing gains against a Government army of over 200,000 men together with 23,000 American "advisers"? The close-range attacks on Bienhoa and Pleiku indicate the lack of support by neighboring villagers for the Saigon government.

What has our policy meant for the people of South Vietnam? Only a small minority of the people profits from the $600 million in foreign aid we send annually to South Vietnam. The peasantry of Vietnam has been terrorized. The country, once one of the most prosperous areas of southeast Asia, is being devastated by the napalm bombing of peasant villages, by the unbridled strafing of the countryside by American-supplied aircraft, by the detention and mass transfers of the South Vietnamese people. Prisoners are being tortured in South Vietnam. It does not seem likely that this could be done without the knowledge of American officials.

What effect has our policy had on U.S. prestige abroad? By supporting dictatorial military regimes in South Vietnam we have undermined confidence in our professed belief that nations should be allowed to develop their own destinies free from outside interference. Although we pledged to respect the Geneva accords of 1954, we have violated those agreements by supplying troops and weapons to South Vietnam. We have belied our adherence to international law by refusing to submit the dispute to an international conference, such as the parties to the Geneva accords or one of the bodies of the United Nations.

Our justification for intervention in South Vietnam has been that we are preventing the spread of communism in southeast Asia. The effect of our policy, however, has been to alienate both the neighboring countries and our allies.

As recent events have shown, the longer the war in South Vietnam continues, the greater are the chances of escalation. Our air and sea attacks upon North Vietnam have not appreciably altered the situation in the south, but they have succeeded in increasing the danger of a major conflagration on the continent of Asia and of nuclear war.

When 81 percent of the American people, according to a recent Gallup poll, indicated they were in favor of a conference with the leaders of southeast Asia and China in an effort to reach a peace agreement, must we continue any longer along this dangerous path?

Mr. President, we urge you to consider another course of action:

We ask that you bring an end to the investment of American men and money in the war in South Vietnam.

We ask you to seek a negotiated settlement by every possible means in order to create an independent, neutralized government and to bring about the withdrawal of U.S. troops.

We ask you to lay the problem immediately before an international body and to put an end to our unilateral and illegal actions.

We urge you, Mr. President, to take immediate action to end the war in South Vietnam. The longer we persist in our present policy, the fewer will be the alternatives open to us.

Adelphi University: Harold Allen, philosophy; Stuart Astor, English; Wesley Camp, history; Paul Crosser, economics; Sydney Davis, education; Robert Endleman, sociology; Robert Ernst, history; Beatrice Freeman, social work; David Gordon, sociology; Murray Greene, philosophy; Philip Greene, English; Harlon Joye, sociology; Stephen Klass, English; Donald Koster, English; Allen M. Krebs, sociology; David Levin, history; Jerry March, chemistry; Joan Martin, English; Ronald McHaffy, mathematics; Robert Pasotti, philosophy; Robert Payton, mathematics; Eugene Roth, English; Henry F. Smith, English; Virginia Terris, English; Alfred Vogel, chemistry; Argyrios Vourkas, sociology; Henry T. Wilt, Greek and Latin; Cedric Winslow, English; Donald Wolf, English; Stephen Yeh, sociology.

Albert Einstein College of Medicine: Beverly Birns, psychiatry; Everett W. Bovard, anatomy; Wagner H. Bridger, psychiatry; N. M. Buckley, physiology; Jean L. Cook, medicine; Lewis M. Fraad, pediatrics; Sidney Goldfischer, pathology; Eric Holtzman, pathology; Edward J. Hornick, psychiatry; William Obrinsky, pediatrics; Samuel M. Rosen, medicine; Bertram A. Lowy, biochemistry; Mary Weitzman, anatomy; N. Henry Williams, medicine.

Brooklyn College: Harry Gracey, sociology; Brijen Gupta, history; Paul Haberfield, chemistry; David Koulack, psychology; Barton Meyers, psychology; Myriam Miedzianogora, philosophy; Rose Mukerji, education; Heman E. Zieger, chemistry; Carl B. Zuckerman, psychology.

City College of New York: Bernard Bellush, history; Nathan Berall, English; Gustave Bischof, mechanical engineering; Daniel Bronstein, philosophy; M. Vertner Brown, physics; Mark Brunswick, music; Maurice Cohen, philosophy; Ephraim Cross, romance languages; Helen Davidson, education; Sidney Ditzion, history; Abraham Edel, philosophy; Sophie L. Elan, education; J. A. Elias, philosophy; Joseph A. Ellis, history; Ernest Ferguson, physical education; Dorothy H. Gampel, psychology; Geoffrey J. Gibson, philosophy; Daniel Greenberger, physics; Leo Hamalain, English; Fritz Jahoda, music; Florine Katz, education; Y. H. Kirkorian, emeritus, philosophy; Edward Mack, English; Irving Malin, English; Aaron Noland, history; Stanley W. Page, history; George W. Phillips, history; A. I. Rabin, psychology; Sidney M. Rosenblatt, education; Aurel M. Seifert, physics; Oscar Sherwin, English; Irwin Stark, English; Samuel Sumberg, Germanic and Slavic languages; Martin Tammy, philosophy; Harry Tarter, philosophy; H. S. Thayer, philosophy; Martin S. Tiersten, physics; Barbara Watson, English; Phillip Wiener, philosophy; Harold Wilensky, psychology; Bohdan Zawadzki, psychology; Rose Zimbardo, English.

Columbia University: Alexander Alland, Jr., anthropology; Hugh Amory, English; E. Duncan Aswell, English; Bertram L. Bassuk, architecture; Sacvan Bercovitch, English; Lipman Bers, mathematics; Rudolph Binion, history; Robert Brustein, English; Justus Buchler, philosophy; Sue Buckingham, medicine; Jack Budowsky, dentistry; Arthur C. Carr, medicine; Eloise E. Clark, zoology; Jonathan H. Collett, English; Lambros Comitas, philosophy; Mason Cooley, English; Arnold Cooper, medicine; Stephen M. Corey, Teachers College; Robert Cross, history; Elizabeth Czoniczer, French; Leonardo C. De Morelos, Spanish; H. M. Edwards, mathematics; Alexander Erlich, economics; Amitai Etzioni, sociology; Samuel Finestone, social work; James M. Fitch, architecture; David Fitelson, English; Goodwin L. Foster, emeritus, biochemistry; Marie L. Franciscus, occupational therapy; Morton H. Fried, anthropology; Herbert Gans, Institute of Urban Studies; Willard Gaylin, medicine; Percival Goodman, architecture; Frederic Grab, English; Richard L. Greeman, French; E. I. Gumbel, industrial engineering; Robert W. Hanning, English; Marvin Harris, anthropology; Teru Hayashi, zoology; Amelia Hess, anthropology; Charles H. Hinnant, English; Terrence K. Hopkins, sociology; E. R. Kolchin, mathematics; Alexander Kouzmanoff,

architecture; Corliss Lamont, philosophy; Serge Lang, mathematics; Robert F. Lynd, professor emeritus; William Martin, sociology; A. L. Mayer, mathematics; Peter McHugh, sociology; Fabrizio Melano, English; Seymour Melman, engineering; Solomon Miller, anthropology; Mary Mothersill, philosophy; John Mundy, history; Jay Neugeboren, English; George Pappas, medicine; Lawrence Pinkham, journalism; J. Herman Randall, Jr., philosophy; John D. Rosenberg, English; Leon S. Roudiez, French; Phillips Salman, English; Mario G. Salvadori, civil engineering; J. Schilt, astronomy; Paul Schwaber, English; Arthur Schwartz, mathematics; Jerome Schwartz, French; Morton D. Schweitzer, epidemiology; Peter Shaw, English; William Silverman, medicine; Ernest Simon, French; Susan Sontag, religion; Robert Spitzer, medicine; Harold Stahmer, religion; Michael Studdert-Kennedy, psychology; Samuel Sutton, medicine; Mark Van Doen, English; William Vickrey, economics; Frederick E. Warburton, zoology; Michael Wood, English; David Zipser, zoology.

Cornell University: Douglas F. Dowd, economics; Robert M. Durling, romance literature; Chandler Morse, economics; David E. Novack, economics; Taylor Stoehr, English literature; Harold Widom, mathematics.

Hofstra College: Adolf Anderson, New College; Ethel Brook, modern languages; Frances Z. Kalman, educational foundations; Shirley P. Langer, psychology; Harvey Levin, economics; Mary Gilbert Ligon, education; Broadus Mitchell, New College; Anne Morgenstern, education; Elie Siegmeister, music; E. R. Stabler, mathematics; Ruth Stauffer, English; Albert Tepper, music; Lynn Turgeon, economics; Murray Yanowitch, economics; June Zaccone, economics.

Long Island University: Kenneth Bernard, English; Kenneth Bridenthal, history; George Economou, English; Harry Fenson, English; Leonard Fleischer, English; Frederic Jaher, history; John McDermott, philosophy; Edward Pomerantz, English; Kenneth W. Scott, English; Paul N. Siegel, English; Robert Vas Dias, English.

New York University: Elaine Allen, medicine; Michael Arons, physics; Sabert Basescu, psychology; Marvin Belsky, medicine; Joy Gould Boyum, English; Robert Burrowes, government; Edwin Campbell, chemistry; James Tracy Crown, government; Stanley Deutsch, medicine; Eugenie Dubnau, medicine; Dora Fisher, psychology; Emanuel Fisher, medicine; H. H. Giles, social studies; Mary A. Giles, education; Vincent Glinsky, sculpture; Jacob Goodman, mathematics; Martin Hamburger, guidance; George Kaufer, psychology; Gerson T. Lesser, medicine; Leah Levinger, psychology; Harvey Levy, medicine; Evelyn Mauss, dentistry; L. Nirenberg, mathematics; Ruth Ochroch, psychology; Robert Perlman, medicine; Morris Perlmutter, medicine; Richard Pollack, mathematics; Frederick L. Redefer, education; Albert Romasco, history; Sanford Rosenzweig, dentistry; H. Laurence Ross, sociology; Irving Sarnoff, psychology; Ernest G. Schachtel, psychology; Milton Schwebel, guidance; Martin Spencer, sociology; Herbert A. Tonne, business education; Gilbert M. Trachtman, educational psychology; William G. Vander Kloot, medicine; Louis Wilker, sociology; Pearl Zipser, reading institute.

Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn: E. Banks, chemistry; Judith S. Bellin, chemistry; Irving Cohen, chemistry; Sid Deutsch, electrical engineering; Owen Fleischman, physics; Marvin E. Gettleman, history; H. P. Gregor, chemistry; Helmut Gruber, history; Frederick C. Kreiling, history; Eleanor B. Leacock, history; David Mermelstein, economics; Carol Moodie, history; Gerald Oster, chemistry; R. F. Riley, chemistry; Paul E. Spoerri, chemistry; J. Steigman, chemistry.

Pratt Institute: Joseph L. Cobitz, philosophy; Robert B. Dennis, architecture; Frances Esecover, architecture; Sibyl Moholy-Nagy, architecture; Sidney M. Shelov, architecture; Christopher D. Wadsworth, architecture; J. Sherwood Weber, English.

Queens College: Kenneth T. Abrams, English; Arnold Bernstein, psychology; Ellen Bindman, mathematics; Bell Gale Chevigny, English; E. Richard Covert, student personnel; Jack Cypin, economics; M. Herbert Danzger, sociology; Herbert Fremont, education; Hilliard Gardiner, contemporary civilization; L. Terrell Gardner, mathematics; Louis Geller, economics; Ronald Glassman, sociology; Del Greenblatt, history; Alan Harwood, sociology; Mark A. Haskell, economics; L. Hochman, physics; Lawrence Kaplan, philosophy; Joel Kauffman, economics; Lawrence B. Kirschner, history; Benjamin Lapkin, education; Marvin Leiner, education; Thomas M. Mongar, political science; James R. O'Connell, history; Melvin Reichler, sociology; Vera Reichler, political science; Edmund Reiter, contemporary civilization; Sol Resnik, political science; Anita Ross, education; Selma Sapir, education; Robert E. Savage, biology; Edward Seltzer, philosophy; John B. P. Shaffer, psychology; Sidney B. Simon, education; Harvard Sitkoff, contemporary civilization; Harry Sitomer, mathematics; Julia Sutton, music; Frank A. Warren, III, history; Frank White, philosophy; Elizabeth Friar William, education; John S. Williams, sociology; Michael Wreszin, history; Martin Zelin, psychology; Burton Zwiebach, political science.

Rutgers University: John M. Cammett, history; Eugene D. Genovese, history; John Gorgol, management; Arnold M. Paul, history; B. P. Sonnenblick, zoology; Warren I. Susman, history.

Rockefeller Institute: Erwin Fleissner, biochemistry; Max Gottesman, biochemistry; Fritz Lipmann; David Mauzerall; Philip Siekevitz, cell biology.

Sarah Lawrence College: Robert Engler, political science; Ira Glasser, mathematics; Helen Merrell Lynd, prof. emeritus; Carl Resek, social science; Harvey Swados, literature.

Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research: Aaron Bendich, biological chemistry; Roland Finston, biophysics; Richard Lee, biophysics; Paul Milvy, biophysics; Allen C. Nadler, clinical investigation; Edmund O. Rothschild, clinical investigation; Martin Sonenberg, clinical investigation; Herbert Weiss, biophysics; Louis Zeitz, biophysics.

State University of New York at Stony Brook: Karl S. Bottigheimer, history; Hugh G. Cleland, history; Sallie S. Goldstein, English; Charles Hoffmann, economics; Norman Leer, English; Ruth Misheloff, English; Michael Parenti, political science; Joel Rosenthal, history.

Stevens Institute of Technology: James L. Anderson, physics; Hugh W. Byfield, physics; I. Richard Lapidus, physics; Arthur Layzer, physics; Kenneth C. Rogers, physics; George Schmidt, physics; Snowden Taylor, physics; George Yevick, physics.

Yeshiva University: R. E. Behrends, physics; Barbara Berger, educational psychology; William Block, psychology; Morris N. Eagle, psychology; Melvin Feffer, psychology; David Finkelstein, physics; Joshua Fishman, psychology; Gertrude Goldberg, educational psychology; Allan C. Goldstein, psychology; Herbert Goldstein, special education; Edmund W. Gordon, educational psychology; Norman Gordan, psychology; Aaron Hershkowitz, psychology; Adelaide Jablonsky, education; Shelly P. Koenigsberg, educational psychology; Arthur Komar, physics; Ruth Lesser, psychology; Boris Levinson, psychology; D. J. Newman, mathematics; Harry E. Rauch, mathematics; Irvin Rock, psychology; William Spindel, chemistry; Paul C. Whitworth, education; Doxey A. Wilkerson, educational psychology.

Other institutions: Carl R. Baldwin, Hunter College; Carl Barus, Swarthmore College; Herbert Bassow, Fieldston School; Walter Bonime, New York Medical College; Richard S. Bowman, Cooper Union; Lewis Brandt, Fairleigh Dickinson University; Emile Capouya, New School for Social Research; Neil A. Chassman, Fieldston School; Carla Drije, Bank Street College of Education; Stephen Edelglass, Cooper Union; Bernard Elevitch, Fairleigh Dickinson University; Hanna Faterson, Downstate Medical Center; Jules Feiffer, Hall Syndicates; Dorothy Ferguson, Long Island City High School; Doris Z. Fleischer, New York Institute of Technology; Burton Goodman, Queensborough Community College; Paul Goodman, Institute for Policy Studies; Robert Gwathmey, Cooper Union; Eleanor Hakim, New School for Social Research; Robert Hodes, Mount Sinai Hospital; Ralph Douglas Hyslop, Union Theological Seminary; Herbert C. Jackson, Union Theological Seminary; E. Roy John, New York Medical College; Marc Karson, Kingsborough Community College; Anatole Norman Klein, Bennington College; Eric Krystall, University of Michigan; Arnold Lieber, Hillside Hospital; Donah B. Litauer, Jewish Child Care Association; William Paul Livant, University of Michigan; Edward Margolies, Staten Island Community College; Arno J. Mayer, Princeton; June Nash, Yale University; John A. Nevin, Swarthmore College; K. H. Niebyl, New School for Social Research; Hans Rademacher, University of Pennsylvania; Ronald Radosh, Kingsborough Community College; Philip Rahv, Brandeis University; Richard M. Reinitz, Wayne State University; Alfred H. Rifkin, New York Medical College; Arthur J. Samuels, Hunter College; Jane C. Schneider, University of Michigan; Peter T. Schneider, University of Michigan; Jack Stuart, Hunter College; Paul M. Sweezy, economist; Arthur Vidich, New School for Social Research; Andrews Wanning, Bard College; John Weiss, Wayne State University; Ken Wibecan, Harper and Row; H. H. Wilson, Princeton; Robert Wolfe, Harvard; J. S. Wolkenfeld, Kingsborough Community College.

This letter is being published as an advertisement paid by the signers. Comments and contributions toward cost will be welcomed and should be sent to: University Committee To Protest the War in Vietnam, Post Office Box 115, Woodside, New York, 11377.

(Institutional affiliation for purposes of identification only.)

If you approve of this statement, we urge you to reprint it, in whole or in part, in other newspapers, and write or wire: President Lyndon B. Johnson, White House, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Ronald Glassman, chairman; Dr. Myriam Miedzianogora, secretary; Dr. Stanley Deutsch, cotreasurer; Miss Del Greenblatt, cotreasurer.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the New York Times, Feb. 2, 1965]

MR. NIXON'S TOTEM POLE

Looking at the present situation in South Vietnam, former Vice President Nixon insists that the United States must "avoid being forced into negotiation when at the bottom of the totem pole." Mr. Nixon's prescription is to forget about negotiation and fight harder, throwing into the battle everything "short of atomic weapons." Mr. Nixon does not say so; but this policy, if followed single-mindedly, would turn a comparatively small war into a much bigger one—one that would involve an enormously expanded investment in American blood and resources.

Apparently Mr. Nixon thinks we are at the bottom of the totem pole in South Vietnam because things have not been going too well recently: because the people of South Vietnam seem to be increasingly war weary; because the changes of government in Saigon are abrupt and kaleidoscopic; because the

Vietcong guerrillas seem to be able to penetrate easily into our lines; because our Vietnam allies do not seem to wish to fight as hard as we would like them to.

These are discouraging factors. But to assume that they put the United States at the bottom of the totem pole is to look at that symbol from a mistaken angle. The United States has an immense concentration of naval and air power close to the coast of southeast Asia. It is capable of expanding that power many times over. This fact, with the potential consequences it implies, is well understood in North Vietnam. It is well understood in Moscow. It is well understood, despite all talk of paper tigers, in Peiping. And once we recognize how well it is understood, in all these and other places, we can take a more realistic view of who is where on the totem pole.

The United States has amply proved, and is continuing to prove, its ability and its determination to stay in South Vietnam as long as present circumstances require it to do so. This is not the question which Secretary General Thant and President de Gaulle and other advocates of negotiation now wish to explore; they know the answer to this question. What they wish to explore is whether matters have not reached a point at which it will be possible to set up a system of adequate international guarantees to protect South Vietnam against outside aggression.

There is every commonsense reason why this possibility should be promptly and thoroughly investigated. An agreement to do so would surrender nothing; it would open up the possibility for determining whether the goal of effective neutralization of South Vietnam, now being sought by arms, could be achieved by diplomacy.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, let me reply briefly to the Senator from Alaska by saying that he is correct in stating that the Korean situation is not the same as that in South Vietnam. We were deeply involved in Korea. We were involved to the extent of sustaining well over 100,000 casualties in Korea, as I recall.

The South Koreans are wonderful and brave people, and fought very hard; but the fact is that the South Vietnamese have borne a much heavier proportion of the burden of the fighting and the dying in South Vietnam than the South Koreans did in Korea.

The record in South Vietnam shows than the South Vietnamese people, on the basis of their military performance, do support us.

The Senator from Alaska also mentioned the United Nations, and asked why we do not invite them in. I have wondered about that for a long time. I questioned the State Department for several years, as to why the United Nations was not invited in. There is an excellent answer: There is no basis for the United Nations to settle this controversy unless the U.N. is willing to recognize the invasion of South Vietnam by North Vietnam Communists. Aggression has come from outside the country, from North Vietnam to South Vietnam. Our Ambassador to the U.N. Adlai Stevenson told the U.N. when he submitted our documented case proving this aggression that we will get all of our armament out of South Vietnam when this aggression from the north stops.

Second, during the past week, the Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant, has somewhat prejudiced the position of the United Nations so far as the Secretary General himself coming into the action to arbitrate is concerned.

Third, the United Nations Assembly, as everyone knows, is now paralyzed because of its financial situation. It is unable to meet. At its only meeting this year it took one vote on a procedural question and then adjourned until fall. There is serious question as to whether it will be able to act for the remainder of this year.

The Security Council is paralyzed by a Soviet veto.

Finally, any dispassionate, objective person would have to agree that the United States is not in a position of strength in South Vietnam at the present time. This is not the time to negotiate. This is not the time to bargain. Our position in South Vietnam is weak. We should be realistic enough to realize that fact, and act upon that basis.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in praising the fine statement by the Senator from Wisconsin. As he shall see from my statement, we are in practical agreement on this subject.

SOUTH VIETNAM—U THANT SHOULD GO

Mr. President, on February 17, President Johnson stated very clearly and succinctly our purpose and objective in South Vietnam. He said:

That purpose and that objective is to join the defense and protection of the freedom of a brave people who are under attack that is controlled and that is directed from outside their country.

We have no ambition there for ourselves. We seek no wider war. But we must all understand that we will persist in the defense of freedom and our continuing actions will be those which are justified and those that are made necessary by the continuing aggression of others.

These actions will be measured, and fitting, and adequate. Our stamina, and the stamina of the American people, is equal to the task.

On February 25, Secretary of State Dean Rusk issued a prepared statement amplifying the policy statement of the President. The key points of this statement are as follows:

1. The nations of southeast Asia have a right to live in peace, free from aggression directed against them from outside their borders. This is a point of vital importance to the safety and the very existence of a hundred smaller nations all over the world.

2. North Vietnam, in callous disregard of the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962, has directed and supplied the essential military personnel and arms for this aggression, aimed at the imposition of a Communist regime by force.

3. The position of the United States toward threats to the peace in southeast Asia has been made clear many times, going back to 1954, when President Eisenhower wrote to the President of South Vietnam that our offer of assistance was to enable South Vietnam to maintain "a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion of aggression through military means."

4. The key to peace in southeast Asia has been repeated over and over again. It is the readiness of all in that area to live at peace and to leave their neighbors alone. Those who are not leaving their neighbors alone know exactly what it means—the illegal infiltration of military personnel and arms cannot be described as "leaving your neighbor alone."

5. Compliance with the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962 can establish peace.

6. What is still missing is any indication that Hanoi is prepared to stop doing what it is doing against its neighbors. The absence of this crucial element affects the current discussion of negotiation. A negotiation aimed at the acceptance or the confirmation of aggression is not possible.

I repeat here today what I have said ever since our retaliatory air strikes against North Vietnam. I fully support President Johnson in his actions of firmness, and I fully support his policy statement of February 17 and the policy statement of Secretary Rusk to which I have just referred.

Indeed, I would go a step further than the Secretary and say that not only must Hanoi indicate that it is prepared to stop what it is doing to its neighbors in South Vietnam, but it must also bring back the many thousands of guerrillas and infiltrators to North Vietnam, where they belong, before negotiations begin. This would not preclude a period of a truce during which these people, along with their war materiel, are pulled back to North Vietnam. Perhaps this is implied when the Secretary says that "negotiation aimed at the acceptance or the confirmation of aggression is not possible," but I think it should be clearly stated. Also, it should be made clear that any period of a truce or cease-fire cannot be used as a ruse for the North Vietnamese to consolidate their positions in South Vietnam—let alone improve them.

On February 27, the State Department issued a white paper on Vietnam setting forth a full and up-to-date summary of the massive evidence establishing North Vietnam's responsibility for the aggression against South Vietnam—evidence which has been presented to the International Control Commission.

The "white paper" points out that the war in Vietnam—and note that it uses the word "war"—is a new kind of war; a totally new brand of aggression against an independent people who want to make their own way in peace and freedom; that a Communist government has set out deliberately to conquer a sovereign people in a neighboring state; that South Vietnam is fighting for its life against a brutal campaign of terror and armed attack inspired, directed, supplied, and controlled by the Communist regime in Hanoi—an aggression which has been going on for years.

The evidence shows that the hard core of the Communist forces attacking South Vietnam was trained in North Vietnam and ordered into South Vietnam by Hanoi; that the key leadership of the Vietcong, the officers and much of the cadre, many of the technicians, political organizers, and propagandists have come from North Vietnam and operate under Hanoi's direction; that the training of essential military personnel and their infiltration into South Vietnam is directed by the military high command in Hanoi; that many of the weapons and much of the ammunition and other supplies used by the Vietcong have been sent into South Vietnam from Hanoi; and that war materiel from Communist China and

other Communist states has been channeled through North Vietnam for the Vietcong army.

The evidence shows that these attacking forces remain under the military discipline of Hanoi after they enter South Vietnam, and that increasingly the forces sent into South Vietnam are native North Vietnamese.

The infiltration rate has been as follows, and these are minimum figures:

Year:	*Minimum*
1959–60	1,800
1961	3,700
1962	5,400
1963	4,200
1964	4,400

Thus, since 1959, nearly 20,000 Vietcong officers, soldiers, and technicians are known to have entered South Vietnam under orders from Hanoi, and probably 17,000 more infiltraters were sent in. It is now estimated that the Vietcong number 35,000, comprising the "hard core" of all Communist forces in South Vietnam.

Of particular interest is the statement in the "white paper" that "Clearly the restraint of the past was not provided adequately for the defense of South Vietnam against Hanoi's open aggression," that further means for defense were agreed upon between the United States and South Vietnam, and that the air strikes against North Vietnam were made as a "limited response fitted to the aggression that produced them."

I have been saying, ever since our Government permitted Premier Khrushchev to renege on his agreement for onsite inspection in Cuba, that a policy of "restraint" might sound good, but if it really is not reasonably firm, it would be misinterpreted by the Communists as a sign of weakness. That is what has happened in Vietnam, and I am encouraged that the State Department has faced up to this fact. Whether or not the air strikes on North Vietnam are indeed fitted to the aggression by the Vietcong, only time will tell. I hope that they are. I am concerned that Hanoi may interpret this new policy of firmness as merely an interlude in what has been a policy of accommodation rather than a change in the policy of accommodation. If Hanoi misreads the policy intentions of our President and the Secretary of State, things will get worse before they get better. More lives will be lost—American as well as Vietnamese. More devastation will come to North Vietnam, and probably to Hanoi itself. Concern is being expressed over the possibility that Red China will send troops to North Vietnam and Laos for eventual use against South Vietnam. I suggest that this possibility will be in direct proportion to our failure to continue a policy of firmness, as distinguished from a policy of accommodation. That is why it is so important that not one sign of a return to the unfortunate accommodation policy be shown; and it will not be shown as long as the present policy of the President and the State Department are steadfastly adhered to. They will continue to have my full support as long as they follow this policy.

And while I am on this point, we may trust that Peiping will understand that the privileged sanctuary policy which prevailed during the Korean war went down with the bombs on North Vietnam.

I have not been particularly concerned over the reaction in some capitals to our change from a policy of accommodation to one of firmness. After all, there has been general satisfaction to let the United States and South Vietnam bear almost all of the cost of repelling the aggression by North Vietnam. Too many of these capitals have long been following a policy of accommodation, exchanging ambassadors with Red China, failing to pay their obligations to the United Nations, accepting our foreign aid, and influencing our foreign policy. Words like "peace," "negotiations," "settlement," and "restraint" are expedients which seem to blind them to the evidence of aggression and to their moral responsibility in the family of nations to help put a stop to it. We may hope that our clear and steadfast adherence to a policy of firmness will persuade them to our cause.

What does concern me, however, is the attitude and statements of Mr. U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations.

On February 24, the day before Secretary Rusk's policy statement, Mr. U Thant told a news conference that he had proposed a secret peace plan to end the war in South Vietnam. It was reported that he was unusually critical of American policy in southeast Asia and suggested that there would have been no Communist intervention had the United States stayed out of South Vietnam, supporting his contention by using his own country, Burma, as an example. He said that the Burmese Communist underground had never received any outside help because the Burmese Government had not itself asked for any outside help in fighting the Communists. "Not one precious American life has been lost in Burma," he was quoted as saying. "Not one precious American dollar has been spent in Burma in the form of military assistance in the last 17 years."

Is it not strange that Mr. U Thant had no words of condemnation against North Vietnam for its acts of aggression? Why did he not condemn the violations by North Vietnam of the Geneva pacts of 1954 and 1962? Just because his own government in Burma did not seek military assistance from the United States, does he deny the right under the SEATO treaty, of South Vietnam to ask the United States for help against Communist subversion? Does he deny that the Communists in Burma, in South Vietnam, in Cuba, are controlled by Peiping or the Kremlin? Do his statements sound like those of a representative of the United Nations, whose charter says:

> We the peoples of the United Nations [are] determined to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained.
>
> And for these ends to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors.

Does Mr. U Thant believe that North Vietnam has been acting like a "good neighbor"?

I invite attention that the Geneva agreement of 1954 provided among other things as follows:

> Article 5. To avoid any incidents which might result in the resumption of hostilities, all military forces, supplies, and equipment shall be withdrawn from the demilitarized zone within 25 days of the present agreement's entry into force.
>
> Article 6. No person, military or civilian, shall be permitted to cross the provisional military demarcation line unless specifically authorized to do so by the Joint Commission.
>
> Article 17. (a) With effect from the date of entry into force of the present agreement, the introduction into Vietnam of any reinforcements in the form of all types of arms, munitions, and other war material, such as combat aircraft, naval craft, pieces of ordnance, jet engines and jet weapons and armored vehicles, is prohibited.

I invite attention that the Geneva agreement of 1962 provided among other things as follows:

The parties undertake that:

> (a) they will not commit or participate in any way in any act which might directly or indirectly impair the sovereignty, independence, neutrality, unity or territorial integrity of the Kingdom of Laos; (b) they will not resort to the use or threat of force or any other measure which might impair the peace of the Kingdom of Laos; (c) they will refrain from all direct or indirect interference in the internal affairs of the Kingdom of Laos; * * * (i) they will not use the territory of the Kingdom of Laos for interference in the internal affairs of other countries.

I note from the World News Digest that last July 8, Mr. U Thant proposed reconvening the 1954 Geneva Conference to negotiate an end to the war in Vietnam. What good does he think this world do when North Vietnam has violated the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962?

On last August 6, following a conference with President Johnson, Mr. U Thant told reporters that he believed the UN Security Council was currently in no position to be "usefully employed in a settlement" of the problem, being hampered by the nature of the dispute and by the fact that Hanoi is not a member of the UN.

With respect to Mr. U Thant's statement, "Not one precious American dollar has been spent in Burma in the form of military assistance in the last 17 years," I note from the February 24 issue of the Davenport, Iowa, Times-Democrat that the Allen and Scott Report refers to a secret $9 million arms program furnished by the United States to Burma; and, I might add, for fiscal year 1964 we furnished $1.5 million in foreign aid of a nonmilitary nature.

I find Mr. U Thant's behavior one-sided, prejudiced, ungrateful, superficial, and unrealistic. How can he command the trust and respect so necessary for the performance of his duties? He should resign.

Let me remind Senators that last August 7, by a vote of 88 to 2, the Senate passed the southeast Asia resolution, following the retaliatory raids on North

Vietnamese PT boat bases ordered by President Johnson as a result of attacks on our destroyers in the Bay of Tonkin. This resolution was approved without a single negative vote in the House of Representatives.

It states:

That the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.

The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. Consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.

I do not criticize the sincerity of my two colleagues who voted against this resolution; and their continued criticism is completely consistent with their vote at that time. But what I am wondering about are the statements of some of those Senators who voted for this resolution which, in light of the evidence, hardly represent support for the President in his action to put a stop to Communist aggression in South Vietnam. It is these statements which might collectively be interpreted by Hanoi as a "sign" that the United States is not going to be as steadfast in pursuing the President's policy as we must be. We simply cannot be inconsistent about this matter.

It will not do to contend that we are following the wrong course of action just because there are frequent changes in the Government of South Vietnam. Our previous policy of accommodation has contributed to this. When we were asked for help to stop Communist aggression, it would be only natural that the South Vietnamese expected that help to be effective. It was not effective, and one cannot blame the people for becoming disillusioned. Ambassador Taylor's indication that the morale of the people improved following our attacks on North Vietnam bears out this point. These people wish to be left alone, but if they are not left alone by North Vietnam, and if it appears that the United States is not going to take sufficient action to put a stop to it that the Vietcong will win, it is understandable why a good many of these troubled people would wish to be on the side of the winner. Costly airstrikes against the privileged sanctuary of North Vietnam have been designed to persuade Hanoi that we mean business, and if aggression continues, more of the same can be expected. Hanoi must be persuaded that any gain from continued aggression will be more than offset by its losses. No one in the Pentagon whom I know is saying that airstrikes against guerrillas will stop them. But there are other targets besides guerrillas. They may have to be destroyed before the cost of continued aggression is brought home to the Communist regime in Hanoi.

In the final analysis, the war in Vietnam is a test of the wills of the people of the United States and those of the Communist world, particularly in Hanoi and Peiping, as of the moment. The moral fiber, the character, the patience of our people to break the Communist will to win in this area are involved. Ours is a truly moral cause—completely in consonance with the Charter of the United Nations and the principles which have caused millions of freedom-loving people to turn to the United States for leadership in the cause of peace with justice and respect for the dignity of man. We must not fail to provide this leadership. Let me say, in behalf of our President, that great leadership does not always mean the most popular leadership. What is important is the righteousness of the cause and the perseverance of a leader to see it through. Neville Chamberlain was, undoubtedly, popular for the moment following the Munich agreement. Winston Churchill was not always popular, but he will go down in history as the finest leader the world has known in our time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following be placed in the RECORD:

Statement by Secretary of State Dean Rusk on U.S. position in southeast Asia, from the Washington Post of February 26, 1965.

Partial text of the U.S. white paper on Vietnam, from the Washington Evening Star for February 27.

"How Our Far Eastern Policy Led to Vietnam," a recent speech by William P. Bundy, published in the Washington Sunday Star for February 28.

An excerpt from the article written by the distinguished columnist, William S. White, entitled "Negotiation—U Thant's View on Vietnam," from the Washington Post of February 26.

An excerpt from the article written by the distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond, entitled "Red Aggressor—Evidenced Against Hanoi," from the Washington Post of February 26.

An article written by Louis B. Fleming of the Los Angeles Times and published in the February 25 issue of the Washington Post, entitled: "Thant Proposes Secret Peace Plan To End Vietnam War."

An article written by Columnists Allen and Scott and published in the Davenport Times-Democrat for February 24, entitled "Arms Aid for Burma Is Questioned by Congress."

Remarks of NBC Correspondent David Wills on "Three-Star Extra" program of February 25.

Comments of "Three-Star Extra" editor in chief, Ray Henle, on the same program of February 25.

Excerpt of Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Vietnam, July 20, 1954.

Excerpt from the Declaration on the Neutrality of Laos, July 23, 1962.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 25, 1965]

THANT PROPOSES SECRET PEACE PLAN TO END VIETNAM WAR

(By Louis B. Fleming)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Secretary General U Thant has proposed a secret peace plan to end the war in South Vietnam, he told a news conference today.

He hinted that the proposal has gone to the Governments of Communist China and North Vietnam, which are not members of the United Nations, and confirmed that it had been sent to President Johnson.

"Up to this moment, the results of these consultations and discussions have not been conclusive," he observed.

Thant was unusually critical of American policy in southeast Asia during the news conference. He suggested that there would have been no Communist intervention had the United States stayed out of South Vietnam.

STABILITY CALLED NEED

He asserted that the American public does not know the facts, adding: "In times of war and of hostilities the first casualty is truth."

But he emphasized for the first time that he was not advocating an immediate withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam. The troops could not be withdrawn until stability had been established, he said, tacitly rejecting Communist demands that the troops be withdrawn as a precondition for negotiations.

He warned that the chances for a settlement grow dimmer with each passing day, adding that no one can be sure that negotiations or a conference would succeed, "but it is worth trying."

The Secretary General said he had sent "concrete ideas and proposals" to the interested parties, but that "it would not be helpful at this stage to reveal even parts or some features of the negotiations I have conducted."

He left the impression that he still favors:

An informal, secret dialogue between the principal parties as a preliminary to any formal meeting. He first put this idea forward in a press statement February 12.

A reconvening of the 1954 Geneva Conference on Indochina, which would work out the terms of a political settlement, presumably pointing to a nonalined status for South Vietnam. He first specifically appealed for such a conference last July.

Thant refused to say whether he had received any response to his February 12 public appeal for preliminary consultations. The question had asked specifically whether he had heard from Peiping and Hanoi.

U.N. ROLE LIMITED

He said it is not likely that the United Nations Security Council can play a useful role in the dispute. The principal obstacle is that "more than two parties directly concerned in the question are not members of this organization." He referred to Communist China and the two Vietnams.

The Secretary General used the example of his own country, Burma, to support his contention that Communist intervention in South Vietnam came only as a response to American intervention.

He said the Burmese Communist underground had never received so much as a single rifle from outside forces because the Burmese Government had not itself asked for help in fighting the Communists.

"Not one precious American life has been lost in Burma," Thant said. "Not one pre-

cious American dollar has been spent in Burma in the form of military assistance in the last 17 years."

In the official text of the news conference, the word "precious" was eliminated from both sentences.

Thant also asserted that no arms had gone from North Vietnam to South Vietnam before the American intervention after the Geneva Conference.

[From Three-Star Extra]

PRESIDENT AUTHORIZES NO NEGOTIATIONS

The President has no sympathy for the views of U.N. Secretary General Thant on Vietnam. The White House says the President has not authorized, and is not contemplating, any negotiations, nor are there any proposals for negotiations before the President.

Yesterday Secretary Thant said he had sent concrete ideas and proposals to the interested parties. The White House says nothing has been received. Mr. Thant is in effect offering himself as a go-between. But yesterday Mr. Thant indicated his belief that American intervention is the whole cause of the trouble.

As an example to others, he held up the conduct of his own country, Burma, which lives cautiously in the shadow of its aggressive neighbor, Red China. Mr. Thant observed that no precious American lives had been lost in Burma and no precious American dollars had been spent in Burma—a sneering comment that in itself makes him most unsuitable as a go-between.

Mr. Thant revealed his awareness that he had blundered by having the word "precious" deleted from the official U.N. transcript of his news conference. Mr. Thant implied in this conference that the U.S. administration is not telling the truth about Vietnam to the American people; but to issue a deliberately inaccurate transcript of his own conference hardly qualifies Mr. Thant to make any such criticism of others.

The situation as of today is that U.N. Secretary General Thant thinks the heart of the Vietnam problem is to find a face-saving way for the United States to withdraw, while the President says the real task is to get the Communists to stop their aggression. Between these two positions, there is no common ground. As Secretary of State Rusk said this afternoon, a negotiation aimed at the acceptance or the confirmation of aggression is not possible.

It would appear that U.N. Secretary General Thant has delivered a very serious blow to the prestige and the effectiveness of the world organization. His comments on the situation in Vietnam, on which you have heard Mr. Wills' report, not only ignored the facts but put Mr. Thant in a position of bias against the United States and the fundamental principles of the organization which he heads.

The United Nations already has been robbed of much of its powers for keeping the peace of the world by the recent actions of Russia and her satellites. By creating an impasse in the U.N. through her refusal to pay up on her past dues, the Soviets have immobilized all of the organization's peacekeeping machinery. They have created a situation in which the U.N. can move only when they [the Soviets] agree to the action.

That has left the U.N. with nothing but its prestige as an instrument for maintaining order around the world. And now that last weapon has been blunted by Mr. Thant himself.

Over the years the United Nations has been operating under very difficult circumstances in a world under increasing threats from Communist aggression. In this situation it could have made some limited contribution to world peace through the maintenance of a posture of neutrality and fairness. By his own words, Mr. Thant now appears to have disqualified himself as a spokesman for those principles. From now on he speaks as the neutralist with heavy leanings toward the Communist world.

[From the Times-Democrat, Feb. 24, 1965]

ARMS AID FOR BURMA IS QUESTIONED IN CONGRESS

WASHINGTON.—Congressional probers are adding Burma to their growing list of foreign aid programs they want President Johnson to review carefully.

With the government of General Ne Win moving closer to Communist China, members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee are questioning the wisdom of continuing a secret $9 million arms program to that socialist regime.

The legislators, headed by Representative H.R. GROSS, Republican of Iowa, are demanding that the weapons be halted until the United States obtains a written guarantee from Burma that they won't be used against the United States or to help Communist subversion in Thailand.

Although the State Department has refused to publish details of the Burma arms aid program, its confidential documents show it is very similar to the aid given neighboring Cambodia, which is now using the U.S. arms to help the Communist Vietcong in South Vietnam.

Since Burma borders Thailand, now being threatened by Peiping, Representative GROSS and the other lawmakers want to make sure the mistake made in Cambodia won't be repeated in Burma.

According to the committee's findings, the United States has furnished General Ne Win's government more than $5 million in arms and equipment to improve and strengthen its 46,000 paramilitary force.

Since the initiation of the secret arms deal in 1960, more than 1,000 motor vehicles and motorcycles, 1,700 bicycles and 50 small patrol craft have been turned over to the Burmese troops.

As in the Cambodia aid program, a countrywide communications systems was set up with U.S. equipment, linking all of Burma's military forces with a central headquarters in Rangoon.

Another $4 million worth of supplies are either en route or being programed for shipment to Burma this year. Its paramilitary troops are being trained in the latest counterinsurgency methods both in the United States and at U.S. installations in the Pacific.

In addition to this military assistance, the United States is helping finance General Ne Win's road to socialism with a number of major economic programs.

One of the largest is the construction of a 132-mile, two-lane highway from Rangoon to Mandalay. When finished, this road will connect with one leading all the way to the border of Communist China. The United States is providing $10 million for this controversial project.

Another $4 million is going to improve Burma's inland waterways fleet. The United States already has turned over 47 barges and 12 other vessels to the Burmese, with more coming.

An additional $4.8 million is for the expansion of the government's lumber industry. With this aid, the Burmese have purchased five sawmills and reequipped seven others.

To help launch a controversial land reform program, the United States is giving Burma more than $3 million to develop its land and water resources.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 26, 1965]

STATEMENT BY RUSK ON U.S. POSITION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

(Secretary of State Dean Rusk issued the following prepared statement yesterday at his news conference.)

1. The nations of southeast Asia have a right to live in peace, free from aggression directed against them from outside their borders. This is not an empty theory, it is a point of vital importance to the safety and, indeed, the very existence of more than a hundred smaller nations all over the world.

2. North Vietnam, in callous disregard of the Agreements of 1954 and 1962, has directed and supplied the essential military personnel and arms for a systematic campaign of terror and guerrilla action aimed at the overthrow of the Government of South Vietnam and at the imposition by force of a Communist regime. The evidence of North Vietnam's direct responsibility for this aggression has been repeatedly presented by the Government of Vietnam, the U.S. Government, and the International Control Commission. A full and up-to-date summary of the evidence establishing this responsibility will be available within a very few days.

3. The attitude of the United States toward threats to the peace in southeast Asia has been made clear many times and in the most serious and formal ways:

(a) by the ratification of the Manila Pact in February 1955, which includes South Vietnam as a protocol state. (This treaty was approved by the Senate by a vote of 62 to 1.)

(b) by a decision of President Eisenhower in 1954, set forth in a letter to the President of South Vietnam: "The implications of the agreement concerning Vietnam have caused grave concern regarding the future of a country temporarily divided by an artificial military grouping, weakened by a long and exhausting war and faced with enemies without and by their subversive collaborators within.

"The purpose of this offer to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means."

(c) by the joint resolution of the Congress of the United States, passed in August 1964 by a combined vote of 502 to 2, which stated, among other things:

"That the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.

"The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia.

"The United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom."

(d) by the statement of President Johnson on the occasion of signing that joint resolution:

"To any armed attack upon our forces, we shall reply.

"To any in southeast Asia who ask our help in defending their freedom, we shall give it.

"In that region, there is nothing we covet, nothing we seek—no territory, no military position, no political ambition. Our one desire—our one determination—is that the people of southeast Asia be left in peace to work out their destinies in their own way."

4. It has been stated over and over again that the key to peace in southeast Asia is the

readiness of all those in that area to live at peace and to leave their neighbors alone. There is no mystery about that formulation; those who are not leaving their neighbors alone know exactly what it means. It is an obligation under the 1954 agreements, under the 1962 accords on Laos, and under general international law. The illegal infiltration of military personnel and arms cannot be described as "leaving your neighbor alone."

5. There have been negotiated settlements in southeast Asia, the most recent one as late as 1962. Those several agreements were intended to establish peace in that area; compliance with them by all concerned can achieve that result.

6. Since the Geneva Conference of 1962, the United States has been in active and continuous consultation with other governments about the danger created by aggression in southeast Asia. It has been discussed in the United Nations, in the SEATO and NATO Councils, and on innumerable occasions directly with other governments through diplomatic channels. We have had direct discussions with almost every signatory of the agreements of 1954 and 1962. What is still missing is any indication that Hanoi is prepared to stop doing what it is doing against its neighbors. The absence of this crucial element affects the current discussion of "negotiation." Political channels have been and are open and a considerable number of governments are actively interested in keeping them open to explore the possibilities of a peaceful solution. But a negotiation aimed at the acceptance or the confirmation of aggression is not possible. A negotiation which simply ends in bitterness and hostility merely adds to the danger.

7. Let me remind you that on February 17 the President said:

"As I have said so many, many times, and other Presidents ahead of me have said, our purpose, our objective there is clear. That purpose and that objective is to join in the defense and protection of freedom of a brave people who are under attack that is controlled and that is directed from outside their country.

"We have no ambition there for ourselves. We seek no dominion. We seek no conquest. We seek no wider war. But we must all understand that we will persist in the defense of freedom, and our continuing actions will be those which are justified and those that are made necessary by the continuing aggression of others.

"These actions will be measured and fitting and adequate. Our stamina and the stamina of the American people is equal to the task."

Let me conclude by reaffirming, still once more, that the central object of American policy and action is peace in southeast Asia and the safety of the independent states in that region. Many of the peoples of that area have been subjected to 25 years of turmoil and violence; they are entitled to peace. We should much prefer to use our resources as a part of an international effort to assist the economic and social development of the peoples of that area than to have them diverted into the harsh necessities of resisting aggression.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 26, 1965]

NEGOTIATION?—U THANT'S VIEW ON VIETNAM

(By William S. White)

With a rarely matched twisting of the truth, but at least with a certain insolent candor, Secretary General U Thant of the United Nations has now openly become an apologist and propagandist for Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

U Thant has now trumpeted as revealed truth, and without hesitation or qualification, the whole basic Communist line that the war in South Vietnam was only a little homegrown contest involving two sets of local boys until dreadful old Uncle Sam intervened to assist the anti-Communist government of that country. He has called upon us to negotiate and to withdraw ourselves as soon as possible.

In the process, he has rewritten 10 years of history, annulling 10 years in which the Communist government of North Vietnam has undeniably and consistently directed and supplied and commanded a tireless and savage invasion of South Vietnam in endless violation of agreements made in 1954 at just such negotiations as are now being so pressed upon us.

Thus, with U Thant's now unhidden recruitment to them, those forces seeking to blackmail or persuade the United States into abandoning its commitments in South Vietnam and to cut and run are at last complete. And what a pretty company they make for any American to travel with.

Thant, the Soviet Union, and Charles de Gaulle of France—this is the splendid trinity that, whatever the intention in individual cases, is taking actions to remove the American presence in Asia, to sully an American effort against pillage and murder of signal honor and decency, and to open all southeast Asia to the faceless hordes of Communist China.

And it would all be done under definitions that only Thant and the Communists can understand: If Communist forces invade or infiltrate a country, the resulting fighting is only local and nobody is intruding anywhere. If anti-Communist forces respond to an independent country's appeal for help against marauders, then this is not only intervention but also quite unacceptable intervention.

Even the precious little band of Democratic Senators that has been crying for weeks for negotiation—even though it is perfectly plain that negotiation at this stage would be outright surrender to aggression—may find itself a bit unhappy with the international associates it now has.

When the Soviet Union pushes us toward negotiation—again, at this stage, before we could possibly negotiate from strength in South Vietnam—is it really likely that this would be in the interests of the United States? When Charles de Gaulle of France pushes us toward negotiation, is it really likely that this would be in the interests of the United States, considering that Charles de Gaulle for years has been attempting to break down American influence all over the world?

Is it not odd that U Thant should feel free to interfere in this matter anyhow, since neither North Vietnam, the aggressor state here, nor Communist China, its master, is even a member of the organization for which he speaks?

And does the Democratic splinter in the Senate know that, according to word to me from a distinguished allied Ambassador, it has already succeeded in convincing the diplomatic community here that the majority party of this country is not behind the President in Vietnam? The fact that this estimate is absurdly wrong and that a vast majority of both parties backs the President does not cure the measureless harm that has been done to American interests by the Democratic splinter.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 26, 1965]

RED AGGRESSOR: EVIDENCE AGAINST HANOI

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The United States is ready to submit to the United Nations Security Council or any other proper body, massive, and mounting proof that the war in South Vietnam is armed and directed from Hanoi.

The evidence is now fully prepared for use by the Government at the right moment.

It rests on captured arms, captured documents, testimony of Communist defectors and interrogation of North Vietnamese prisoners of war.

It proves that the aggression against South Vietnam is inspired, commanded, controlled, and supplied by the Communist regime in Hanoi.

This evidence shows a systematic violation of the frontier that Hanoi agreed to respect in the Geneva agreements of 1954 and in the Laotian agreement of 1962.

This evidence makes North Vietnam the procuring force in the attempt to overthrow the Government of South Vietnam and, in the words of Under Secretary of State George W. Ball, "the mainspring of the whole Vietcong effort."

Here is a good cross section of the information that documents the role Hanoi has played from the beginning:

Infiltration: From 1959 to 1964, Hanoi sent 19,000 military personnel across the border to wage war against South Vietnam. This figure comes from cross-checked reports from prisoners, defectors, and secret documents. There is substantial information that 15,000 additional infiltrators entered South Vietnam during this period. In guerrilla warfare, 20,000 guerrillas can be equal to a regular army of 200,000 to 300,000.

Vietcong leadership: Most officers, the key cadres and the technicians for hard-core Vietcong units operating in South Vietnam are from North Vietnam.

Arms supplies: Large and increasing quantities of weapons are entering from outside. One captured Vietcong said that his entire company had recently been supplied with modern Chinese weapons. A Vietcong arms cache contained recoilless rifles and ammunition, carbines, detonating fuses, 110 pounds of TNT, fuses for mortar shells, and other arms. Their identifiable sources were: North Vietnam, Red China, East Germany, and Hungary.

Another massive cache was seized last week. Included in the capture were 1,000 Russian-made carbines, 900 Red Chinese rifles, several hundred Soviet submachineguns, antiaircraft guns, recoilless rifles, and grenades.

Supposedly the source of manufacture of these weapons is to be obliterated. Captured documents reveal instructions from Hanoi directing the infiltrators to remove all markings from their munitions. The infiltrators themselves start out from near Hanoi in North Vietnamese uniforms and change into South Vietnamese uniforms at the frontier.

The admission: Hanoi has officially declared that its army is the instrument of the class struggle to liberate South Vietnam. It has said that it is the brain and the factor that decides.

The thanks: The Vietcong have several times thanked Hanoi for its armed support.

No deviation: The Vietcong Communists have never once deviated from the Hanoi party line.

This is the evidence that caused the three-nation International Control Commission (India, Canada, with Communist Poland dissenting) to report that "beyond any reasonable doubt North Vietnam has sent arms and men into South Vietnam with the aim of overthrowing the legal government."

This is the evidence that has caused the United States to conclude that the Hanoi regime is in full strategic control of every action by the Vietcong and is providing the major share of its equipment and supplies.

[From the Washington, D.C. Evening Star, Feb. 27, 1965]

PARTIAL TEXT OF THE U.S. WHITE PAPER ON VIETNAM

(Following is a partial text of the State Department's white paper on Vietnam.)

South Vietnam is fighting for its life against a brutal campaign of terror and armed attack inspired, directed, supplied

and controlled by the Communist regime in Hanoi. This flagrant aggression has been going on for years, but recently the pace has quickened and the threat has now become acute.

The war in Vietnam is a new kind of war, a fact as yet poorly understood in most parts of the world. Much of the confusion that prevails in the thinking of many people, and even many governments, stems from this basic misunderstanding. For in Vietnam, a totally new brand of aggression has been loosed against an independent people who want to make their own way in peace and freedom.

In Vietnam, a Communist government has set out deliberately to conquer a sovereign people in a neighboring state. And to achieve its end, it has used every resource of its own government to carry out its carefully planned program of concealed aggression. North Vietnam's commitment to seize control of the south is no less total than was the commitment of the regime in North Korea in 1950. But knowing the consequences of the latter's undisguised attack, the planners in Hanoi have tried desperately to conceal their hand. They have failed, and their aggression is as real as that of an invading army.

This report is a summary of the massive evidence of North Vietnamese aggression obtained by the Government of South Vietnam. This evidence has been jointly analyzed by South Vietnamese and American experts.

THE EVIDENCE

The evidence shows that the hard core of the Communist forces attacking South Vietnam were trained in the North and ordered into the South by Hanoi. It shows that the key leadership of the Vietcong, the officers and much of the cadre, many of the technicians, political organizers and propagandists have come from the North and operate under Hanoi's direction. It shows that the training of essential military personnel and their infiltration into the South is directed by the military high command in Hanoi.

The evidence shows that many of the weapons and much of the ammunition and other supplies used by the Vietcong have been sent into South Vietnam from Hanoi. In recent months, new types of weapons have been introduced in the Vietcong Army for which all ammunition must come from outside sources. Communist China and other Communist states' ammunition have been primarily channeled through North Vietnam.

The hard core of the Communist forces attacking South Vietnam are men trained in North Vietnam. They are ordered into the South and remain under the military discipline of the military command in Hanoi. Special training camps operated by the North Vietnamese Army give political and military training to the infiltrators. Increasingly the forces sent into the South are native North Vietnamese who have never seen South Vietnam.

White paper text

The infiltration rate has been increasing. From 1959 to 1960, when Hanoi was establishing its infiltration pipeline, at least 1,800 men and probably 2,700 more moved into South Vietnam from the North. The flow increased to a minimum of 3,700 in 1961 and at least 5,400 in 1962. There was a modest decrease in 1963 to 4,200 confirmed infiltrators, though later evidence is likely to raise this figure.

MORE THAN 7,400 IN 1964

For 1964, the evidence is still incomplete. However, it already shows that a minimum of 4,400 infiltrators entered the South and more than 3,000 others probably were sent in.

There is usually a time lag between the entry of infiltrating troops and the discovery of clear evidence they have entered. This fact plus collateral evidence of increased use of the infiltration routes suggest strongly that 1964 was probably the year of greatest infiltration so far.

Thus, since 1959, nearly 20,000 Vietcong officers, soldiers, and technicians are known to have entered South Vietnam under orders from Hanoi. Additional information indicates that probably 17,000 more infiltrators were dispatched to the South by the regime in Hanoi during the past 6 years. It can reasonably be assumed that still other infiltration groups have entered the South for which there is no evidence yet available.

It is now estimated that the Vietcong number approximately 35,000 so-called hard-core forces, and another 60,000 to 80,000 local forces. It is thus apparent that infiltrators from the North—allowing for casualties—make up the majority, and probably the overwhelming proportion, of the so-called hard-core Vietcong. Personnel from the North, in short, are now and have always been the backbone of the entire Vietcong operation.

CASE HISTORIES

Following are individual case histories of North Vietnamese soldiers sent by the Hanoi regime into South Vietnam. They are only an illustrative group. They show that the leadership and specialized personnel for the guerrilla war in South Vietnam consists in large part of members of the North Vietnam armed forces trained in the North and subject to the command and discipline of Hanoi.

Dan was a Vietcong major, commander of the 60th Battalion. Disillusioned with fighting his countrymen and with communism and the lies of the Hanoi regime, he surrendered to the authorities in South Vietnam on February 11, 1963.

At the age of 15 he joined the revolutionary army (Vietminh) and fought against the French forces until 1954 when the Geneva accords ended the Indochina war. As a regular in the Vietminh forces, he was moved to North Vietnam. He became an officer in the so-called People's Army.

In March 1962, Major Dan received orders to prepare to move to South Vietnam. He had been exposed to massive propaganda in the North which told of the destitution of the peasants in the South and said that the Americans had taken over the French role of colonialists. He said later that an important reason for his decision to surrender was that he discovered these propaganda themes were lies. He found the peasants more prosperous than the people in the North. And he recognized quickly that he was not fighting the Americans but his own people.

With the women of his unit, Major Dan left Hanoi on March 23, 1962. They traveled through the Laos corridor. His group joined up with the Vietcong first regiment in Central Vietnam.

The 35-year-old major took part in 45 actions, and was wounded once in an unsuccessful Vietcong attack on an outpost. As time passed, he became increasingly discouraged by his experience as a troop commander of the Vietcong. Most of all, he said, he was tired of killing other Vietnamese. After several months of soul searching, he decided to surrender to the authorities of the Republic of Vietnam. He has volunteered to do anything to serve the national cause of South Vietnam.

VO THOI

Sgt. Vo Thoi (Communist party alias Vo Bien) was an assistant squad leader in the Vietcong Tay Son 22d Battalion. On the night of October 7, 1963, his unit attacked An Tuong village in Binh Dinh Province. After overrunning the village, Vo's company was assigned to set up an ambush against Republic of Vietnam troops rushing to defend the village. In the ensuing fight, Vo was seriously wounded. He was picked up by local farmers and turned over to the authorities.

Vo's life and experiences were similar to those of thousands of Vietcong. Born in Quang Ngai Province in 1932, he went through 5 years of school and then worked on his parents' small farm. During the war against the French, he joined the Viet Minh forces. When the fighting ended, he was transferred to North Vietnam with his unit, the 210th Regiment. He remained in the North Vietnamese Army until 1960 when he was sent to work on a state farm in Nghe An Province. In September 1962, Vo was told he must join the newly activated 22d Battalion. All the members of the battalion came from provinces in South Vietnam, from Quang Tri to Phu Yen. But it was not an ordinary battalion; two-thirds of its members were cadre with ranks up to senior captains.

The group was put through an advanced training course that lasted 6 months. It included combat tactics for units from squad to company and the techniques of guerrilla and counterguerrilla fighting. There were heavy doses of political indoctrination.

On March 5, 1963, the 22d Battalion was ordered to move south. They were transported in trucks from Nghe An Province to Dong Hoi in Quang Binh, just north of the 17th parallel. From there the unit was moved westward to the Laotian border. Then the more than 300 men began walking to the south following mountain trails in Laos and the Vietnam border area. They marched by day, rested at night. Every fifth day, they stopped at a way station for a full day's rest. One company dropped off at Thua Thien Province. Vo and the remainder of the group marched on to Pleiku Province. Two fully armed companies from a neighboring province were assigned to the battalion. The assignment given to the Tay Son Battalion was to harass strategic hamlets in the Hoaian district of Binh Dinh, to round up cattle and rice, to kill or kidnap cadre of the Government forces, and to recruit local youth for service with the Vietcong.

NATIVES, TOO

Native North Vietnamese military personnel

The Communist authorities in Hanoi are now assigning native North Vietnamese in increasing numbers to join the Vietcong forces in South Vietnam.

Vo Thanh Vinh was born in Nghe An Province in North Vietnam in 1936. He was captured by South Vietnamese forces on May 5, 1964. He described himself as a military security officer. He infiltrated into South Vietnam in April 1964 with a group of 34 police and security officers from North Vietnam.

Another native North Vietnamese captured in the south was Vietcong Private First Class Vo Quyen. His home was in Nam Dihn Province. He was a member of the 2d Battalion of the North Vietnamese Army's 9th Regiment. He said the entire battalion had infiltrated into South Vietnam between February and May last year. He was captured in an action in Quang Tri Province on July 4. He told interrogators that the bulk of his unit was composed of young draftees from North Vietnam.

Le Pham Hung, also a private first class, was captured on July 7 in Thua Thien Province. He is a native of Nam Dinh in North Vietnam. He had been drafted for military service in May 1963. His unit was the 324th Division. His group, consisting solely of 90 North Vietnamese draftees, infiltrated into South Vietnam in May 1964. He reported that another company of North Vietnamese entered the south at the same time as his unit.

A former member of the 90th Vietcong Battalion reported that his unit had been reinforced by native North Vietnamese troops earlier this year. Le Thua Phuong, an information cadre, surrendered to government forces on April 23, 1964. He said that the 90th Battalion had received 80 North Vietnamese replacements in February.

A medical technician named Hoang Thung was captured in Thua Thien Province on July 4, 1964. He said he had infiltrated into the south in late 1963 with a group of 200 Vietcong, the majority of whom were ethnic northerners, 120 of them draftees.

These reports destroy one more fiction which the authorities in Hanoi have sought so long to promote—that the fighting in the south was a matter for the South Vietnamese. They underline Hanoi's determination to press its campaign of conquest with every available resource.

INTELLIGENCE

The heart of the Vietcong intelligence organization is the central research bureau in Hanoi. Communist agents are regularly dispatched from North Vietnam, sometimes for brief assignments but often for long periods. Many of these agents move into South Vietnam along the infiltration trails through Laos. But others are carried by boats along the coasts and landed at prearranged sites. A special maritime infiltration group has been developed in North Vietnam and its operations are centered in Ha Tinh and Quang Binh provinces just north of the 17th parallel.

In July 1962 a North Vietnamese intelligence agent named Nguyen Viet Duong began training to infiltrate South Vietnam. A native southerner, he had fought against the French and had gone to North Vietnam after the war ended. Selected for intelligence work, he was assigned to the central bureau in 1959.

After a period of intensive instruction in radio transmission, coding and decoding, and other skills of the intelligence trade, he was given false identity papers and other supplies and was transported to the south. His principal task was to set up a cell of agents to collect military information. He flew from Hanoi to Dong Hoi. From the latter port, the maritime infiltration group took him by boat to South Vietnam. That was in August 1962.

In January 1963, Luong reported to Hanoi that he had run into difficulties. His money and papers had been lost and he had been forced to take refuge with Vietcong contacts in another province. Another agent was selected to go to South Vietnam. One of his assignments was to contact Duong, find out details of what had happened to him, and help Duong reestablish himself as a Vietcong agent. The man selected for the task was Senior Capt. Tran Van Tan of the central intelligence organization.

Tan had already been picked to go to the South to establish a clandestine Vietcong communications center to maintain contact with Hanoi. Helping Duong was one of his secondary assignments. After intensive preparations, Tan was ready to move to South Vietnam in March. He was transferred to an embarkation base of the maritime infiltration group just north of the 17th parallel.

FISHERMEN

He was joined by three other Vietcong agents and the captain and three crewmen of the boat that would take them south. Each was given false identity papers to conform to their false names. They also were provided with fishermen's permits, South Vietnamese voting cards, and draft cards or military discharge papers. The boat captain received a boat registration book, crew lists, and several South Vietnamese permits to conduct business. The agents had to become familiar with simple boat procedures so they could pass as fishermen.

The expedition left the embarkation port on April 4. In addition to the four agents, the boat carried six carefully sealed boxes. These contained a generator, several radios, some weapons, and a large supply of South Vietnamese currency. They also carried some chemicals and materials for making false identification papers. Their destination was a landing site on the coast of Phuoc Tuy Province.

Soon after leaving North Vietnam, the Vietcong boat encountered high winds and rough seas. On April 7, the storm became violent. The boat threatened to capsize. Strong northeasterly winds forced it ever closer to shore. Finally, the boat captain, Nguyen Xit, ordered that the six boxes be thrown overboard. This was done and the boat then was beached. The eight men decided to split up into pairs and try to make contact with Vietcong forces. They buried their false papers and set out. Six of the eight were captured almost immediately by authorities in Thua Thien Province. The other two were taken several days later.

Student propaganda agents

The student population of South Vietnam is an important target group for Vietcong propagandists. These agents seek to win adherents for the Communist cause among young workers, students in high schools and universities, and the younger officers and enlisted men in the armed forces of the Republic of Vietnam.

Typical of the agents sent into South Vietnam for this purpose is Nguyen Van Vy, a 19-year-old native of the Vinh Linh district in North Vietnam, just north of the demilitarized zone. He was a member of a Communist Party youth group in his native village. He was recruited for propaganda work in the south in the fall of 1962. He was one of 40 young persons enrolled in a special political training course given by the Communist Party in his district.

PHASE 1

The first phase of the training consisted of political indoctrination.

Those who successfully completed the first phase were selected for the second level of training, the so-called technical training phase. In this, the trainees were given their mission in the south.

Vy was told he should infiltrate into South Vietnam and there surrender to the authorities, describing himself as a defector who was "tired of the miserable life in the north." He was to say he wanted to complete his schooling which was impossible in the north. He was told to ask to live with relatives in the south so he could go to school. Once his story was accepted and he was enrolled in a school, he was to begin his work of propagandizing other students.

He was assigned to work under an older agent to whom he had to report regularly. A third member of the team was a younger man who was to assist Vy. The three were to infiltrate into South Vietnam separately and to meet here at a rendezvous point.

At first, Vy was to do no more than observe his fellow students carefully, collecting biographical data on them and studying their personalities and capabilities. He was then to select those he thought might be most influenced by Communist propaganda and try to make friends with them.

THE TARGETS

Once he had selected targets, he was to begin to influence them favorably toward the north and to implant Communist propaganda. He was responsible then for bringing into his organization those he had influenced effectively. These individuals were to be given their own propaganda assignments to work on other students.

Students who wanted to evade military service in the Government forces were considered prime targets. Where possible, Vy was to help them get to North Vietnam. He was also told to make contact with any students who were suspected of Communist activities. These, too, were to be helped to escape to North Vietnam. Any useful information concerning developments in the south or military activities were to be reported through his superior, Nguyen Van Phong.

In case he became suspect, he was either to make his own way back to North Vietnam or to go into the jungle and try to contact a Vietcong unit.

Vy entered South Vietnam on January 2, 1963, by swimming across the Ben Hai River. He encountered an elderly farmer who led him to the local authorities in Hai Gu. There he told his story but it was not believed. He then admitted his true mission.

THE SOURCE

When Hanoi launched the Vietcong campaign of terror, violence and subversion in earnest in 1959, the Communist forces relied mainly on stocks of weapons and ammunition left over from the war against the French. Supplies sent in from North Vietnam came largely from the same source. As the military campaign progressed, the Vietcong depended heavily on weapons captured from the armed forces in South Vietnam. This remains an important source of weapons and ammunition for the Vietcong. But as the pace of the war has quickened, requirements for up-to-date arms and special types of weapons have risen to a point where the Vietcong cannot rely on captured stocks. Hanoi has undertaken a program to reequip its forces in the South with Communist-produced weapons.

Large and increasing quantities of military supplies are entering South Vietnam from outside the country. The principal supply point is North Vietnam which provides a convenient channel for materiel that originates in Communist China and other Communist countries.

An increasing number of weapons from external Communist sources have been seized in the south. These include such weapons as 57 mm. and 75 mm. recoilless rifles, dual-purpose machineguns, rocket launchers, large mortars, and antitank mines.

A new family of Chinese Communist-manufactured weapons has recently appeared in Vietcong hands. These include the 7.62 semiautomatic carbine, 7.62 light machinegun, and the 7.62 assault rifle. These weapons and ammunition for them manufactured in Communist China in 1962 were first captured in December 1964, in Chuong Thien Province. Similar weapons have since been seized in each of the four corps areas of South Vietnam. Also captured have been Chinese Communist antitank grenade launchers and ammunition made in China in 1963.

CASE IN POINT

On February 16, 1965, an American helicopter pilot flying along the South Vietnamese coast sighted a suspicious vessel. It was a cargo ship of an estimated 100-ton capacity, carefully camouflaged and moored just offshore along the coast of Phu Yen Province. Fighter planes that approached the vessel met machinegun fire from guns on the deck of the ship and from the shore as well. A Vietnamese air force strike was launched against the vessel and Vietnamese Government troops moved into the area. They seized the ship after a bitter fight with the Vietcong.

The ship, which had been sunk in shallow water, had discharged a huge cargo of arms, ammunition, and other supplies. Documents found on the ship and on the bodies of several Vietcong aboard identified the vessel as having come from North Vietnam. A newspaper in the cabin was from Haiphong and was dated January 23, 1965. The supplies delivered by the ship—thousands of weapons and more than a million rounds of ammunition—were almost all of Communist origin, largely from Communist China and Czechoslovakia as well as North Vietnam. At least 100 tons of military supplies were discovered near the ship.

A preliminary survey of the cache near the sunken vessel from Hanoi listed the following supplies and weapons:

Approximately 1 million rounds of small arms ammunition.

More than 1,000 stick grenades.

Five hundred pounds of TNT in prepared charges.

Five hundred antitank grenades.

Two thousand rounds of 82-millimeter mortar ammunition.

Five hundred rounds of 57-millimeter recoilless rifle ammunition.

More than 1,000 rounds of 75-millimeter recoilless rifle ammunition.

One 57-millimeter recoilless rifle.

Two heavy machineguns.

Two thousand 7.95 Mauser rifles.

More than 100 7.62 carbines.

One thousand submachineguns.

Fifteen light machineguns.

Five hundred rifles.

Five hundred pounds of medical supplies (with labels from North Vietnam, Communist China, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Soviet Union, and other sources).

The ship was fairly new and had been made in Communist China. Documents aboard the ship included three North Vietnamese nautical charts (one of the Haiphong area and one of Hong Gay, both in North Vietnam, and one of the Tra Vinh area of South Vietnam). The military health records of North Vietnamese soldiers were found. The man had a political history sheet showing he was a member of the 338th Division of the North Vietnamese Army.

POWER LINES

Military affairs of the Vietcong are the responsibility of high command of the People's Army of North Vietnam and the Ministry of Defense, under close supervision from the Lao Dong Party (North Vietnamese Communist Party). These responsibilities include operational plans, assignments of individuals and regular units, training programs, infiltration of military personnel and supplies, military communications, tactical intelligence, supplies, and the like. The six military regions are the same as those of the Vietcong political organization * * *

The hard core of the Vietcong military organization is the full-time regular unit usually based on a province or region. These are well-trained and highly disciplined guerrilla fighters.

The size of the Vietcong regular forces has grown steadily in recent years. For example, the Vietcong have five regimental headquarters compared with two in 1961. And the main Vietcong force is composed of 50 battalions, 50 percent more than before. There are an estimated 139 Vietcong companies. Hard-core Vietcong strength now is estimated at more than 32,000 whereas it was less than 20,000 in 1961.

Supporting the main force units of the Vietcong are an estimated 60,000 to 80,000 part-time guerrillas. They are generally organized at the district level where there are likely to be several companies of 50 or more men each. These troops receive only half pay which means they must work at least part of the time to eke out a living.

THE CRA

Below the irregular guerrilla forces of the district are the part-time, village-based guerrillas. They are available for assignment by higher headquarters and are used for harassment and sabotage. They are expected to warn nearby Vietcong units of the approach of any force of the legal government. They provide a pool for recruitment into the Vietcong district forces. * * *

A key element in the Vietcong effort is an elaborate organization in Hanoi called the Central Research Agency (CRA—Cuc Nghien-Cuu Trung-Uong). Though it handles Hanoi's intelligence effort on a worldwide scale, the main focus of its operation is on South Vietnam. The research agency is able to draw on the intelligence capabilities of both the Lao Dong Party and the North Vietnamese armed forces for information, personnel, and facilities.

The CRA reportedly operates under the close personal scrutiny of Ho Chi Minh himself. Some of the top officials in the Hanoi government reportedly sit on its directing committee, including Premier Pham Van Dong, Deputy Premier Truong Chinh, and Defense Minister Vo Nguyen Giap. * * *

The headquarters of the CRA in Hanoi is divided into six main sections, not including a special code unit. The six sections are responsible for administration, cadres, communications, espionage, research and training. * * *

CRA headquarters directs a number of special centers for oversea operations. One such center maintains intelligence channels to oversea areas. It operates through special units at Haiphong and at Hongey.

A second special center is responsible for Vietcong intelligence operations in Cambodia and Laos. A third center handles activities along the "demarcation line," the border with South Vietnam. The unit is based in Vinh-Linh in southeast North Vietnam. This center is responsible for sending agents and supplies to the south by sea. * * *

Inside South Vietnam, the Vietcong have a large intelligence network. Some of its units are responsible for receiving and sending on agents arriving from the north. They feed and give instructions to groups infiltrating into South Vietnam. They take delivery of equipment and supplies received from the north and relay them to Vietcong units in the south.

Many Vietcong agents have been captured in the city of Saigon. They have exposed the extensive effort by the CRA to penetrate all Republic of Vietnam government agencies, foreign embassies, and other specialized organizations. * * *

Taken as a whole, the North Vietnamese intelligence operation in support of the Vietcong is one of the most extensive of its kind in the world.

AND NOW

Today the war in Vietnam has reached new levels of intensity. The elaborate effort by the Communist regime in North Vietnam to conquer the south has grown, not diminished. Military men, technicians, political organizers, propagandists and secret agents have been infiltrating into the Republic of Vietnam from the north in growing numbers. The flow of Communist-supplied weapons, particularly those of large caliber, has increased. Communications links with Hanoi are extensive. Despite the heavy casualties of 3 years of fighting, the hard-core Vietcong force is considerably larger now than it was at the end of 1961.

The government in Saigon has undertaken vigorous action to meet the new threat. The United States and other free countries have increased their assistance to the Vietnamese Government and people. Secretary of State Dean Rusk visited Vietnam in 1964, and he promised the Vietnamese: "We shall remain at your side until the aggression from the north has been defeated, until it has been completely rooted out and this land enjoys the peace which it deserves."

President Johnson has repeatedly stressed that the U.S. goal is to see peace secured in southeast Asia. But he has noted that "that will come only when aggressors leave their neighbors in peace."

Though it has been apparent for years that the regime in Hanoi was conducting a campaign of conquest against South Vietnam, the government in Saigon and the Government of the United States both hoped that the danger could be met within South Vietnam itself. The hope that any widening of the conflict might be avoided was stated frequently.

The leaders in Hanoi chose to respond with greater violence. They apparently interpreted restraint as indicating lack of will. Their efforts were pressed with greater vigor and armed attacks and incidents of terror multiplied.

Clearly the restraint of the past was not providing adequately for the defense of South Vietnam against Hanoi's open aggression. It was mutually agreed between the Governments of the Republic of Vietnam and the United States that further means for providing for South Vietnam's defense were required. Therefore, air strikes have been made against some of the military assembly points and supply bases from which North Vietnam was conducting its aggression against the South. These strikes constitute a limited response fitted to the aggression that produced them.

Until the regime in Hanoi decides to halt its intervention in the South, or until effective steps are taken to maintain peace and security in the area the Governments of South Vietnam and the United States will continue necessary measures of defense against the Communist armed aggression coming from North Vietnam.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Feb. 28, 1965]

HOW OUR FAR EASTERN POLICY LED TO VIETNAM

(This explanation of American policy in Vietnam was made by William P. Bundy, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, in a recent speech in Washington, Mo.)

The first question requires a look at history.

Even when the Far East was much more distant than it is today, we Americans had deep concern for developments there. Americans pioneered in trade and missionary effort with China and in opening up Japan to Western influence. In 1898 we became in a sense a colonial power in the Philippines, but began almost at once to prepare the way for independence and self-government there—an independence promised by act of Congress in 1936 and achieved on schedule in 1946. By the 1930's, we had wide interests of many types in the Far East, though only few direct contacts in southeast Asia apart from the individual Americans who had served over decades as political advisers to the independent kingdom of Thailand.

Events then took a more ominous turn. We became aware that the ambitions of Japanese military leaders to dominate all of Asia were a threat not only to the specific interests of ourselves and other Western nations, but to the peace of the whole area and indeed of the world. China, in which we had taken a lead in dismantling the 19th-century system of foreign special privileges was progressively threatened and large parts overrun. We ourselves were finally attacked at Pearl Harbor and in the Philippines. We responded to aggression by conducting with our Allies a major Pacific war that cost the United States alone 272,700 casualties and over a hundred billion dollars.

OUR BASIC STAKE

In the end Japanese militarism was defeated, and the way apparently cleared for an Asia of free and independent national states that would be progressively freed of colonialism, that need threaten neither each other nor neighboring states, and that could tackle in their own way the eternal problems of building political and economic structures that would satisfy the aspiration of their peoples.

That kind of Far East was a pretty good definition of our national interests then. It is equally valid today. We cared about the Far East, and we care today, because we know that what happens there—among peoples numbering 33 percent of the world's

population, with great talent, past historic greatness and capacity—is bound to make a crucial difference whether there will be the kind of world in which the common ideals of freedom can spread, nations live and work together without strife, and—most basic of all—we ourselves, in the long run, survive as the kind of nation we are determined to be. Our basic stake in the Far East is our stake in a peaceful and secure world as distinct from a violent and chaotic one. But there were three great flaws in the 1945 picture after the defeat of Japan.

1. In China, a civil war had been raging since the 1920's between the Government, led by Chiang Kai-shek, and the Chinese Communist movement. After a brief and edgy truce during the war against Japan, that civil war was resumed in circumstances where the Government had been gravely weakened. We assisted that Government in every way possible. Mistakes may have been made, but in the last analysis mainland China could not have been saved from communism without the commitment of major U.S. ground and air forces to a second war on the Asian mainland. Faced with a concurrent threat from Soviet Russia against Europe and the Near East, we did not make—and perhaps could not then have made—that commitment. And there came to power on the mainland, in the fall of 1949, a Communist regime filled with hatred of the West, with the vision of a potential dominant role for China, but imbued above all with a primitive Communist ideology in its most virulent and expansionist form.

KOREA ACTION ANALYZED

2. In Korea, a divided country stood uneasily, half free and half Communist. With our military might sharply reduced after the war, as part of what may have been an inevitable slackening of effort, we withdrew our forces and reduced our economic aid before there was in existence a strong South Korean defensive capacity. With Soviet backing, North Korea attacked across the 38th parallel in June 1950. With the Soviets then absent from the U.N. Security Council, the U.N. was able to condemn the aggression and to mount a U.N. effort to assist South Korea. The United States played by far the greatest outside role in a conflict that brought 157,530 U.S. casualties, cost us at least $18 billion in direct expenses, and in the end—after Communist China had also intervened—restored an independent South Korea, although it left a unified and free Korea to be worked out in the future.

In retrospect, our action in Korea reflected three elements:

A recognition that aggression of any sort must be met early and head on, or it will have to be met later and in tougher circumstances. We had relearned the lessons of the 1930's—Manchuria, Ethiopia, the Rhineland, Czechoslovakia.

A recognition that a defense line in Asia, stated in terms of an island perimeter, did not adequately define our vital interest—that those vital interests could be affected by action on the mainland of Asia.

An understanding that, for the future, a power vacuum was an invitation to aggression, that there must be local political, economic, and military strength in being to make aggression unprofitable, but also that there must be a demonstrated willingness of major external power both to assist and to intervene if required.

3. In southeast Asia, finally, there was a third major flaw—the difficulty of liquidating colonial regimes and replacing them by new and stable independent governments. The Philippines became independent and with our help overcame the ravages of war and the Communist Huk rebellion. The British, who had likewise prepared India and Burma and made them independent, were in the process of doing the same in Malaya even as they joined with the Malayans in beating back a 12-year Communist subversive effort. Indonesia was less well prepared; it gained its independence, too, with our support, but with scars that have continued to affect the otherwise natural and healthy development of Indonesian nationalism.

LEADERSHIP FALLS TO COMMUNISTS

French Indochina was the toughest case. The French had thought in terms of a slow evolution to an eventual status within some French union of states—a concept too leisurely to fit the post war mood of Asia. And militant Vietnamese nationalism had fallen to the leadership of dedicated Communists.

We all know the results. Even France was unable to defeat the Communist-led nationalist movement. Despite last-minute promises of independence, the struggle inevitably appeared as an attempt to preserve a colonial position. By 1954, it could only have been won, again, by a major U.S. military commitment, and perhaps not even then. The result was the settlement at Geneva. The accords reached there were almost certainly the best achievable, but they left a situation with many seeds of future trouble. Briefly:

1. North Vietnam was militantly Communist, and had developed during the war against the French an army well equipped and highly skilled in both conventional and subversive warfare. From the start, North Vietnam planned and expected to take over the south and in due course Laos and Cambodia, thinking that this would probably happen by sheer decay under pressure, but prepared to resort to other means if needed.

2. South Vietnam had no effective or popular leadership to start with, was demoralized and unprepared for self-government, and had only the remnants of the Vietnamese military forces who had fought with the French. Under the accords, external military help was limited to a few hundred advisers. Apart from its natural self-sufficiency in food, South Vietnam had few assets that appeared to match those of the north in the struggle that was sure to come.

3. Cambodia was more hopeful in some respects, more remote from North Vietnam, with a leader in Prince Sihanouk, a strong historical tradition, and the freedom to accept external assistance as she saw fit. From the start Sihanouk insisted, with our full and continuing support, on a status of neutrality.

4. Laos, however, was less unified and was left under the accords with a built-in and legalized Communist presence, a disrupted and weak economy, and no military forces of significance.

ACTION STARTED IN 1954

Such was the situation President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles faced in 1954. Two things were clear; that in the absence of external help communism was virtually certain to take over the successor states of Indochina and to move to the borders of Thailand and perhaps beyond, and that with France no longer ready to act, at least in South Vietnam, no power other than the United States could move in to help fill the vacuum.

Their decision, expressed in a series of actions starting in late 1954, was to move in to help these countries. Besides South Vietnam, and more modest efforts in Laos and Cambodia, substantial assistance was begun in Thailand.

The appropriations for these actions were voted by successive Congresses, and in 1954 the Senate likewise ratified the Southeast Asia Treaty, to which Thailand and the Philippines adhered along with the United States, Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, and Pakistan. Although not signers of the treaty, South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia could call on the SEATO members for help against aggression.

COMMITMENT WAS MADE

So a commitment was made with the support of both political parties, that has guided our policy in southeast Asia for a decade now. It was not a commitment that envisaged a U.S. position of power in southeast Asia or U.S. military bases there. We threatened no one. Nor was it a commitment that substituted U.S. responsibility for the basic responsibility of the nations themselves for their own defense, political stability, and economic progress. It was a commitment to do what we could to help these nations attain and maintain the independence and security to which they were entitled—both for their own sake and because we recognized that, like South Korea, southeast Asia was a key area of the mainland of Asia. If it fell to Communist control, this would enormously add to the momentum and power of the expansionist Communist regimes in Communist China and North Vietnam, and thus to the threat to the whole free world position in the Pacific.

Let us look at Vietnam from the beautiful city of Saigon. I visited Saigon in December of 1963 with five of my colleagues, and spoke at length with Gen. Paul D. Harkins, commander of our Military Assistance Advisory Group, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, and many of our American military and businessmen in the area. The most striking thing about Vietnam is the fact that it is the richest agricultural area in the world. The experts have said that sufficient food can be produced in this area to feed almost all of Asia. This territory in the southern portion of Vietnam also permits guerrilla forces to live off the land without a constant resupply to sustain their activities in the field. The area is abundant in geese, ducks, and of course the staple commodity—rice.

During the early phase of the Vietnamese operation against the Vietcong, our military adviser initiated a policy wherein all of the villages of the country were organized and defended in a unique manner. Instead of letting the farmers fall prey to small marauding bands of Vietcong, each town was fortified. The valuables were placed in a warehouse or hut in the center of town, and at the first sign of an attack, the villagers would retreat to this redoubt, and a radio call for help was sent to the nearest army force whose immediate response was guaranteed through the use of helicopters and other high-speed aircraft, in conjunction with paratroop operations. When the war was virtually won in the north the Vietcong were starved out, but in the south they could rely upon the overabundance in the Mekong Delta to support their operation, hence their success in the Saigon area.

HAD TO STOP WAR

The war has been further complicated by the very complex situation within the country. You can imagine the problems our advisers had with the turnover of governments. The American advisers had to get military advice to the proper authorities, and to determine who was in power very often caused a cessation of combat operations with the enemy. In effect, the war would stop while the heads of government and the key leaders in the army were changed, and this meant a complete retraining program by the American mission of all military unit heads as well as political subdivision chiefs.

Probably one of the hallmarks of our mission in Vietnam has been the extreme patience of our American advisers, from our Ambassador and military commanders, down to the valiant Americans who spill their blood along with their Vietnamese comrades. The situation to say the least is vexatious but we must always keep our eyes on our strategic role—that of thwarting these Communist advances.

We will be successful. The Vietnamese will win their struggle. However, the road

to victory never has been easy. The future may call for more intensive strikes at the base and source of Communist power and aggression in North Vietnam. The borders of South Vietnam may have to be sealed to prevent the flow of reinforcements and war material to the subversive Communist army. The 1,800 miles of coastline must be patrolled and the potential for resupply of North Vietnamese operations on the sea be destroyed.

The American people stand firm behind their President and behind the principles of freedom everywhere.

AGREEMENT ON THE CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES IN VIETNAM, JULY 20, 1954

(The Geneva agreements theoretically ended the war between French Union forces and the Vietminh in Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam. These states were to become fully independent countries, with the last named partitioned near the 17th parallel into two states pending reunification through free elections to be held by July 20, 1956. The United States and Vietnam are not signatories to these agreements.)

CHAPTER I—PROVISIONAL MILITARY DEMARCATION LINE AND DEMILITARIZED ZONE

Article 1

A provisional military demarcation line shall be fixed, on either side of which the forces of the two parties shall be regrouped after their withdrawal, the forces of the People's Army of Vietnam to the north of the line and the forces of the French Union to the south.

The provisional military demarcation line is fixed as shown on the map attached (omitted).

It is also agreed that a demilitarized zone shall be established on either side of the demarcation line, to a width of not more than 5 kilometers from it, to act as a buffer zone and avoid any incidents which might result in the resumption of hostilities.

Article 2

The period within which the movement of all the forces of either party into its regrouping zone on either side of the provisional military demarcation line shall be completed shall not exceed 300 days from the date of the present agreement's entry into force.

Article 3

When the provisional military demarcation line coincides with a waterway, the waters of such waterway shall be open to civil navigation by both parties wherever one bank is controlled by one party and the other bank by the other party. The Joint Commission shall establish rules of navigation for the stretch of waterway in question. The merchant shipping and other civilian craft of each party shall have unrestricted access to the land under its military control.

Article 4

The provisional military demarcation line between the two final regrouping zones is extended into the territorial waters by a line perpendicular to the general line of the coast.

All coastal islands north of this boundary shall be evacuated by the armed forces of the French Union, and all islands south of it shall be evacuated by the forces of the People's Army of Vietnam.

Article 5

To avoid any incidents which might result in the resumption of hostilities, all military forces, supplies, and equipment shall be withdrawn from the demilitarized zone within 25 days of the present agreement's entry into force.

Article 6

No person, military or civilian, shall be permitted to cross the provisional military demarcation line unless specifically authorized to do so by the Joint Commission.

Article 7

No person, military or civilian, shall be permitted to enter the demilitarized zone except persons concerned with the conduct of civil administration and relief and persons specifically authorized to enter by the Joint Commission.

Article 8

Civil administration and relief in the demilitarized zone on either side of the provisional military demarcation line shall be the responsibility of the commanders in chief of the two parties in their respective zones. The number of persons, military or civilian, from each side who are permitted to enter the demilitarized zone for the conduct of civil administration and relief shall be determined by the respective commanders, but in no case shall the total number authorized by either side exceed at any one time a figure to be determined by the Trung Gia Military Commission or by the Joint Commission. The number of civil police and the arms to be carried by them shall be determined by the Joint Commission. No one else shall carry arms unless specifically authorized to do so by the Joint Commission.

Article 9

Nothing contained in this chapter shall be construed as limiting the complete freedom of movement, into, out of or within the demilitarized zone, of the Joint Commission, its joint groups, the International Commission to be set up as indicated below, its inspection teams and any other persons, supplies or equipment specifically authorized to enter the demilitarized zone by the Joint Commission. Freedom of movement shall be permitted across the territory under the military control of either side over any road or waterway which has to be taken between points within the demilitarized zone when such points are not connected by roads or waterways lying completely within the demilitarized zone.

CHAPTER II—PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURE GOVERNING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PRESENT AGREEMENT

Article 10

The commanders of the forces on each side, on the one side the commander in chief of the French Union forces in Indochina and on the other side the commander in chief of the People's Army of Vietnam, shall order and enforce the complete cessation of all hostilities in Vietnam by all armed forces under their control, including all units and personnel of the ground, naval and air forces.

Article 11

In accordance with the principle of a simultaneous cease-fire throughout Indochina, the cessation of hostilities shall be simultaneous throughout all parts of Vietnam, in all areas of hostilities and for all the forces of the two parties.

Taking into account the time effectively required to transmit the cease-fire order down to the lowest echelons of the combatant forces on both sides, the two parties are agreed that the cease-fire shall take effect completely and simultaneously for the different sectors of the country as follows:

Northern Vietnam at 8 a.m. (local time) on July 27, 1954.

Central Vietnam at 8 a.m. (local time) on August 1, 1954.

Southern Vietnam at 8 a.m. (local time) on August 11, 1954.

It is agreed that Peiping mean time shall be taken as local time.

From such time as the cease-fire becomes effective in northern Vietnam, both parties undertake not to engage in any large-scale offensive action in any part of the Indochinese theater of operations and not to commit the air forces based on northern Vietnam outside that sector. The two parties also undertake to inform each other of their plans for movement from one regrouping zone to another within 25 days of the present agreement's entry into force.

Article 12

All the operations and movements entailed in the cessation of hostilities and regrouping must proceed in a safe and orderly fashion:

(a) Within a certain number of days after the cease-fire agreement shall have become effective, the number to be determined on the spot by the Trung Gia Military Commission, each party shall be responsible for removing and neutralizing mines (including river- and sea-mines), booby traps, explosives and any other dangerous substances placed by it. In the event of its being impossible to complete the work of removal and neutralization in time, the party concerned shall mark the spot by placing visible signs there. All demolitions, minefields, wire entanglements and other hazards to the free movement of the personnel of the Joint Commission and its joint groups, known to be present after the withdrawal of the military forces, shall be reported to the Joint Commission by the commanders of the opposing forces;

(b) From the time of the cease-fire until regrouping is completed on either side of the demarcation line:

(1) The forces of either party shall be provisionally withdrawn from the provisional assembly areas assigned to the other party.

(2) When one party's forces withdraw by a route (road, rail, waterway, sea route) which passes through the territory of the other party (see article 24), the latter party's forces must provisionally withdraw three kilometers on each side of such route, but in such a manner as to avoid interfering with the movements of the civil population.

Article 13

From the time of the cease-fire until the completion of the movements from one regrouping zone into the other, civil and military transport aircraft shall follow air-corridors between the provisional assembly areas assigned to the French Union forces north of the demarcation line on the one hand and the Laotian frontier and the regrouping zone assigned to the French Union forces on the other hand.

The position of the air-corridors, their width, the safety route for single-engined military aircraft transferred to the south and the search and rescue procedure for aircraft in distress shall be determined on the spot by the Trung Gia Military Commission.

Article 14

Political and administrative measures in the two regrouping zones, on either side of the provisional military demarcation line:

(a) Pending the general elections which will bring about the unification of Vietnam, the conduct of civil administration in each regrouping zone shall be in the hands of the party whose forces are to be regrouped there in virtue of the present agreement;

(b) Any territory controlled by one party which is transferred to the other party by the regrouping plan shall continue to be administered by the former party until such date as all the troops who are to be transferred have completely left that territory so as to free the zone assigned to the party in question. From then on, such territory shall be regarded as transferred to the other party, who shall assume responsibility for it.

Steps shall be taken to insure that there is no break in the transfer of responsibilities. For this purpose, adequate notices shall be given by the withdrawing party to the other party, which shall make the necessary arrangements, in particular by sending administrative and police detachments to prepare for the assumption of administrative responsibility. The length of such notice shall be

determined by the Trung Gia Military Commission. The transfer shall be effected in successive stages for the various territorial sectors.

The transfer of the civil administration of Hanoi and Haiphong to the authorities of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam shall be completed within the respective time limits laid down in article 15 for military movements.

(c) Each party undertakes to refrain from any reprisals or discrimination against persons or organizations on account of their activities during the hostilities and to guarantee their democratic liberties.

(d) From the date of entry into force of the present agreement until the movement of troops is completed, any civilians residing in a district controlled by one party who wish to go and live in the zone assigned to the other party shall be permitted and helped to do so by the authorities in that district.

Article 15

The disengagement of the combatants, and the withdrawals and transfers of military forces, equipment and supplies shall take place in accordance with the following principles:

(a) The withdrawals and transfers of the military forces, equipment and supplies of the two parties shall be completed within 300 days, as laid down in article 2 of the present agreement;

(b) Within either territory successive withdrawals shall be made by sectors, portions of sectors or provinces. Transfers from one regrouping zone to another shall be made in successive monthly installments proportionate to the number of troops to be transferred;

(c) The two parties shall undertake to carry out all troop withdrawals and transfers in accordance with the aims of the present agreement, shall permit no hostile act and shall take no step whatsoever which might hamper such withdrawals and transfers. They shall assist one another as far as this is possible;

(d) The two parties shall permit no destruction or sabotage of any public property and no injury to the life and property of the civil population. They shall permit no interference in local civil administration;

(e) The Joint Commission and the International Commission shall insure that steps are taken to safeguard the forces in the course of withdrawal and transfer:

(f) The Trung Gia Military Commission, and later the Joint Commission, shall determine by common agreement the exact procedure for the disengagement of the combatants and for troop withdrawals and transfers, on the basis of the principles mentioned above and within the framework laid down below:

1. The disengagement of the combatants, including the concentration of the armed forces of all kinds and also each party's movements into the provisional assembly areas assigned to it and the other party's provisional withdrawal from it, shall be completed within a period not exceeding 15 days after the date when the cease-fire becomes effective.

The general delineation of the provisional assembly areas is set out in the maps [1] annexed to the present agreement.

In order to avoid any incidents, no troops shall be stationed less than 1,500 meters from the lines delimiting the provisional assembly areas.

During the period until the transfers are concluded, all the coastal islands west of the following lines shall be included in the Haiphong perimeter:

Meridian of the southern point of Kebao Island

Northern coast of the Ile Rousse (excluding the islands), extended as far as the meridian of Campha-Mines

Meridian of Campha-Mines.

2. The withdrawals and transfers shall be effected in the following order and within the following periods (from the date of the entry into force of the present agreement):

	Days
Forces of the French Union	
Hanoi perimeter	80
Haiduong perimeter	100
Haiphong perimeter	300
Forces of the People's Army of Vietnam	
Ham Tan and Xuyenmec provisional assembly area	80
Central Vietnam provisional assembly area—first installment	80
Plaine des Joncs provisional assembly area	100
Point Camau provisional assembly area	200
Central Vietnam provisional assembly area—last installment	300

CHAPTER III—BAN ON INTRODUCTION OF FRESH TROOPS, MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMS AND MUNITIONS, MILITARY BASES

Article 16

With effect from the date of entry into force of the present agreement, the introduction into Vietnam of any troop reinforcements and additional military personnel is prohibited.

It is understood, however, that the rotation of units and groups of personnel, the arrival in Vietnam of individual personnel on a temporary duty basis and the return of Vietnam of individual personnel after short periods of leave or temporary duty outside Vietnam shall be permitted under the conditions laid down below:

(a) Rotation of units (defined in paragraph (c) of this article) and groups of personnel shall not be permitted for French Union troops stationed north of the provisional military demarcation line laid down in article 1 of the present agreement, during the withdrawal period provided for in article 2.

However, under the heading of individual personnel not more than 50 men, including officers, shall during any 1 month be permitted to enter that part of the country north of the provisional military demarcation line on a temporary duty basis or to return there after short periods of leave or temporary duty outside Vietnam.

(b) "Rotation" is defined as the replacement of units or groups of personnel by other units of the same echelon or by personnel who are arriving in Vietnam territory to do their oversea service there;

(c) The units rotated shall never be larger than a battalion—or the corresponding echelon for air and naval forces;

(d) Rotation shall be conducted on a man-for-man basis, provided, however, that in any one quarter neither party shall introduce more than 15,500 members of its armed forces into Vietnam under the rotation policy.

(e) Rotation units (defined in paragraph (c) of this article) and groups of personnel, and the individual personnel mentioned in this article, shall enter and leave Vietnam only through the entry points enumerated in article 20 below:

(f) Each party shall notify the joint commission and the international commission at least 2 days in advance of any arrivals or departures of units, groups of personnel and individual personnel in or from Vietnam. Reports on the arrivals or departures of units, groups of personnel and individual personnel in or from Vietnam shall be submitted daily to the Joint Commission and the International Commission.

All the above-mentioned notifications and reports shall indicate the places and dates of arrival or departure and the number of persons arriving or departing.

(g) The International Commission through its inspection teams, shall supervise and inspect the rotation of units and groups of personal and the arrival and departure of individual personnel as authorized above, at the points of entry enumerated in article 20 below.

Article 17

(a) With effect from the date of entry into force of the present agreement, the introduction into Vietnam of any reinforcements in the form of all types of arms, munitions and other war material, such as combat aircraft, naval craft, pieces of ordnance, jet engines and jet weapons and armored vehicles, is prohibited.

(b) It is understood, however, that war material, arms, and munitions which have been destroyed, damaged, worn out, or used up after the cessation of hostilities may be replaced on the basis of piece-for-piece of the same type and with similar characteristics. Such replacement of war material, arms, and munitions shall not be permitted for French Union troops stationed north of the provisional military demarcation line laid down in article 1 of the present agreement, during the withdrawal period provided for in article 2.

Naval craft may perform transport operations between the regrouping zones.

(c) The war material, arms, and munitions for replacement purposes provided for in paragraph (b) of this article, shall be introduced into Vietnam only through the points of entry enumerated in article 20 below. War material, arms, and munitions to be replaced shall be shipped from Vietnam only through the points of entry enumerated in article 20 below;

(d) Apart from the replacements permitted within the limits laid down in paragraph (b) of this article, the introduction of war material, arms, and munitions of all types in the form of unassembled parts for subsequent assembly is prohibited;

(e) Each party shall notify the Joint Commission and the International Commission at least 2 days in advance of any arrivals or departures which may take place of war material, arms, and munitions of all types.

In order to justify the requests for the introduction into Vietnam of arms, munitions, and other war material (as defined in paragraph (a) of this article) for replacement purposes, a report concerning each incoming shipment shall be submitted to the Joint Commission and the International Commission. Such reports shall indicate the use made of the items so replaced.

(f) The International Commission, through its inspection teams, shall supervise and inspect the replacements permitted in the circumstances laid down in this article, at the points of entry enumerated in article 20 below.

Article 18

With effect from the date of entry into force of the present agreement, the establishment of new military bases is prohibited throughout Vietnam territory.

Article 19

With effect from the date of entry into force of the present agreement, no military base under the control of a foreign state may be established in the regrouping zone of either party; the two parties shall insure that the zones assigned to them do not adhere to any military alliance and are not used for the resumption of hostilities or to further an aggressive policy.

Article 20

The points of entry into Vietnam for rotation personnel and replacements of material are fixed as follows:

Zones to the north of the provisional military demarcation line: Laokay, Langson,

[1] Not reprinted here.

Tien-Yen, Haiphong, Vinh, Dong-Hoi, Muong-Sen;

Zone to the south of the provisional military demarcation line: Tourane, Quinhon, Nhatrang, Bangoi, Saigon, Cap St. Jacques, Tanchau.

CHAPTER IV—PRISONERS OF WAR AND CIVILIAN INTERNEES

Article 21

The liberation and repatriation of all prisoners of war and civilian internes detained by each of the two parties at the coming into force of the present agreement shall be carried out under the following conditions:

(a) All prisoners of war and civilian internees of Vietnam, French and other nationalities captured since the beginning of hostilities in Vietnam during military operations or in any other circumstances of war and in any part of the territory of Vietnam shall be liberated within a period of 30 days after the date when the cease-fire becomes effective in each theater.

(b) The term "civilian internees" is understood to mean all persons who, having in any way contributed to the political and armed struggle between the two parties, have been arrested for that reason and have been kept in detention by either party during the period of hostilities.

(c) All prisoners of war and civilian internees held by either party shall be surrendered to the appropriate authorities of the other party, who shall give them all possible assistance in proceeding to their country of origin, place of habitual residence or the zone of their choice.

CHAPTER V—MISCELLANEOUS

Article 22

The commanders of the forces of the two parties shall insure that persons under their respective commands who violate any of the provisions of the present agreement are suitably punished.

Article 23

In cases in which the place of burial is known and the existence of graves has been established, the commander of the forces of either party shall, within a specific period after the entry into force of the armistice agreement, permit the graves service personnel of the other party to enter the part of Vietnam territory under their military control for the purpose of finding and removing the bodies of deceased military personnel of that party, including the bodies of deceased prisoners of war. The Joint Commission shall determine the procedures and the time limit for the performance of this task. The commanders of the forces of the two parties shall communicate to each other all information in their possession as to the place of burial of military personnel of the other party.

Article 24

The present agreement shall apply to all the armed forces of either party. The armed forces of each party shall respect the demilitarized zone and the territory under the military control of the other party, and shall commit no act and undertake no operation against the other party and shall not engage in blockade of any kind in Vietnam.

For the purposes of the present article, the word "territory" includes territorial waters and airspace.

Article 25

The commanders of the forces of the two parties shall afford full protection and all possible assistance and cooperation to the Joint Commission and its joint groups and to the International Commission and its inspection teams in the performance of the functions and tasks assigned to them by the present agreement.

Article 26

The costs involved in the operations of the Joint Commission and joint groups and of the International Commission and its inspection teams shall be shared equally between the two parties.

Article 27

The signatories of the present agreement and their successors in their functions shall be responsible for insuring and observance and enforcement of the terms and provisions there of. The commanders of the forces of the two parties shall, within their respective commands, take all steps and make all arrangements necessary to insure full compliance with all the provisions of the present agreement by all elements and military personnel under their command.

The procedures laid down in the present agreement shall, whenever necessary, be studied by the commanders of the two parties and, if necessary, defined more specifically by the Joint Commission.

CHAPTER VI—JOINT COMMISSION AND INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SUPERVISION AND CONTROL IN VIETNAM

28. Responsibility for the execution of the agreement on the cessation of hostilities shall rest with the parties.

29. An International Commission shall insure the control and supervision of this execution.

30. In order to facilitate, under the conditions shown below, the execution of provisions concerning joint actions by the two parties, a Joint Commission shall be set up in Vietnam.

31. The Joint Commission shall be composed of an equal number of representatives of the commanders of the two parties.

32. The presidents of the delegations to the Joint Commission shall hold the rank of general.

The Joint Commission shall set up joint groups the number of which shall be determined by mutual agreement between the parties. The joint groups shall be composed of an equal number of officers from both parties. Their location on the demarcation line between the regrouping zones shall be determined by the parties whilst taking into account the powers of the Joint Commission.

33. The Joint Commission shall insure the execution of the following provisions of the agreement on the cessation of hostilities:

(a) A simultaneous and general cease-fire in Vietnam for all regular and irregular armed forces of the two parties.

(b) A regroupment of the armed forces of the two parties.

(c) Observance of the demarcation lines between the regrouping zones and of the demilitarized sectors.

Within the limits of its competence it shall help the parties to execute the said provisions, shall insure liaison between them for the purpose of preparing and carrying out plans for the application of these provisions, and shall endeavor to solve such disputed questions as may arise between the parties in the course of executing these provisions.

34. An international commission shall be set up for the control and supervision over the application of the provisions of the agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Vietnam. It shall be composed of representatives of the following States: Canada, India and Poland.

It shall be presided over by the representative of India.

35. The international commission shall set up fixed and mobile inspection teams, composed of an equal number of officers appointed by each of the above-mentioned States. The fixed teams shall be located at the following points: Laokay, Langson, Tien-Yen, Haiphong, Vinh, Dong-Hoi, Muong-Sen, Tourane, Quinhon, Nhatrang, Bangoi, Saigon, Cap St. Jacques, Tranchau. These points of location may, at a later date, be altered at the request of the Joint Commission, or of one of the parties, or of the International Commission itself, by agreement between the International Commission and the command of the party concerned. The zones of action of the mobile teams shall be the regions bordering the land and sea frontiers of Vietnam, the demarcation lines between the regrouping zones and the demilitarized zones. Within the limits of these zones they shall have the right to move freely and shall receive from the local civil and military authorities all facilities they may require for the fulfillment of their tasks (provision of personnel, placing at their disposal documents needed for supervision, summoning witnesses necessary for holding enquiries, ensuring the security and freedom of movement of the inspection teams, etc.). They shall have at their disposal such modern means of transport, observation, and communication as they may require. Beyond the zones of action as defined above, the mobile teams may, by agreement with the command of the party concerned, carry out other movements within the limits of the tasks given them by the present agreement.

36. The International Commission shall be responsible for supervising the proper execution by the parties of the provisions of the agreement. For this purpose it shall fulfill the tasks of control, observation, inspection, and investigation connected with the application of the provisions of the agreement on the cessation of hostilities, and it shall in particular:

(a) Control the movement of the armed forces of the two parties, effected within the framework of the regroupment plan.

(b) Supervise the demarcation lines between the regrouping areas, and also the demilitarized zones.

(c) Control the operations of releasing prisoners of war and civilian internees.

(d) Supervise at ports and airfields as well as along all frontiers of Vietnam the execution of the provisions of the agreement on the cessation of hostilities, regulating the introduction into the country of armed forces, military personnel, and of all kinds of arms, munitions, and war material.

37. The International Commission shall, through the medium of the inspection teams mentioned above, and as soon as possible either on its own initiative, or at the request of the Joint Commission, or of one of the parties, undertake the necessary investigations both documentary and on the ground.

38. The inspection teams shall submit to the International Commission the results of their supervision, their investigation, and their observations, furthermore, they shall draw up such special reports as they may consider necessary or as may be requested from them by the Commission. In the case of a disagreement within the teams, the conclusions of each member shall be submitted to the Commission.

39. If any one inspection team is unable to settle an incident or considers that there is a violation or a threat of a serious violation the International Commission shall be informed; the latter shall study the reports and the conclusions of the inspection teams and shall inform the parties of the measures which should be taken for the settlement of the incident, ending of the violation, or removal of the threat of violation.

40. When the Joint Commission is unable to reach an agreement on the interpretation to be given to some provision or on the appraisal of a fact, the International Commission shall be informed of the disputed question. Its recommendations shall be sent directly to the parties and shall be notified to the Joint Commission.

41. The recommendations of the International Commission shall be adopted by majority vote, subject to the provisions contained in article 42. If the votes are divided the Chairman's vote shall be decisive.

The International Commission may formulate recommendations concerning amendments and additions which should be made

to the provisions of the agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Vietnam, in order to insure a more effective execution of that agreement. These recommendations shall be adopted unanimously.

42. When dealing with questions concerning violations, or threats of violations, which might lead to a resumption of hostilities, namely:

(a) Refusal by the armed forces of one party to effect the movements provided for in the regroupment plan;

(b) Violation by the armed forces of one of the parties of the regrouping zones, territorial waters, or air space of the other party;

The decisions of the International Commission must be unanimous.

43. If one of the parties refuses to put into effect a recommendation of the International Commission, the parties concerned or the Commission itself shall inform the members of the Geneva Conference.

If the International Commission does not reach unanimity in the cases provided for in article 42, it shall submit a majority report and one or more minority reports to the members of the Conference.

The International Commission shall inform the members of the Conference in all cases where its activity is being hindered.

44. The International Commission shall be set up at the time of the cessation of hostilities in Indochina in order that it should be able to fulfill the tasks provided for in article 36.

45. The International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam shall act in close cooperation with the International Commissions for Supervision and Control in Cambodia and Laos.

The Secretaries-General of these three Commissions shall be responsible for coordinating their work and for relations between them.

46. The International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam may, after consultation with the International Commissions for Supervision and Control in Cambodia and Laos, and having regard to the development of the situation in Cambodia and Laos, progressively reduce its activities. Such a decision must be adopted unanimously.

47 All the provisions of the present agreement, save the second subparagraph of article 11, shall enter into force at 2400 hours (Geneva time) on July 22, 1954.

Done in Geneva at 2400 hours on the 20th of July 1954 in French and in Vietnamese, both texts being equally authentic.

For the commander in chief of the People's Army of Vietnam.

TA-QUANG BUU,
Vice Minister of National Defense of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

For the commander in chief of the French Union Forces in Indochina.

Brigadier General DELTEIL.

DECLARATION OF THE NEUTRALITY OF LAOS, JULY 23, 1862

(The 1954 Geneva accords provided for the withdrawal of Vietnamese Communist forces from Laos and for the reintegration of the Pathet Lao into the national community. However, it was not until 3 years later that the Pathet Lao, having achieved important concessions from the Royal Lao Government agreed to the reunification and ostensibly to the dissolution of Pathet Lao forces. In 1959, the Pathet Lao reverted to the use of force and by spring of 1961 won a series of military victories and were in a position to take over the country. In 1961 a de facto cease fire was achieved under the government of Prince Boun Oum and the Geneva Conference to settle the Lao question convened, which finally resulted in agreement in 1962, by which a coalition government would be established, all foreign troops and military personnel withdrawn, and the use of Lao territory for "interference in the internal affairs of other countries" was prohibited.)

The Governments of the Union of Burma, the Kingdom of Cambodia, Canada, the People's Republic of China, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the Republic of France, the Republic of India, the Polish People's Republic, the Republic of Vietnam, the Kingdom of Thailand, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, whose representatives took part in the International Conference on the Settlement of the Laotian Question, 1961–62;

Welcoming the presentation of the statement of neutrality by the Royal Government of Laos of July 9, 1962, and taking note of this statement, which is, with the concurrence of the Royal Government of Laos, incorporated in the present declaration as an integral part thereof, and the text of which is as follows:

"The Royal Government of Laos,

"Being resolved to follow the path of peace and neutrality in conformity with the interests and aspirations of the Laotian people, as well as the principles of the Joint Communiqué of Zurich dated June 22, 1961, and of the Geneva Agreements of 1954 in order to build a peaceful, neutral, independent, democratic, unified, and prosperous Laos,"

"Solemnly declares that:

"(1) It will resolutely apply the five principles of peaceful co-existence in foreign relations, and will develop friendly relations and establish diplomatic relations with all countries, the neighboring countries first and foremost, on the basis of equality and of respect for the independence and sovereignty of Laos;

"(2) It is the will of the Laotian people to protect and insure respect for the sovereignty, independence, neutrality, unity, and territorial integrity of Laos;

"(3) It will not resort to the use or threat of force in any way which might impair the peace of other countries, and will not interfere in the internal affairs of other countries;

"(4) It will not enter into any military alliance or into any agreement, whether military or otherwise, which is inconsistent with the neutrality of the Kingdom of Laos; it will not allow the establishment of any foreign military base on Laotian territory, nor allow any country to use Laotian territory for military purposes or for the purposes of interference in the internal affairs of other countries, nor recognize the protection of any alliance or military coalition, including SEATO.

"(5) It will not allow any foreign interference in the internal affairs of the Kingdom of Laos in any form whatsoever;

"(6) Subject to the provisions of article 5 of the protocol, it will require the withdrawal from Laos of all foreign troops and military personnel, and will not allow any foreign troops or military personnel to be introduced into Laos;

"(7) It will accept direct and unconditional aid from all countries that wish to help the Kingdom of Laos build up an independent and autonomous national economy on the basis of respect for the sovereignty of Laos;

"(8) It will respect the treaties and agreements signed in conformity with the interests of the Laotian people and of the policy of peace and neutrality of the Kingdom, in particular the Geneva agreements of 1962, and will abrogate all treaties and agreements which are contrary to those principles.

"This statement of neutrality by the Royal Government of Laos shall be promulgated constitutionally and shall have the force of law.

"The Kingdom of Laos appeals to all the states participating in the International Conference on the Settlement of the Laotian Question, and to all other states, to recognize the sovereignty, independence, neutrality, unity, and territorial integrity of Laos, to conform to these principles in all respects, and to refrain from any action inconsistent therewith.

Confirming the principles of respect for the sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity of the Kingdom of Laos and noninterference in its internal affairs which are embodied in the Geneva agreements of 1954;

Emphasizing the principle of respect for the neutrality of the Kingdom of Laos;

Agreeing that the above-mentioned principles constitute a basis for the peaceful settlement of the Laotian question;

Profoundly convinced that the independence and neutrality of the Kingdom of Laos will assist the peaceful democratic development of the Kingdom of Laos and the achievement of national accord and unity in that country, as well as the strengthening of peace and security in southeast Asia;

1. Solemnly declare, in accordance with the will of the Government and people of the Kingdom of Laos, as expressed in the statement of neutrality by the royal government of Laos of July 9, 1962, that they recognize and will respect and observe in every way the sovereignty, independence, neutrality, unity and territorial integrity of the Kingdom of Laos.

2. Undertake, in particular, that

(a) they will not commit or participate in any way in any act which might directly or indirectly impair the sovereignty, independence, neutrality, unity or territorial integrity of the Kingdom of Laos;

(b) they will not resort to the use or threat of force or any other measure which might impair the peace of the Kingdom of Laos;

(d) they will not attach conditions of a direct interference in the internal affairs of the Kingdom of Laos;

(d) they will not attach conditions of a political nature to any assistance which they may offer or which the Kingdom of Laos may seek;

(e) they will not bring the Kingdom of Laos in any way into any military alliance or any other agreement, whether military or otherwise, which is inconsistent with her neutrality, nor invite or encourage her to enter into any such alliance or to conclude any such agreement;

(f) they will respect the wish of the Kingdom of Laos not to recognize the protection of any alliance or military coalition, including SEATO;

(g) they will not introduce into the Kingdom of Laos foreign troops or military personnel in any form whatsoever, nor will they in any way facilitate or connive at the introduction of any foreign troops or military personnel;

(h) they will not establish nor will they in any way facilitate or connive at the establishment in the Kingdom of Laos of any foreign military base, foreign strong point or other foreign military installation of any kind;

(i) they will not use the territory of the Kingdom of Laos for interference in the internal affairs of other countries;

(j) they will not use the territory of any country, including their own for interference in the internal affairs of the Kingdom of Laos.

3. Appeal to all other states to recognize, respect, and observe in every way the sovereignty, independence, and neutrality, and also the unity and territorial integrity, of the Kingdom of Laos and to refrain from any action inconsistent with these principles or with other provisions of the present declaration.

4. Undertake, in the event of a violation or threat of violation of the sovereignty, independence, neutrality, unity, or territorial integrity of the Kingdom of Laos, to consult

jointly with the Royal Government of Laos and among themselves in order to consider measures which might prove to be necessary to insure the observance of these principles and the other provisions of the present declaration.

5. The present declaration shall enter into force on signature and together with the statement of neutrality by the Royal Government of Laos of July 9, 1962, shall be regarded as constituting an international agreement. The present declaration shall be deposited in the archives of the Governments of the United Kingdom and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which shall furnish certified copies thereof to the other signatory states and to all the other states of the world.

In witness whereof, the undersigned Plenipotentiaries have signed the present declaration.

Done in two copies in Geneva this 23d day of July 1962 in the English, Chinese, French, Laotian, and Russian languages, each text being equally authoritative.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Luther L. Terry, of Alabama, to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for a term of 4 years, which was reported by me earlier today from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Luther L. Terry, of Alabama, to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for a term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Luther L. Terry to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for a term of 4 years?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request by Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the Members of this body have been making significant contributions, it seems to me, in their willingness to discuss the many ramifications concerning Vietnam which bother not only this country but also the world at large.

It was on the 17th of February, I believe, that the marked increase in the tempo of the discussions on this issue began. On that occasion, the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] and the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] made known their thoughts.

We have had a very protracted colloquy on the implications of their suggestion, that we negotiate now. A consequence of that long colloquy has been the further development and, may I say, sophistication of the discussion of this question. Over this weekend one notes that a number of things have come to a head.

In making my own remarks I advocated that in the United States we make certain that no one on the other side misunderstands our intentions, that we get much tougher, that we seal off the border of South Vietnam, and call the hand there.

Over the weekend there has been much discussion of the statement by Soviet Premier Kosygin. We cannot know its full meaning, but we can see the range of what is implied and make our selections.

I would suspect that his remarks are met best by the explanation that he is seeking to get the initiative back from Peiping, to which it had been lost in recent weeks, and that they are aimed more at Peiping than they are Washington. To the extent that they may have been addressed to Washington we see the same kind of language being employed that was employed by Stalin at the time of the Berlin crisis, and that was employed when Khrushchev threatened us in Cuba.

We gave our answer then, and it is imperative that we likewise be prepared to give the same answers today; namely, that we will stand and see it through.

A part of that answer has already been given by Secretary of State Rusk, in restating our basic position in southeast Asia, in which he left no doubt as to where we stand; namely, that as long as the Reds continue to violate the border between South and North Vietnam, we will not go to the bargaining table with them. We have said again that intransigence, belligerence, aggression, and terror are not suitable credentials for entrance to honorable negotiations between nations. Just this weekend the State Department presented overwhelming evidence to show the nature of the new brand of aggression.

I do not agree that all the guerrillas could be called back by Hanoi, even if Hanoi wanted to pull them all back, because many thousands of them could not be found.

As I have suggested several times in recent days, I believe we should announce that the cessation of the act of infiltration across the Vietnam border by the forces—regular or irregular—of North Vietnam, and that the cessation of active, logistical support for the Communist forces in South Vietnam, is a prerequisite for any negotiation on our part. I repeat my contention that our determination to stick to this standard should be reinforced, if necessary, by systematic air attacks upon selected targets in North Vietnam, beginning with smaller tactical targets and working up, again if necessary, to the larger industrial targets which make up Hanoi's potential to wage war.

The situation in Vietnam has many of the qualities of the situation that existed in Czechoslovakia some 25 years ago.

It was present in Berlin on another occasion. This is the common denominator that makes our position in South Vietnam synonymous with the position that the West was confronted with in Munich and in many other areas and that led to the rise of Mr. Hitler and Mr. Mussolini in the 1930's.

During the debate, much has been said about warhawks and pacifists. To those who have used these expressions, let me say that the quickest way to war or the inevitable way to war is to continue to equivocate in this situation or to seek the least unfortunate terms that will allow us to ease out of our commitment in this area, because the going is tough and dirty, and all alternatives are unpleasant.

If there is such a bird as a "warhawk"—someone who deliberately wants a war now—he should realize that the quickest way to get one is to permit the present situation along the borders to continue, with the Communists always keeping the initiative, and to let the dictators of North Vietnam and the dictators in Peiping think that by continuing their actions they can force us to go home. Our President has determined to stay. We are determined to stand and to see things through. The Communists think we are going to get out. They have convinced themselves that time is on their side and that if they continue to strike, continue to press, we will fold up our tents and go home.

So long as they have serious doubts about our sticking it out, they will persist in prodding and pushing, to hasten the day of the American pullout.

I know of no situation that could be more irresponsible than to permit that kind of policy to continue.

Our President has seen fit to draw the line and to draw it firmly and to make it clear that we do not intend to pull out and that we do not intend to forfeit this area to the forces from the north.

Mr. President, there is a second road to war. It is a longer path by far, but it is just as certain in its horrendous consequences, should it ever be traveled. That is the road that would lead to the surrender of this area to the Chinese. This in my judgment would completely unbalance the political forces in that part of the world. It is the unbalancing of these forces, the world's balance of power, that throughout the history of mankind has led to big wars, both in our time and in the days of old.

Therefore, if we were to withdraw, if we were to negotiate our way out of this area that holds the balance of Asia in its grip, we would find the tides reversed and turning against us. There is no question that the tides have been running our way in the 20 years of the cold war. To put these rich resources at the disposal of a land with too many people and too few resources, would clearly contribute to an imbalance in that quarter and would invite the next step, over a longer period of time, which is a war to redress that imbalance.

Southeast Asia's resources are rich enough as to have been the reason for Japan's starting World War II. There is no reason to think that their potential to buttress power is altered even in the nuclear age. If southeast Asia is

to be forfeited to mainland China, this is sufficient to alter the balance of power in Asia and the world against our national interest. And from the view of history, a world that finds its spheres of influence between its great powers unbalanced soon finds itself at war—a big war.

Therefore, if we are to keep peace in the world, American policy must direct itself toward both of these sobering threats. The first is met by taking the initiative in clarifying our intentions and taking the initiative from Hanoi. To make sure that we not stumble into war, it is important that we clear the air—thus, the basis for my request to our Government for a carefully calculated announcement spelling out American prerequisites to useful negotiations.

To thwart a second possibility of war, it requires that we draw a firm line across southeast Asia to match the line that has already been drawn all the way from Eastern Europe to Central Asia—a line which we would hold firmly against the aggressors to the north. These joint objectives of our policy give us the best chance to avoid war and even a chance to win peace in eastern Asia. While it is fraught with risks and great costs, the alternatives are even worse.

Again, let me state that I am well aware of the risks that we must take—they haunt me and should haunt every American. But they are as nothing compared to the risk inherent in inaction. For history shows only too clearly that an aggressor's appetite is not satisfied by peace offerings of small chunks of the territory he is seeking; it is only whetted and encouraged. Certainly there are big risks involved in the course I suggest, but they are only the risks that will someday have to be faced. To postpone them is only to increase their potential for world destruction.

Nor should we be dissuaded by the local conditions of the civil war, which has provided the soft spot now under Communist probe. It is deeply regrettable that the Government of South Vietnam is unstable and undemocratic, but we are not committed to preserve the political stakes of whichever general happens to be in power at the moment. But what we are committed to preserve is that same illusive condition for which free men have struggled, worked, fought, and died for many centuries—human freedom, or the chance to obtain that freedom. We will not give the Vietnamese freedom. We cannot give them freedom. But we will give them a chance to be free. We will not preserve freedom in the Philippines or in Malaysia, but we will provide these nations with the opportunity to maintain their freedom and their national identity. We cannot choose the spot on which we will defend freedom or the conditions by which the conflict will be waged. Wherever freedom, or the chance for freedom, is threatened, there is where we must go, and there is where we must stand.

Too often in periods of crisis we spend our energies in the academic exercise of trying to decide which conflicts affect Western civilization and which do not. There is a simple answer to this question in this era of aggressive Communist exploitation of weakness and instability. All conflicts, all wars, anywhere on this earth, pose a real and direct threat to Western civilization. These conflicts should be eliminated by negotiation, if that is possible, or by force, if all else fails.

And we must also accept the realities of existence in our world which are hard and unpleasant realities, but realities nonetheless. And they are that we cannot expect a perfect solution to these conflicts, and that a workable solution may leave a nation divided for the immediate future. These divisions now exist in Berlin, in Korea, and will probably exist in Vietnam. In historical perspective they are not permanent; but, for the moment, they are a compromise that we can live with in the hope that the future will provide a more rational means of settling these differences. And negotiations, once begun, may do very well to settle for a divided Vietnam.

We will negotiate—indeed, at some time we must negotiate—but that time is not now. At the present moment our task must be to set the record straight, to make clear to those whose ambitions lead them to threaten the peace and the security of freemen, that we accept the challenge, that we stand firm, that we will take the risk involved. Let us accept this risk now in the hope and expectation that it will enable us to accept then the equally great risk of establishing peace in this troubled area through the rule of reason and understanding rather than through terror and the force of arms.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an article published in the New York Times of Sunday, and also an article published in today's Washington Daily News, which report that the United States is landing a force of Marines in Vietnam for the purpose of sealing off the 17th parallel.

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

[From the New York Times, Feb. 28, 1965]

BRITISH WARY ON CALL FOR VIETNAM NEGOTIATIONS

LONDON, February 26.—Officials here are not persuaded that the publicized peace moves by President de Gaulle will be helpful in working toward a settlement in Vietnam.

They fear that the talk about negotiations may obscure what they regard as the central problem: How to assure that any political settlement reached can be enforced on the scene.

The point is made that there once was a political settlement—the Geneva agreement of 1954—but that its terms have been violated by Communist infiltration from North to South Vietnam. The need, therefore, is to find a realistic way of seeing that agreements are observed.

For these reasons British officials see the necessity for continuing American air attacks in North Vietnam. They think a real settlement can come only if North Vietnam is persuaded that the price of trying to take over the south is too high.

The important thing, as one official put it, is for the West to leave any conference table convinced that South Vietnam will be left alone.

The support for continuing air strikes is conditioned on one factor—that the strikes be aimed specifically at northern support of the Vietcong guerrillas in the south. General bombing of North Vietnam would be another matter.

SOVIET INFLUENCE CRUCIAL

It is agreed that the Soviet Union has a crucial part to play in the shaping of any settlement. Only if Moscow believes that the risk is getting too high in the Vietnam fighting will the time be ripe for negotiations, officials say.

One element that gives concern about General de Gaulle's activity is the possibility that it may be premature. Government officials do not think publicized peace moves are particularly helpful now.

The attitude in the British Government seems to be close to the American position, as far as that is known. It is a hard-boiled attitude, based on the belief that negotiations in Vietnam cannot be a cover for a handover of the south to the Communists without endangering the Western position in Asia generally.

It continues to surprise many observers that a labor government is taking so firm a line. The Government is doing so despite restiveness in the Labor Party's leftwing.

The leader of the conservative opposition, Sir Alec Douglas-Home, said today that he thought a political solution in Vietnam would be desirable. Then he added:

"But I must say America is taking the right position on the question of negotiations now. There is no basis for a conference unless we have the certainty that there would be a way to police what the conference decides."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Mar. 1, 1965]

FIRM ACTION URGED IN VIETNAM: DEMOS BACK L.B.J. IN CONGRESS

Democratic Congressmen, armed with a State Department "white paper" documenting the Communist war against South Vietnam, gave strong backing today to President Johnson's Vietnam policy.

Senator WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, said in a speech prepared for Senate delivery that Mr. Johnson's Vietnam policies offer "the best chance for us to achieve an enduring peace in this enormously complex situation."

He said it would be "a grim mistake" to attempt to negotiate a settlement if the Communists have not shown "by their actions that they want peace and will end the aggressive conduct that prevents it."

In opposing premature negotiations, Senator PROXMIRE said, "Perhaps the worst outcome of all would be a conference that ended in failure. The war would resume without even the glimmer of hope that the possibility of peace talks always offers."

LONG SPEAKS OUT

Senate Democratic Whip RUSSELL B. LONG, of Louisiana, said the United States should "do whatever is necessary to win * * * and if Communist China comes in, we will take them on, and if Russia wants to deal herself a hand, we will go ahead, but there will be no sanctuary."

Senator GALE MCGEE, Democrat, of Wyoming, called on the United States to take the initiative with more aggressive policies.

Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Democrat, of Wisconsin, chairman of the House Far East Subcommittee, said the United States has issued North Vietnam an ultimatum, in effect, to withdraw from South Vietnam or face destructive military consequences.

He said North Vietnam must be forced to realize that none of its territory is immune from attack as a privileged sanctuary.

Senator McGEE said, "I believe we should now go a step further" by increasing bombing of North Vietnam if that is needed.

Senator LONG said bombing North Vietnam would serve notice that the United States intends to win "and that we don't propose to stop by letting them call the rules and make us fight on their terms, that we propose to do some of this fighting on our own terms."

MINORITY REPORT

A top House Republican today labeled President Johnson's Great Society plan a blueprint for an all-powerful, one-party Government.

Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, Republican, of Wisconsin, chairman of the House Republican conference and principal author of the 1964 GOP national platform, also assailed Mr. Johnson's conduct of foreign affairs. He predicted the administration would seek a negotiated end to the war in Vietnam and that this would lead to a Communist takeover.

He said Republicans know that communism respects strength and seeks accommodation only for its own purposes. But he said the administration apparently will seek eventually to negotiate itself out of South Vietnam.

In a speech prepared for House delivery, Representative LAIRD said the painfully small Republican minority in Congress would continue to speak its piece, and with the voice of a moral majority.

"Though we do not win rollcall votes, we can win for America the all-important second look that may save us from blindly accepting a Great Society that might be just another great mistake, just another great scheme, just another great debt, accepted without due consideration," he said.

Representative LAIRD's major address was seen by Republicans as a sort of minority state of the Union message as well as a call to arms to the Republican ranks.

He said Republicans will oppose some of Mr. Johnson's proposals, and offer alternatives to others.

EULOGIES OF THE LATE SENATOR ENGLE OF CALIFORNIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the legislative business of the Senate will be suspended, pursuant to Senate Resolution 81, adopted February 23.

The clerk will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 81) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That on Monday, March 1, at 2 o'clock postmeridian, the legislative business of the Senate be suspended to permit the delivery of memorial addresses on the life, character, and public service of Honorable Clair Engle, late a Senate from the State of California.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CLAIR ENGLE: A EULOGY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last July 30, 1964, it was my sad duty to announce to the Senate the death of a distinguished American statesman, our beloved friend and late colleague from California, U.S. Senator Clair Engle.

Clair Engle was a man of high courage and unique ability. Forceful, colorful, articulate, and persuasive, he faithfully served the people of California and the Nation during all of his adult lifetime.

The Senate had a sweet fondness and a real respect for him, which reflected the continuing esteem in which he was held by all who knew him.

Clair Engle was a Californian in every sense of the word. He was born in Bakersfield on September 21, 1911. His grandfather Engle, who was of German-English decent, had fought in the Mexican War under Gen. Zachary Taylor, emigrated to California in search of gold in 1849, and ended up as a cattle rancher. Clair's father, Fred J. Engle, worked variously as a cattle rancher, schoolteacher, lawyer, and railroad man. His mother, whose maiden name was Keeran, was of Irish heritage and also descended from California pioneers.

In a State where most of the people are newcomers, Engle's third-generation status—on both sides of the family—made him a Californian indeed.

At the age of 6 months, Clair moved with his family to northern California. They settled in the small town of Red Bluff, which even today numbers only 7,000 in population. Red Bluff is within sight of Mount Lassen, the only active volcano in the United States. Years later, the Saturday Evening Post was to note that it was no coincidence that Engle grew up near the only active volcano in the country, because in adulthood he became the only active volcano in the U.S. Congress. I like that. I think, perhaps, Clair did too.

Clair Engle experienced the typical childhood of boys living close to the western frontier. He learned to saddle and ride a horse and rope a calf almost as soon as he learned to read and write and add. At Red Bluff High School, he played basketball, won election as a class officer, and was a ferocious fighter, even though he was younger and smaller than nearly all of his classmates. That capacity to stand up and fight for the right stood the people of my State in good stead years later, when he fought their battles in the Congress.

Engle's penchant for fighting led him to take up boxing in high school and college. Noticing that most amateurs were "right hand crazy," Engle made a practice of opening doors and lifting heavy objects from the ground with his left hand. His efforts to make himself a southpaw puncher paid off. He could jab, hook, and uppercut lefthanded with devastating skill.

Engle's willingness and eagerness to fight, even against overwhelming odds, remained with him to his last days and through the affliction which finally triumphed, though he fought it with a vengeance to the end.

Many of Clair's friends wanted him to take up prizefighting as a career, but he had larger ambitions. As a boy he had wanted to go to West Point, but by the time he received an appointment to the U.S. Military Academy, he had decided that the chances of a rewarding career in the peacetime Army were somewhat remote. He never lost his childhood interest in military affairs, however, and as a Congressman, worked assiduously to keep this country militarily strong, that it might remain free.

At the age of 16, Engle entered Chico State College and 2 years later went on to the Hastings School of Law at the University of California. Graduating with a law degree at 21, he returned home to Red Bluff with the idea of becoming Tehama County district attorney, an office he felt would build his reputation and insure future success as a lawyer.

The sole survivor of a rough three man race, Clair was elected district attorney when he was just turning 23 years old. He immediately became known as the "baby-faced D.A." but appearances were deceiving. Engle earned a strong record of convictions in Tehama County, a record that led Earl Warren, then attorney general of California and now Chief Justice of the United States, to applaud the vigor of his law enforcement.

Clair was elected to a second 4 year term as Tehama County district attorney in 1938. In 1942 he stepped up to the State senate at Sacramento, but had served only 8 months in that office when a special election was called to fill a vacancy in the House of Representatives left by the death of Republican Harry Englebright. The local Democrats chose Engle as their candidate, and once again the tough fighter from Red Bluff emerged as the winner in a difficult three-way race.

Clair Engle was easily elected to a full 2-year term in the House in 1944; and, in 1946, his constituents paid him the supreme compliment of nominating him in both the Republican and Democratic primaries under California's now defunct system of cross-filing. From 1946 to 1956 the voters of northern California consistently gave Clair Engle both party nominations, a decade long tribute that has been received by few candidates for public office in my State.

Engle's district, which soon became known as "Engle's empire," was one of the most unusual in the country. It covered a staggering 53,400 square miles—more than one-third of the geographical area of California—and was larger than 23 States. Superimposed on a map of the eastern seaboard, Engle's constituency would have extended all the way from Maine to North Carolina. It began at the Oregon border, took in most of northern California, and then zigzagged down the backbone of California along the Nevada border almost to the Mojave Desert—a distance of 600 air miles. Made up of 19 so-called "cow counties," Engle's empire did not contain a single large city, but was made up almost entirely of small towns.

Clair Engle's district boasted the birthplace of the gold rush, famous natural masterpieces such as Lake Tahoe and Yosemite National Park, and all or part of 13 national forests. The very vastness of his district led Engle to claim that he was "closer to both heaven and hell than any other Congressman," since his district included Mount Whitney, the

highest point in the United States, and Death Valley, the lowest point.

Faced with such a giant constituency, Clair decided early in his career that the only way to service it adequately was by airplane. Flying from smalltown airport to smalltown airport, Claire would often fly 10,000 miles just "making the rounds."

Years later, in 1957, Engle's interest in flying enabled him to be the first U.S. Congressman to fly at the speed of sound riding as a passenger in an Air Force jet. "Since the beginning of the Republic," he remarked on landing, "there have been more than 10,000 Congressmen elected and all of them have battered at the sound barrier. I figured it was time one busted it."

Clair was frequently joined in his barnstorming tours around his congressional district by his dear wife, the former Lucretia Caldwell, of San Jose, Calif. The two of them would often dress like twins in sharp-pointed leather boots, frontier pants, and checked shirts and 5-gallon hats. Thus attired, they would cover all the rodeos in the district during the late summer and early fall. Mrs. Engle was constantly at her husband's side throughout his last 15 years in office, a devoted helpmate to her beloved husband.

In the House of Representatives, Engle became known as "Congressman Fireball." The name stuck for two good reasons. One was that he was usually trailed by a billowing cloud of cigar smoke as he hurried through Capitol corridors. The second reason was that he was a figurative ball of fire when pushing legislation in committee sessions or in cloakrooms.

More than anything else, Clair Engle was a legislator. His primary interest as a Member of the House of Representatives and of the Senate was getting bills enacted into law. A member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Clair Engle galvanized that committee during the 83d Congress into originating more than 1 out of every 5 of the 781 bills signed into public law by President Eisenhower.

In the 8 years from 1946 to 1954 the late Senator Engle piloted 39 of his public bills through the House and got 23 of them enacted into law—an enviable record for any Member of Congress, let alone a relative newcomer. From 1955 to 1959, when Clair served as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that committee reported and succeeded in having enacted a staggering total of 365 public laws. There is no question that Clair Engle exceeded—and excelled greatly—at the exceedingly delicate and mystical art of maneuvering bills through the legislative branch of the American Government. It only enhances his legislative stature for me to say that many of those bills were regional in nature and thus incited opposition sometimes vigorous, simply on sectional grounds.

Engle's legislative craftsmanship was strengthened by his curt and colorful western vocabulary. When pleased—and I recall this myself—he had a habit of saying "I'm as happy as a fox with two tails." One time, when stomping out of a committee hearing in order to get more information, he shouted as he went out the door: "When I come back in 10 minutes, I'm sure going to throw a skunk into your henhouse."

Along with his western oriented "Engleisms," Clair like to quote Shakespeare. He found the saying of the great bard particularly apt for a multitude of political situations, and never traveled without taking a collection of Shakespearean plays with him. "The great value I find in Shakespeare," he confided. "is how it helps you in phrasing."

In his 23 years in the House and the Senate, Clair Engle became an outstanding congressional authority on water rights, electric power, and public lands, the three major concerns of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I think his greatest legislative accomplishment was greatly to expand the far-reaching irrigation-flood control system in California's two great Central Valleys. The first bill Engle succeeded in having enacted along this line was the $300 million American River development bill in 1949, under which Folsom Dam was constructed east of Sacramento City. This dam saved Sacramento, California's capital city, just a few weeks ago, from the ravages of flood damage unleashed against much of northern California. Less than 1 year later, in 1950, Engle pulled a near miracle by securing an additional $100 million for the program which was used to build the Sacramento Valley canals and bring water to 200,000 acres of land in the Sacramento River Valley.

In 1952 Engle went to work on the third step in his Central Valley development plans—an increase in the water level in the Sacramento River by diverting some of the ocean runoff from the Trinity River to the northwest. In January 1953, during the last few days of the Truman administration, Engle slipped into the White House and the Interior Department and talked the outgoing Democratic officials into giving Congress the necessary green light, or as you and I know it, Mr. President, the "finding of feasibility," for the Trinity project.

A few days after the triumphal inauguration of Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Clair Engle gloated to a GOP colleague, with a characteristically exultant laugh:

> While you Republicans were out in the living room at the White House leading cheers over Eisenhower's inauguration, I was luggin' the bacon out the kitchen door.

When the Trinity River project was completed several years later, Clair Engle could point with pride to the fact that of his indefatigable leadership in bringing three major additions to the Central Valley project, which cost the Federal Government a combined total of two-thirds of a billion dollars, all of it to be repaid in future years through the sale of electric power and of water to irrigation users. Quipped Engle: "I guess you could call me the gold miner who went to Washington."

Clair's efforts on behalf of the Central Valley have helped to enable California's farmers to reap more cash income than farmers in any other State. Clair himself pointed to the great dams that control the rivers of the Central Valley as his most significant achievement:

> They're better than something you read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They're cement and steel—something you can get out and stomp around on.

In 1957, Engle put together the complete background and legislative history of the Central Valley project into a two-volume study. I am glad to say, Mr. President, that I treasure this two-volume study that I have at home in my library. Entitled "Central Valley Project Documents," this work stands today as the most definitive guide available to the planning, construction, operation, and management of vast public works undertakings.

But Clair Engle's interest in conservation stretched way beyond the boundaries of California's Central Valley. He was one of the major sponsors of large-scale Federal research into the conversion of sea water into fresh water. "If we can develop low-cost means of bringing water to the thirsty lands and peoples of the world," Engle said, "we will bring a boon to mankind that is more meaningful than the conquest of outer space."

What we do today with respect to the development of conversion processes by which the waters of the sea may be made potable and useful for humankind and for God's green earth springs in great part from the leadership given to that wholesome undertaking by which the late Clair Engle first introduced legislation on the subject.

Clair was also a strong supporter of land reclamation projects. He authored the bill establishing the small reclamation projects program. This legislation authorized interest-free loans for irrigation districts to rehabilitate and extend their works or build new projects. Another successful Engle bill established the distribution systems program, which authorized interest-free loans to irrigation districts receiving water from Federal reclamation projects to construct their own water-distribution systems. Both of these programs have been a tremendous success throughout the Western United States.

Because his congressional district contained within its borders most of the mineral wealth of the State of California, Clair Engle became a champion of the American mining industry. He was a strong advocate of stockpiling strategic and critically needed minerals and metals for possible American defense purposes. He long sought to obtain a national minerals policy and program which would recognize that the development and maintenance of existing domestic mining and mineral industries is essential to the future security and economy of the United States.

When he became a Congressman, Engle did not let his childhood desire to go to West Point and be a professional soldier go to waste. A former member of the National Guard, Engle earned the rank of colonel in the Air Force Reserve. When Congress would adjourn, Engle's

idea of a vacation was to go on active duty.

Engle in 1952 received an active duty assignment from the Air Force to go to Korea and investigate the results of the new military justice code recently put into effect there. This permitted Clair to tour the combat zone for 5 weeks without the protective chaperoning customarily thrown around visiting Congressmen. He flew north of the 38th parallel on jet reconnaissance missions, studied the frontlines from a rescue helicopter, fired a .50-caliber machinegun at the Chinese trenches from a tank, and talked at great length with battle-hardened American dive bomber pilots.

Later on, as chairman of the House of Representatives Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Clair Engle launched and directed a searching investigation into military land excesses and abuses of conservation laws in military areas. The result of his hard work was corrective legislation known as the Engle Military Withdrawal Act.

In 1958, Congressman Engle gave up his seat in the House of Representatives and filed for the U.S. Senate seat being vacated by Senate Minority Leader William F. Knowland. Clair was elected to a full 6-year term in the U.S. Senate by a large majority.

In the Senate, Clair Engle made the improvement of U.S. foreign trade his principal project. Named to the Committee on Commerce, he immediately went on a factfinding tour of the Far East in order to discover why U.S. exports to that part of the world had declined so radically. In 1961, the Senate passed an Engle-authored bill designed to get American exports on the move by correcting defects in our export policies and procedures. Although this particular bill died in the House of Representatives, it succeeded in jogging the Government agencies who administer foreign trade relations into adopting most of the major recommendations of the bill that bore Clair's name.

Engle was also a strong supporter of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. He labored throughout 1961, 1962, and 1963 as chairman of the Commerce Committee hearings on foreign trade and Pacific trade opportunities.

As a Senator, however, Clair did not let his interest in foreign trade stop him from continuing his activities in the field of domestic land reclamation and development. In 1960, he led in the enactment of legislation establishing the San Luis project in California. In 1963, he successfully fought for urgently needed funds for the Los Angeles County flood control project. A series of bills bearing his name culminated in the creation of Point Reyes National Seashore in Marin County, a significant step in the national effort to save vanishing shorelines and increase recreational facilities for the American people.

The western intertie agreement which makes possible the transfer of surplus electric power over a network serving 11 Western States met his standards and had his approval. Senator Engle first proposed such a project more than 15 years ago. It was signed into law by President Johnson only a few hours before Engle's tragic death.

Still pending before Congress is one bill which bears the familiar Engle brand. It would authorize the Auburn Dam-Folsom South Canal—a project needed to furnish electric power for local irrigation pumping and to provide better flood protection for Sacramento and the lowlands in the Sacramento Delta area. When it passes, as it surely shall, it will be in great part a congressional tribute to an able friend now departed.

In many ways, Clair Engle's greatest moments as a legislator occurred during the last 11 months of his 30 years in public service. His concern for humanity and his dedication to public duty were never greater than in his last year on this earth. Under extremely desperate circumstances, with very great and very obvious physical pain, he made his final appearance on the Senate floor in order to help do what he believed must be done.

On June 10, 1964, Senator Engle had himself brought to the Senate floor in a wheelchair to cast his vote on the cloture motion to shut off the extended debate against the civil rights bill. Throughout the entire 3-month debate on that bill, the bipartisan leadership in the Senate knew it could depend on Clair Engle, despite his grave illness, to be there and voting when the crucial moment came. The cloture vote was a close vote; Clair's vote was badly needed, and he was there and voting when the American people needed him.

Clair confided to close friends that he believed his vote on debate-limiting cloture would be his final act as a public servant.

But it was not to be his last Senate vote. On June 19, he again made, successfully, the herculean effort to come to the Senate floor and vote for the final passage of the civil rights bill.

I recall that moment poignantly, as I know all his colleagues will. He was unable to say "yea," but, by significant gestures made his vote known, and thus once again this courageous Californian recorded his position as another admirable milestone in the journey of this Republic was reached.

Clair Engle's insistence on casting these last two Senate votes, despite severe paralysis and agonizing pain, dramatized to all Americans how deeply this man was committed to both public service and public leadership.

It is beyond my ability to stand here on the floor and build an appropriate monument to my late colleague, Clair Engle, based on words which would attempt to spell out his deeds. No words are adequate truly to memorialize this man of fire and zeal who did so much to build his State and his country.

Clair Engle's monument is the whole complex of mighty dams that control California's raging rivers. His monument lives in the irrigation canals which carry life-giving water to land once arid and barren. His monument is the gentle blue of giant manmade lakes, the lush green of once-brown desert valleys, and the warm yellow glow of electric energy provided cheaply and quickly to American families.

As Clair Engle himself said, his monument is not in "something you read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD," but in projects of cement and steel that "you can get out and stomp around on."

Yet, the true monument to Clair Engle is more than all these things. It lies in the happy smile of a child swimming in a manmade lake. It lies in the enjoyment campers get from the scenery of a great national park. It can be found in the relief in a man's soul when he knows the river near his property will no longer overflow its banks and destroy so much of what he has worked to own.

Clair Engle's monument, like that of any great public servant, is in the well-being of the people he served.

On behalf of myself, my colleagues, and our families, we extend to his beloved widow and all his family our deepest condolences for the loss of a man who lived a constructive life for the benefit of the people which the late U.S. Senator, Clair Engle, of California, represented so actively and well.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is always a sad occasion when we lose one of our colleagues, especially when death strikes down a man who is still in the prime of his life, when his creative abilities and legislative skills are at their peak and his personal zest for life and service is vigorous. Clair Engle possessed all of these qualities in full measure. Indeed, he was looking forward with confidence and eagerness to another term of Senate service to his beloved State of California when his tragic illness occurred.

Clair Engle had a vigorous and forceful life and left a rich heritage of legislative accomplishments. In the House of Representatives alone, he guided 39 measures to passage—23 of which became the law of the land. His influence in the Senate was likewise great.

Clair Engle and I came to the House of Representatives together in the 78th Congress. Let me say, Mr. President, that no man fought harder—or with greater effectiveness—to preserve our great natural heritage. First as a Congressman, then as chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and finally as a U.S. Senator, Clair Engle made his mark in behalf of water resources, reclamation, electrical power, and conservation. He acted not only for California in these areas but, in a larger sense, for the West and the Nation. He authored every major expansion of the huge California Central Valley reclamation project since its beginning in 1937.

Senator Engle was also a stanch supporter of excellence in the Nation's schools. He fought for legislation to protect the livelihood and health of the American miner. And as a licensed pilot, he was intimately acquainted with the problems of the aviation industry.

The issue for which history will no doubt remember Clair Engle best is none of these, however. For who will ever forget the raw courage and devotion to

principle which he displayed in connection with the Civil Rights bill of 1964? Under exceptionally difficult physical and emotional circumstances, he came on this floor and cast his votes to end the longest Senate debate ever held, and to assure passage of an act of profound importance to the Nation. In this instance, as throughout his struggle with the illness with which he was stricken, his wife stood with him. She gave that full measure of devotion which helped him to live with meaning and with contentment up to the very hour of his death.

Mr. President, Mrs. Mansfield and I reiterate, today, our deep respect for the memory of a great Senator, Clair Engle, of California.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, it is indeed an honor to join my many colleague's to pay tribute to the memory of one of the greatest Senators ever to represent the sovereign State of California, and one of the most effective spokesmen for the interests of these United States.

Senator Clair Engle's untimely passing, in the summer of 1964, left a deep and serious gap within the ranks of those in the Senate usually identified with the progressive West. It will be a most difficult position for anyone to fill.

Much has been said and written about the personal legislative record of this man. And well it should for it is an outstanding record of accomplishment. As I stand in this Chamber today, I cannot help recalling the most important contribution Senator Clair Engle made in the cause of Hawaiian statehood while he served as chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the 84th and 85th Congresses. His keen understanding of our problems and his dogged determination made it possible for Hawaii to be admitted as our Nation's 50th State. On this day, I join the people of Hawaii in thanking Senator Engle for this most important contribution. As a Member of the Senate, I was most privileged to serve with our late friend as a member of the Armed Services Committee. His counsel was constantly sought, and his voice for a secure and strong America was always heard.

Notable as are his many accomplishments, I shall always remember Senator Clair Engle for his courageous contributions in the 1964 Senate battle on civil rights. Although unable to participate directly in the many skirmishes and confrontations, both in committee and on the Senate floor preceding the crucial vote on cloture due to his illness, I will always remember vividly his valiant figure being wheeled in on June 10 to vote an almost inaudible "aye" to halt debate and bring the civil rights bill to a vote. This was undoubtedly a moment for which he rallied all his mental and physical strengths, this was unquestionably the opportunity for which he conserved all his waning powers. And on June 19, Clair Engle cast his last vote—a vote for civil rights.

This was a most appropriate culmination to an outstanding career. It reflected the deep sense of commitment and responsibility so characteristic of the man throughout his life.

During Clair Engle's last days, we were privileged to witness the unselfish love of his dedicated and devoted wife. Clair's last hours were chapters of courage, and these tragic hours were shining hours for Clair's beloved wife—Lu. Today I join my colleagues in saluting Clair and Lu Engle.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Senator Clair Engle was one of the bravest and finest men I ever met. It so happens that I am standing at the desk he occupied. Every time I sit down at this desk, I think of him.

For Mrs. Young and me, his death meant the loss of a great and dear friend.

However, his tragic death was more than merely a loss to those privileged to have known him. It was more than a loss to the Congress of a skilled legislator and dedicated public servant. It was a great loss to all Americans and to the very spirit of our country. Above all, Clair Engle was a fighter—for his country, for his State, and always for his principles.

It can truly be said of our beloved colleague that he lived with an abiding faith in the democratic processes which he zealously guarded, and, by doing so, provided a ringing affirmation of our way of life in these times of trial and torment.

A sense of dedication to his office and the people he represented illumined his 21 years of fruitful service in Congress.

Senator Clair Engle was a generous, warm, and understanding human being. Above all, he was a fighter for the causes in which he believed. He was never quarrelsome, never belligerent in manner, but from his boyhood throughout his manhood he was an athlete, self-trained and experienced—a tough fighter, indeed, well able to smash any aggressive bully into submission—were Clair Engle assailed.

Senator Engle exemplified a spirit which is more and more absent in American life in an age when much of the country jumps to the erratic and seductive tunes of Madison Avenue—a spirit of individual courage and conviction which brooked no compromise with conscience.

Clair Engle was truly a man of determination and tremendous, real, unselfish courage, such as was exemplified by his actions and votes over the years. His adherence to high principles of conduct during his life and in his work in the House of Representatives and the Senate are elements too often lacking in American public life.

It was a tragedy that this great statesman, while still in the prime of life, was struck down at the height of his powers by a terrible illness. Clair Engle had that unique combination of integrity, compassion, and ability so admirable in a man and so prized in a public servant. His loyalty, his vibrant personality, his courage, and his integrity will remain with us forever. The spirit of this man will linger long in the Halls of Congress.

I first knew him in 1949, when we served together in the House of Representatives. I admired him then as an industrious and most able representative of the interests of his State of California and of the Nation. We formed a friendship at that time which lasted until his death late last summer.

Clair Engle made friends as easily as some of us make enemies. Of what we call the class of 1958, the 15 Democratic U.S. Senators elected in 1958, he was one of the most outstanding and best beloved of all our Members. His death, at the early age of 52, was one of the greatest tragedies confronting Members of Congress at any time during the year 1964. Had he lived, I am personally convinced that he would have been called on by leaders of his party in California and in the Nation to become our candidate for Vice President or President of the United States sometime within the coming 12 or 16 years. Such were his high mental qualities, ability, and personality as a man and such was his record as a truly dedicated public servant.

As I grew to know him well, I found that his chief concern was for the betterment of the lives of the average persons and the underprivileged of this Nation. His deep feelings about problems arising from poverty and poor housing, his endeavors to help small business enterprises, his concern for the welfare of our elderly men and women, his vigorous leadership in behalf of the poor, the disinherited, the hungry, and the hopeless—all of these testified that his compassion for humanity knew no boundaries. He was not only endowed with great energy, he was a student. In addition he was respected for his achievements for his State of California in conservation matters and in connection with projects to bring more water into areas greatly needing it. His eloquence carried conviction from the time when he was termed "the boy district attorney" right up to the enthusiastic responses he received in 1958 when campaigning for election to the Senate. In the Senate of the United States his words were always listened to with respect and his arguments were always convincing. All of us recall that toward the end of his life, following brain surgery and hospitalization while partially paralyzed and in great pain, he came to the Senate Chamber on June 10, last year, and cast his vote to close debate on the civil rights bill and to cast his vote 9 days later for the Civil Rights Act of 1964. He manifested by responding by gesture and voice his belief in complete and equal civil rights and civil liberties for all Americans. These important votes were the last votes he cast as a Senator of the United States. We who were in the Senate Chamber on those 2 days last June will never forget the gallantry, bravery, and dedication of this great statesman.

Clair Engle was a man's man—a great athlete, a man of the utmost vigor—an active dynamic young man who at the age of 52 was cruelly struck down in the prime of his life. I recall him telling me of how he loved to walk and to hunt in the redwood forests of his native northern California. I find myself now and then in conversations using some of the picturesque language that I first heard from Clair Engle. These phrases were original with him. They spiced his con-

versation and helped endear him to all who met him.

Mr. President, I desire also to pay tribute to Mrs. Lucretia Engle, an outstanding woman. She is known to thousands of Californians and to us in Washington as "Lu." For months prior to his death, Senator Clair Engle lay ill in a hospital and for months thereafter he was returned to his home and confined to a wheelchair and near the end of his life he was barely able to speak. During all those weeks and months he was sustained by his beloved wife Lucretia, a great and gracious lady. He was confident throughout many months following the first operation to which he was subjected in August 1963 that he would fully recover. He planned his campaign for reelection and we who were elected to the Senate in 1958 along with him and were his friends and companions also felt he would recover. We believed that of all of us Senators elected for the first time to the Senate in 1958, he was the most likely to be reelected by the largest majority. His wife Lu along with us, his colleagues, kept alive in him the flame of hope for his recovery and a continued career. "Lu" Engle was at his side day and night and fought with great courage and devotion to encourage her husband in his fight against the dread malady with which he was afflicted. She is a great lady—a very great lady—and their years of married life together were radiant with successes, happiness, and love.

Mr. President, our Nation lost one of its great men in his most unfortunate death. Ninety-nine U.S. Senators lost a fine friend. All one can say this day is our Nation is stronger and a better country for having had him in the Congress of the United States. I too feel that I gained much and am a better man for having known him.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Clair Engle was one man who in my opinion found his proper niche in life—that of a legislator. He was a lawyer, an aviator, and always a gentleman and a humanitarian, but primarily he achieved success in life in the art of legislation—by which I mean, getting bills considered and passed by the Congress.

Out in the West today when someone refers to the Engle act, you have to ask "Which Engle act?" Do you mean Public Law 448 of the 82d Congress, the original Saline Water Act which created the Office of Saline Water in the Department of the Interior, and is known in that Office as the Engle act?

Do you mean Public Law 130 of the 84th Congress, the Irrigation Distribution Systems Loan Act, or possibly Public Law 984 of the 84th Congress, the widely acclaimed Small Reclamation Projects Act?

Or do you mean Public Law 337 of the 85th Congress, which is the act to limit public land withdrawals by the military agencies.

All of these are known today in various circles as the Engle act. In his one term in the Senate, cut short by tragic illness, Senator Engle was the author or cosponsor of 104 bills which became law.

Senator Engle was interested in many things. He was author of the bill creating the new Point Reyes National Seashore north of San Francisco, a forerunner of our national seashore parks. His specialty was resource development, particularly water and power. His great love was the Central Valley project in California. Clair Engle was the author or coauthor of every act of legislation authorizing an addition to the Central Valley project since the basic project was approved in the late thirties. These additions include Folsom Dam on the American River, now operating for flood control, irrigation, conservation, and electric power generation; the Sacramento Valley canals in the northern part of the valley, authorized more than a decade ago, and now finally well into construction; the tremendous San Luis unit now nearing completion in the San Joaquin Valley; the new Trinity River division in the north; and finally, in the 88th Congress, the Stanislaus division, which is authorized but not yet under construction.

Senator Engle did little for show or publicity. He was not prone to long speeches on the floor of the Senate or to inserting many statements in the Appendix of the RECORD. His method was to work by direct contact and by personal persuasion in the interest of legislation he considered important. His record is that of a constructive and effective legislator.

Much more could be said of the life and accomplishments of my friend and colleague Clair Engle, but he appreciated brevity. So with these few and inadequate words I pay tribute to his memory.

Phyllis joins me in this expression of our gratitude for the life and work of Clair Engle and we express our admiration to Lu, his wife, for her steadfast devotion and support of her great husband. She has today our love and condolences. We remember Clair and we remember Lu. They set a great example for us all.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, it is an honor to have served with the late Senator Clair Engle, and it is a privilege to join my colleagues in paying respect and tribute to him this day.

Clair Engle was a rugged individualist. He was nurtured in rugged country—the Sierra Nevada Mountains—where the country is big, and men think big.

Clair Engle was one of those rare persons, who never compromised a principle. Though serving a neighboring State, he was considered a Congressman and Senator who would always lend a sympathetic ear to my State's problems. We had many common causes.

As chairman of the House Interior Committee, it was Clair Engle who took the lead in stopping land grabs by departments of the Federal Government. He fought successfully for the 5,000-acre limit on lands to the military, which had been a troublesome problem in California and Nevada as well as many other Western States. He was always ready to take the lead on problems peculiar to the mining industry. His own congressional district is steeped in mining history, having furnished this Nation in its early history much gold from some of the largest placer mining operations in the world.

He was a tireless worker in the fields of reclamation, water, and conservation. His work in these areas will stand as a beacon to those of us who are privileged to carry on the battle.

We were, to a man, shocked to lose this valuable colleague—one who had a zest for life and who fought until the very end.

As a freshman Senator, tackling a big problem, the Washoe project, which extended into common ground, the upper reaches of the Sierras, I knew the support of Clair Engle would be necessary. His congressional district comprised seven or eight counties bordering my own State.

I acknowledge with gratitude that without the help of Clair Engle, who was then chairman of the powerful House Interior Committee, this legislation would not have been successfully enacted into law. His counsel will be cherished the remainder of my life and his effort in lending assistance to me and to my State on this one major problem is one from which all Nevadans will benefit.

When he entered the Senate as a junior Senator from the largest State in the Union, Clair Engle lost no ground. He was immediately recognized as a leader and one who would continue to fight for principles and causes of the highest nature. It is a tragedy that this man was taken from us in the prime of his life. Yet his doggedness, his perseverance, and his friendly smile will always be a cherished memory to those of us who knew and respected him so well.

I join all who have expressed heartfelt words with respect and affection for the late Senator. His record of service to his State and to his Nation is one which all can project as a lifetime goal. Yet this big man accomplished so much in a little over half of a life's span. We have truly lost a friend, a western, neighborly man, whose accomplishments knew no boundary line.

Any tribute to Senator Engle would be incomplete without special mention of his wife "Lu." Those of us who saw his game fight for life know something of the love and affection which she gave him in those difficult and trying days last year. Her faith and her devotion should not go unnoticed.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the practice of honoring our deceased colleagues and coworkers in the vineyards of representative democracy is an old and honored tradition of the Senate. Even if we had no such tradition, I know that every Member of this body would feel impelled to rise today to honor the memory and to reflect on the achievements of that great human being and great Senator from California, the late Clair Engle.

For he was truly a man of giant proportion—a man unusually suited in qualifications and dimension to represent the largest and fastest growing State in our Union. In a sense California has become the melting pot of America, absorbing into its sinews the diverse elements and peoples of our great country,

just as the United States was the melting pot of the world not too many years ago.

The finest and highest quality steel is forged and tempered by melding the best elements from many raw materials. And so the high quality, character, courage, and strength of Clair Engle was developed from the teaming mixture of the diverse peoples and ideals of California.

It was not an easy task to represent the State of California with its striking contrasts in population, in geography, in political philosophy, and in monumental problems. It is a measure of the man that he did it so well, with such ease and grace, and without ever losing the overwhelming confidence of his people which swept him into public service at an early stage in his life.

Not only was he unusually suited to represent his own State, but he was uniquely qualified to represent the United States as a Member of the Senate. The caricaturists often picture Senators in an unflattering manner. Should a stream of compassion ever infect them with a desire to paint an accurate picture of those qualities of a great Senator, they could find no better model than Clair Engle.

He looked the part and played the part with sensitivity and with a flourish beyond the capacity of many of us. He understood the Senate and was wise in the ways of politics in the highest sense of the word.

He had the respect of his colleagues—respect for his great intellect, his skill, his devotion, and his willingness to work without complaint and with vigor no matter how great or small the task. He had the friendship of his colleagues also, for he was a warm man and a compassionate man.

It was my privilege to serve with him for many years on the Commerce Committee. Able, competent, enthusiastic, he was a champion of all transportation. But he especially took into the most careful consideration problems related to the aviation industry, for he achieved skill as a pilot. I shall never forget his sparkling wit, his courtesy, and his enthusiasm. Whenever hearings became dull and monotonous or tempers were pushed to the boiling point, his warm smile and twinkling eyes always enlivened our spirits or dissolved our tensions.

And, Mr. President, my heart still rises in my throat when I recall the magnificent courage of Clair Engle during his last days when, despite all pain and despite all handicaps, he came here and stood on the floor of the Senate to cast his vote on the civil rights bill and the test ban treaty. His last courageous efforts will place him in the forefront of all great Americans of the past whose devotion and loyalty to their country surpassed all things, even death.

With Mrs. Lucrecia Engle, his partner and helper in all things before and after his tragic illness, we share the grief of the loss of a leader, a helper, a true and faithful friend.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, what does one say of Clair Engle? How does one find the right words to use on this day set aside in the Senate of the United States in memory of such a man as Clair Engle? Surely, I do not have the mood or desire to deliver a eulogy. Nor do I want to say much. It is not that his life left little to be said. It was a rich life and a full one. Its biographical details and the successes and failures and sadnesses and happinesses of Clair Engle have been recounted before, doubtless will be recounted today, and the record will not then close because the wholesome shadows this man cast before him will linger and men's recollections concerning him will be stirred at times far distant from now. And the people in his own, his native California, now and for generations to come, will have reasons to be thankful that Clair Engle decided to enter public life. For his achievements in the Congress of the United States for California meant better lives and happier and more prosperous lives for the people there.

All of this is known. It is stated in laws, it is stated in committee hearings, in newspaper accounts, in magazine articles, by word of mouth; and principally it is stated by way of concrete achievement in irrigation projects and dams, and ever so many other ways.

Mr. President, a mention or two and I am done.

Strive against it as we will, we are bound to make our evaluations based upon personal relationships when they exist. So I do now.

Clair Engle came to Washington one Congress in advance of me. He arrived in the 78th. In a legislative way, our lot was cast pretty much together. In those distant days he was a lowly Congressman, one step out of the freshman class, and I was a voteless delegate. We served together on the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee until other circumstances, other times, brought us to the Senate together in 1959. It is true that Clair Engle rose to become chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee because of his seniority. It is likewise true that seniority aside, merit and ability would have as surely carried him to the top.

During this period—almost 20 years—our association became personal as well as professional. It was Clair Engle who was chairman of the House committee when Congress passed the Alaska statehood bill. And on the Senate side of the Capitol, by reason of coincidence and desire and assignment, we found ourselves once more closely associated and in most cases closely allied. We were both on the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Commerce.

What made Clair Engle stand out? What made him different from the ordinary run of men? As with all exceptional men, the reasons are many, some obvious, some perhaps hidden. The keystone, of course, was his inborn ability. He had a first-class mind and used it in a first-class manner. He was a vibrant man filled with energy and enthusiasm and determination. His drive and ability to accomplish matched his vision. Of all, he had a superabundant supply. The gift of phrase that was Clair Engle's was unique and to those who were hearing it for the first time, startling. A name came to be applied to that phrase-making. The products became known as "Engleisms." They came from a westerner, and were born of the West. They were a product of a frontier land before it had been overrun by civilization. They were made up on the spur of a moment, they were always penetrating and analytical and had their points to make, and made superlatively well. They popped out faster than ever when things were going well for Clair Engle and for him most of the time things were going well.

He is gone now. When we are summoned to the floor of the Senate for a vote we shall no longer, except in memory, see before us the hustling, jaunty figure of the man from California, cigar in right hand. I do not care to refer except in passing to that tragic last illness. I cherish and shall preserve the other memory, the memory of a man as thoroughly alive as any human being I have ever known.

I counted Clair Engle as a friend, as did my wife, Vide, and we embraced in that circle, the circumference of which can never and should never be too great, his wonderful wife, Lu. In braveness of spirit and in ever so many other ways she matched her husband, the man from California.

I cherish his memory.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the late Senator Clair Engle, of California, whose brilliant career was tragically cut short last year by death.

It was my privilege to know and work with Senator Engle from the time he first entered the Senate in 1959. We served together for 3 years on the Special Committee on Aging, where he distinguished himself by his dedication to the problems of our senior citizens.

Senator Engle began his public career in 1934 as district attorney of Tehama County, Calif. He later served briefly in the California State Senate before entering the U.S. House of Representatives in a special election in 1943.

During the next 15 years, he served with distinction in the House, justly earning the reputation for being one of the most able and hard-working Members of that body.

In 1958, the people of California demonstrated excellent judgment in electing him to represent them in the U.S. Senate. The reputation he brought with him from the House and the energy and effort he expended, quickly won him both acceptance and admiration in the Senate.

Clair Engle was a man who had a deep and abiding interest in people; particularly the unfortunate, the afflicted, and the forgotten. He was a man of great personal charm, with a keen wit and a delightful sense of humor. He was a "Senator's Senator."

His death cut short a career of public service already marked by solid success and destined for even greater achievements. It was a loss that California—and the Nation—could ill afford.

To his charming and devoted widow "Lu" and the Engle family, my wife joins me in expressing to them our deepest sympathy at their great loss.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, of the tragic losses which occur when death takes one of our colleagues, few, if any, have been more untimely than that which deprived his lovely wife, Lucretia, the Senate, the State of California, and the Nation, of Clair Engle.

For he was in his prime—zestful, joyous, vigorous, vibrant, dynamic. He seemed destined for an even greater career than he had already achieved when fate decreed otherwise. For his career up to that time had indeed been meteoric. He had never lost an election. In these contests for the approval of his fellow citizens, he was the winner not fewer than 14 times. A lawyer, he became assistant district attorney of Tehama County, Calif., in 1933; was elected district attorney in 1934; and reelected in 1938. He was elected a State senator in 1942. Due to a vacancy occurring in the Second California Congressional District in 1943 through the death of its incumbent Congressman, Clair Engle ran in a special election that year and won, taking his seat in the 78th Congress.

He was reelected to Congress six times, serving thus from the 78th to the 85th Congresses.

Although he held in the last two of these Congresses the enviable and highly important chairmanship of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, by far the most important committee from the standpoint of the West, he decided to run for the U.S. Senate and was elected in 1958. It was his 14th electoral victory. And, had he lived, it is as certain as anything can be in politics that he would have been in the Senate for life, unless, indeed, he had been drafted for a higher office. For he was only 53 years of age at his untimely death and could normally have looked forward to an additional quarter of a century or more of active senatorial service. Entering the Congress at the youthful age of 32, he might well have exceeded CARL HAYDEN'S alltime record for length of service, since CARL was first elected to Congress at the age of 35. Never did unkind fate halt a great career more cruelly; for few of our colleagues could match Clair Engle, before his fatal illness struck, for verve, zest, alertness, pep, energy, and resoluteness.

He was a man of action, a human dynamo, mentally and physically, but he was never too active for kindly and courtly consideration of many personal demands made upon him.

His successor in the House as chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee—the Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL, of Colorado—has testified that during Clair Engle's chairmanship in the 84th and 85th Congresses, 365 new public laws came out of that committee. In his House service, moreover, he sponsored 65 bills benefiting his home State which became laws. He was a champion of resource development. The great river projects which mean so much to the West were, in California, largely guided to fulfillment by him. More than any other person he contributed to the Great Central Valley project, successfully guiding the American River, Trinity River, and Sacramento Canals division of that great undertaking. It was he who likewise successfully guided the Santa Barbara, Santa Maria, and Ventura reclamation projects.

He sponsored the Small Reclamation Projects Act and the Distribution Systems Act. He was the author of the original Saline Water Research Act.

A great conservationist, he felt that too much land that should be used for recreation and multiple purpose was immured in military reservations. An act to require all military withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres to receive the approval of Congress, did much to rectify this condition. This valuable legislation bears his name. It is known as the Engle Act. But it is only one of half a dozen important acts which bear his name.

The wide diversity of interests in his great State was matched by a correspondingly wide response from him. He sponsored legislation beneficial to mining, fisheries, agriculture, and transportation. An aviator—a pilot—he was active in the Senate Armed Services Committee in behalf of our national defense. His ideas always carried the impact of his dynamic personality.

He was a pro in the very best sense of that word. By that I mean that he kept his close contact with the people of his State—who loved him—and was ever aware of and attended to their needs. He was salty, colorful, a typification of the great West as it is in both romance and reality.

He was a cosponsor of civil rights legislation, and in his last appearance in the Senate, when he was so desperately crippled by his tragic illness, though speechless, he cast his vote for the passage of the act.

Alaskans and Hawaiians will ever be grateful for his support and leadership in their statehood fights which began while he was a member of the House Interior Committee and culminated under his chairmanship. He was a militant champion of democracy and carried his faith in the basic principles of representatative government into all his legislative activities. In this legislative field he was a master craftsman.

He spoke frequently and effectively in favor of both Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood. One passage delivered in the House at the time of the final enactment of the statehood bill in 1958 reveals the loftiness of his thinking and the eloquence of his utterance. Speaking on the Alaska bill, he said in part:

> Our fellow citizens who went west to become Alaskans went of their own free will. They went, in part, in quest of greater opportunity and greater freedom. They went, inspired, in part, by the love of adventure which lies deep in every American heart. They went westward into the unknown, open and emptier spaces of our land as generations of Americans had before them. And they went beyond their predecessors. Settling America's farthest west and farthest north they wrote the final chapter in the greatest epic of all history—the American epic. Yet, it was final only in the sense that they had reached land's end and could go no further.
>
> But if theirs was a concluding chapter in the westward course, it was but the beginning of a great new episode—a still greater adventure—and one of national import. For those pioneers who braved every hardship, who conquered the wilderness, have set themselves in those nothernmost latitudes and westernmost meridians of our continent to establish a great and worthy outpost of American life. Overcoming great natural obstacles and still greater distantly manmade handicaps, they have laid the foundation of a robust society whose destiny it is to be not merely a bulwark of defense for the Western Hemisphere but a citadel of democracy and freedom.
>
> How timely their purpose in this hour of world crisis.
>
> And how appropriate their role in what was once Russian-America and lies within sight of Siberia—Siberia, which to the free world has always signified exile, imprisonment, and death, and never more so than under the tyranny of the Soviet police state.
>
> The Alaskans were and are well qualified to carry out their purpose. They brought with them their traditions of self-government. Imbued with the pioneer spirit, self-reliant, energized by the frontier, hardy in body and independent in spirit, they are the rugged individuals of the type who from earliest days have helped mold America.

And Clair Engle saw statehood for our two Pacific Territories, to which he had so greatly contributed, achieved.

So, in his 30 years of public service, a long period for any public servant regardless of the length of his life, Clair Engle served superlatively and left a shining record and living monuments to his dedication, devotion, and ability and fragrant memories of his helpfulness, his generosity, and his kindliness. We have greatly missed him, and shall continue to miss him, from our midst. And our love and sympathy—my wife, Dorothy's, and mine—go to his brave, gallant wife, Lucretia, who fought so valiantly for him in the days of his triumphs and in the hours of his last, disastrous illness, cherishing and nourishing her hope in his ultimate recovery.

I think in this connection of the verse of Edna St. Vincent Millay, as I recall it:

> Down, down, into the darkness of the grave
> They go. The intelligent, the gallant, the kind,
> Silently they go. The generous, the witty, the brave,
> I know. But I do not approve. And I am not resigned.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, all of us who were privileged to enjoy the rare privilege of serving in the Senate with Clair Engle sorrow with his gracious wife and his other relatives and friends in the irreparable loss which the tragic illness and death brought to them, to the Senate of the United States, to the State of California, to America, and to the world.

This is so because all of us admired Clair Engle for the qualities of his head and loved him for the qualities of his heart.

Clair Engle's tragic passing illustrates a poignant truth which was expressed so beautifully by the Persian poet many centuries ago:

> For some we loved, the loveliest and the best
> That from his vintage rolling time hath prest.
> Have drunk their cup a round or two before.
> And one by one crept silently to rest.

As the able and distinguished junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] has

just stated, we shall continue to miss him as long as our memories last.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, back in August of 1957, on the first night I arrived in Washington to be sworn in in the Senate after the special election in Wisconsin, the then Congressman Clair Engle introduced himself to my wife Ellen and me in the Senate dining room.

He was considering running for the Senate in California, and I recall vividly how deeply impressed both Ellen and I were by this vigorous, humorous, charming, earthy man. How he loved every aspect of political life—even the long, hard, often tedious work of campaigning.

When we think of the contribution that Clair Engle would have made in the years ahead, if his life had been spared, the tragedy of his untimely death is greatly intensified.

For Clair Engle's efforts to protect the country's natural resources against the intrusions of special interests—for these efforts alone—Clair Engle earned a high place among the Nation's statesmen.

Long before he came to the Senate, Clair was recognized by his colleagues in the House as a legislator of great virtuosity. The State of California is eternally indebted to him for the magnitude of his contribution in the development, conservation, and control of its water resources.

The statute books of this country carry a law known as the Military Land Withdrawal Act. It is designed to correct the intemperate use of our public lands by the Military Establishment. This law is the creation of Clair Engle. It was the outcome of months of dogged and courageous investigation by him when he was chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. In critically questioning the military, Clair Engle stepped into sacrosanct territory that men of less courage would be reluctant to tread.

But this was the kind of man Clair Engle was—fearless, determined, spirited.

As a legislator Clair Engle left an impressive legacy.

As a human being, he left an indelible mark.

Six weeks before he died he cast two votes that proved beyond doubt the kind of man he was. Against the wishes of his doctors, he insisted on being placed in an ambulance and wheeled into the Senate Chamber for two crucial votes. One helped stop the filibuster on civil rights. The other helped pass the important 1964 civil rights law.

Clair Engle was fatally ill. But he never lost his feeling for his fellow man. His qualities as a legislator made better legislators of all of us who served with him. His qualities as a human being made better men of us.

And of course there is Mrs. Clair Engle, Lu. My wife, Ellen, has known Lu long and well. No Senator's wife was ever more absolutely dedicated to her husband's career. She made it the supreme goal of her life.

And what a great contribution she made as Clair's constant worker as well as charming hostess. Who in the Senate will ever forget the fierce, almost heartbreaking loyalty of this devoted wife to her stricken husband in those long, agonizing months before he died? No one ever had a mightier champion than Clair had in this petite, charming lady.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I was privileged to know Clair Engle a shorter period of time than did many of my colleagues here today. Yet even in that interval my admiration for him mounted. We were colleagues and members of the class of 1958. That was a very large class. He is the only member of that class now missing. While he was probably the shortest member of that class in physical height, he stood tallest in all the class in his public and personal stature. So I speak a little selfishly as a member of that special group of Senators of one whom we claim as a bit of our own, a fraternity that was a special fraternity, that brought us so closely and intimately into the activities of Senator Clair Engle that intertwined both our hopes and our political ideals with those which he spelled out so articulately.

It was my privilege to see Clair Engle in action on quite another level, one that does not show its head so prominently.

My State of Wyoming happens to have some jealously guarded water rights. Often we have been in contest with Clair Engle's State of California over those rights. But in his own personal crusade, in the interest of the total of our country's western resources, and in the preservation and conservation of those God-given rights, never once did I know of Clair Engle's putting his own personal or State's interest above an interest that he thought was right, and thus superseded it.

On more than one occasion he addressed himself to an understanding of and action in behalf of my own State, even in instances in which surely it must have hurt him politically. That is the mark of the kind of man he was. He might readily have acted differently in those instances, and his difference of action would have been understood by all of us. But he chose to stand tall because it was right.

This attribute of Clair Engle will live forever with me, not because of what he did for Wyoming or for me personally, but because it illustrates a deep quality of a great colleague. It serves as a point of inspiration, one that the rest of us would like to emulate as time could make it possible for us to do so.

His contributions in the few years I saw him in this body are memorable ones. I submit the shadows that they cast ahead shall live forever, that his contributions were not limited to years of simple acts, but by example and with their farseeing qualities will serve as guidelines for us to carry on in his tradition.

As my colleagues have shared before, Loraine and I share with his widow, Lu, those very deep and personal thoughts. But I would like to think even more of those thoughts of Clair Engle that I think will leave a continuing memory and thus act as an inspiration that will move us, for this is the true man.

Much as we miss him, much as his contribution is needed, that which he gave so freely lives on, and we live better because Clair Engle passed this way.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, it is difficult for one to place in words the energy, the vitality, and ability with which Clair Engle addressed himself to his work in the Senate. We remember him as a loyal and faithful representative of California, but he was more. He brought to the Senate a broad interest in major national and international issues. He did not hesitate to inquire, to debate, or to speak his mind upon issues which were of great concern to our Nation. It was the combination of his great qualities which drew to him the respect and affection of his colleagues and the people of his State. That respect and affection will be the best and most lasting tribute which can be paid to him.

We shall always remember him for his brave and fighting spirit which led him time and again to come into this Chamber, although ill, to participate in important decisions pending before this body. We shall remember his qualities of mind and spirit. We shall remember also, and pay tribute to, his great wife for the care and devotion which she gave him in difficult days.

Mr. President, while Clair Engle has gone, he will still inform and inspire us as we remember the qualities which made him a great Senator and, I believe, even more, a great human being.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the Chair). The Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] is recognized.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, all of us from the West appreciate the accomplishments of another westerner who reached great eminence in the Halls of Congress. Such a man was our late departed colleague, Senator Clair Engle.

I first met Clair Engle when he served as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives. I had occasion to appear before his committee, and I came to admire and respect him for his fairness, his thorough knowledge of the subject matter under discussion, and his ability to work very hard.

My own experience in land and water resources has made me increasingly aware of the outstanding contributions made by Senator Engle in this field during his 21 years of service in Congress.

Many of the great reservoirs and land resource development projects in this country stand as a tribute to his persistence and dedication to the sound principles of resource development.

Clair Engle was always ready to cooperate with others who had a sincere desire to further reclamation projects. He was always willing to lend his able hand to many projects which bear the names of others equally interested in reclamation.

We in Idaho will be forever grateful to Clair Engle for his work in Congress on many of our projects to provide water resource development. We shall miss his advice and counsel, but we have his memory and record to guide us as we continue our efforts.

I admire Clair Engle as a man of courage and conviction, a man who was al-

ways willing to go the extra mile for a friend.

Mrs. Jordan joins me in expressing our deep sympathy and our condolences to Mrs. Engle and to the entire Engle family.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, other Senators are better warranted than I to speak of Clair Engle's representation in the great western area of our country. Other Senators are better warranted than I to speak of his attributes in specialized areas, for the long service that he rendered to his country and his State, and earlier to his district as a Member of the House of Representatives.

I have no special warrant to speak at all, except as a human being and a friend of Clair Engle. Who could wish for a better warrant?

Clair Engle was a man of dignity, yet utterly lacking in pomposity. He had a hatred for hypocrisy and sham. He was a fierce partisan, yet he was no demagog. He was never unfair. It was always possible to understand him. He was never bitter. He kept his eyes open and one knew very well that anything of cant or humbug would be dismissed contemptuously by this most decent human being.

He added greatly to the House of Representatives, and in later years to the Senate, as a place in which to serve as a company of kindred spirits.

So long as any of us who knew him are still around, we shall miss him. We join in simple, deep mourning for him, because in a very real sense we have seen in him what many of us would wish ourselves to be. There are not many of his kind. We can ill afford to spare them.

Our hearts go out to Lu Engle. In a very personal sense my wife and I pay her most affectionate best wishes and sympathy.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the loss of Clair Engle at the relatively youthful Senate age of 53 brings all of us in this body up short with the realization that our time on earth is controlled more by the "Great Scorer" than by the electorate back home.

When Clair Engle came to the Senate in January of 1959, he brought with him 15 years' experience in the House of Representatives, many years in the State Senate of California, and 8 years prior to that as district attorney and special deputy attorney general for the State of California.

He brought to the Senate more than a quarter of a century of public service, and was one of the most experienced legislators in the Senate. He had been chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the House of Representatives, an important committee, and he gave up that chairmanship to come to the Senate. Not many persons would be willing to do that.

When Clair Engle came to the Senate, he joined us on the Commerce Committee under the leadership of the able and distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. He was a licensed, able pilot, and flew his own plane. He understood every facet of the difficult and complicated transportation problem. He had studied commerce. He had studied maritime commerce in particular; and, coming from a seafaring State, he knew the importance of maritime commerce in our national life and our international relations. He soon became one of the most valued members on the Commerce Committee, where he supported all measures for the furtherance of undersea studies for the advancement of the science of oceanography in the development of our foreign trade. He was one of the most vigorous protagonists of foreign trade fairs in order to exhibit American products, and for the increase of foreign tourism in the United States. With his vigorous mind and capable advocacy, he supported the establishment of tourist bureaus overseas to help increase tourism in the United States.

Clair Engle was broadminded. He did not believe that the way to remedy the imbalance of gold payments—the outflow of gold—was to cut off Americans from going abroad.

He sought a broader gaged plan of bringing tourists from Europe into the United States in order to stimulate the flow of more American goods overseas. He was broad gaged in his governmental relations. He was broad gaged in his personal relationships.

It was my good fortune to be a deskmate of Clair Engle. It was my good fortune to be his deskmate on the Commerce Committee. I talked with him many times privately, and always found him to be a man of good humor. I never heard him say a mean word about another Member of the Senate, either in private conversation or in public debate. What he said was in good humor, as has already been stated in this Chamber many times. He would often add a humorous statement to relieve a tense situation.

Let me relate one incident only. During the course of a hearing before the Commerce Committee, we were having a discussion on a golden eagles bill to protect the golden eagle in an effort to prevent its extinction.

There was some expression of opposition to that in certain southwestern parts of the United States, including a portion of the Senator's State of California. His opponents thought that the only way to kill the eagles was from planes. The situation was becoming pretty tense in committee, and there were some opposing witnesses. It was then that Senator Engle spoke up and said:

> When it comes to hunting eagles from planes, we have had some experience in my State with eliminating coyotes by hunting them from planes. When they ducked into the canyons and we ducked in and out of the canyons, pretty soon they were getting more of us than we were getting of them.

That was his light touch that he had then.

It is an illustration of how he would always rise to an occasion to help smooth the path of legislation in this body.

To see him and his charming wife together in his Senate years was to see a loving and devoted couple. Her fierce devotion to him in his fatal illness and her efforts to shield and protect him as his last great battle drew near won for him a host of new friends and strengthened the feeling of those who had known him for a long time. I miss him in the Senate as his deskmate, and in the Commerce Committee as a deskmate. He was not here for many years, but he certainly made his mark in the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, my life has been made richer for having known Clair Engle. Even before he came to this body, he was known as one of the most valued and effective Members of Congress. For a number of years, he served as chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. In his capacity as chairman of the committee, he set an example of what a committee chairman should be. He was considerate to junior members. He helped all members make an effective contribution. He considered the position of the Senate when bills originating in the House were amended in the Senate. Contrary to the attitude of some chairmen, Senator Engle would go out of his way to see to it that the Senate's position was considered in conference between House and Senate Members. He seemed to feel no resentment that the Senate should see fit to amend, and sometimes drastically amend, measures which had originated in his committee in the House.

As a Member of the Senate, he was known to us as a genial, friendly, personable, and effective legislator.

There were many things that Senators liked about him. He was forthright. He would tell Senators where he stood. He would not leave anyone in any doubt. He was truthful. He was a cohesive power in the Senate. There was nothing pontifical or self-righteous about him. He understood the needs of the Nation. He understood the needs of his State. He also understood politics.

He understood that there were times when Senators from other States could be expected to vote contrary to the position that he thought was correct.

Much of the public works legislation for better conservation and effective use of water bears his name.

California today is the most populous State, having become so during the period that Clair Engle served his Nation in Congress. Legislation that he sponsored as a Member of this body had much to do with California becoming the No. 1 State from a population standpoint.

He set a good example of what a Senator ought to be. His wife set a good example of what everyone would like to see a Senator's wife to be. She set a noble example of what we like a woman to be and of the kind of woman we like to think of as our mothers.

To his wife and to his millions of friends I wish to say: "Mrs. Long and I and all of Louisiana share your loss."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there has been so much said here today about Clair Engle, that I feel I can add very little to the tribute. Not enough could be said about Clair Engle, because all of us felt so keenly about him in our association with him. So many anecdotes could be recounted about what occurred over the years that I have been with him, that the memory of him would

fill books. It is pretty hard for me, as it is for the occupant of the chair [Mr. YOUNG of Ohio] and some other Senators to be objective about him. I know that history finally chooses a man in an objective way by what he does and what his accomplishments may be. However, for many of us who knew him it is pretty hard to be objective. He was not only a valued colleague of mine in the House and in the Senate, but he was also a true friend.

What has been said about him in his work in the development of the West, in connection with many pieces of legislation pertaining to the many things that now make the western part of our country a great place for people in which to live, because of men like Clair Engle, is correct.

However, all those things do not just happen, unless one has some vision and unless one has some feeling for the people. Clair Engle had both. He saw the West as it was and what it could be.

I suspect that the people of California were more fortunate at the period of time when he served in Congress, in having him in here than any other person I know, with due respect to all the representatives from California. This was a period of change. This was a period when we needed someone with courage and vision to take a look around and say, "We have to do something about our heritage, to strengthen the United States." Without him, I am sure my friend from California will agree, although many of these things would have been done ultimately, they would not have been done on time. Clair Engle saw to it that they were done on time.

This was a part of him. When he took hold of something, he was like a bulldog. I know that he would not mind my saying that sometimes I thought he was stubborn. However, even this made him a great legislator. This is what constituted his monument so far as the country and California and the West are concerned, and what makes that monument stand so high. He combined in him, as has been said by many Senators today, he had a great sense of humor. The Senator from Texas mentioned how Clair Engle relieved tensions in committee with a bit of whimsy now and then. He was often very valuable in that respect, particularly toward a chairman, when there are two sides to a controversy. I could remember many of the things that the Senator from Texas has referred to.

I wish I could remember many of the things he said. The Senator from Texas has related some of them. I suppose that if someone had written them down and put them into a book, the statements of Clair Engle would surely rival those of another great American, Will Rogers. Clair Engle always had an illustration that was homely and to the point, and one which contained enough humor to prove a point while at the same time relieving tension.

With all Senators, I mourn his passing. I do not suppose that he would wish us to mourn him, but we do, because he was the warm, friendly person whom we loved so well. We must mourn him not only for himself, but for the work that he did for our country.

I do not know whether in his last days Clair knew that the great bill providing for an intertie arrangement was signed by the President of the United States. He probably did. That was one of Clair Engle's great achievements.

He was one of the architects of what will be the biggest boon to the West in future generations and for all time.

Once he said to me, "You know, we politicians of today will be judged in the future by how we take care of the great heritage that God has given us, particularly in the West." He believed that.

Mr. President, not enough could be said about the service of Clair Engle to his country and to his fellow men.

There are many other aspects of his life of which I could speak. I speak briefly of the field of mining. I have attended mining congresses which Clair also attended. There are a great number of extremists in the mining field. Clair and I used to be called extremists on the gold question. There are extremists; everyone has an idea which he champions. At those congresses Clair had the faculty of being able to talk to miners. They were his own people; he knew them; he grew up with that type of person. He could bring the discussion to a level so that an objective could be reached in as commonsense a way as possible.

He had many other faculties that resulted from a life of public service. Clair spent his entire life in public service, and it covered many years.

I have never heard anyone, even his political enemies—and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] will bear me out—utter one breath of scandal involving Senator Engle in all the years he served the people of California in various capacities.

Yes, he was controversial because he stood for things and he believed in them. But all who opposed him respected Clair as an individual and his ability to judge and to think things through. Surely he always thought of the people whom he represented.

I mourn him. I need not tell Lu how Mrs. Magnuson and I feel about her bereavement. I need not put that on paper or even in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am sure she knows how we all feel.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, like several other Senators, I had the privilege of serving in the House and in the Senate during the long and distinguished career of the late Senator Clair Engle. While a Member of the House of Representatives, Clair represented a district in California that ran all the way from the Oregon line on the eastern side of California to the Mexican border. In that district were to be found most of the problems that one finds in the West. While he was a Member of the House of Representatives, Clair was probably one of the ablest advocates of the solution of western problems than anyone else who has ever served in that body. As a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, assigned to the subcommittee of the Interior Committee, I had the opportunity of working with him on the many projects in which he was interested and which concerned that section of the West that he represented so well.

In his later years of service in the House of Representatives he served as chairman of the Committee on the Interior. In that capacity he was the author of many bills that have meant so much to his area and to the entire West.

In all that he undertook in the House of Representatives and later in the Senate, there was evident a distinct and outstanding trait of courage. He was never afraid of anyone. He would fight his problem through to victory. If he did not win, those who participated in it knew that they had been in a fight.

After Clair Engle came to the Senate, it was then my privilege to serve with him on the Senate Committee on the Armed Services. There he plunged into all of the problems that we face in national defense. He did so with a wonderful understanding of the issues bearing on the security of our country. He made many, many contributions to the work of the committee during the period that he served.

Again he was courageous in everything that he undertook to do. As we all know, this trait of courage carried through to the last days of his life. There is not a man in this body who could not help but be affected by the way in which Clair Engle endeavored to carry on until his last day on earth.

So the Senate and the House of Representatives have lost one of their ablest servants. My wife and I extend to Clair Engle's wonderful wife Lu and his family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, no one who had the privilege of serving in this Senate of the United States with Clair Engle will ever forget our dynamic colleague.

There was a challenge to his very, every day, charge to his chair in this Chamber. No State ever cherished a more able and eloquent advocate of its interests—and our country and the world knew no man more knowledgeable of their problem: and perils.

He was tireless at every task and he never lost a fight until "finis" was written to the life of this lovable man.

How proud he was of his public service which began at the age of 23 as district attorney of his California county. How proud he was of service under the California Attorney General Earl Warren. And how proud his Golden State was of him.

His Washington days were crowded with California's concerns—and he never spared himself until nature called a halt.

Clair Engle never gave in. We cheered him when his indomitable spirit brought him back here—broken in health—but brave beyond belief. We prayed that he might be spared and restored to health and to our circle. But more than a lifetime's work had already been done by this patriot who lived and labored in the most critical half century of our country's history.

Clair Engle is an immortal part of that history. We are the better for having turned those pages with him—and America is the better for the soul and

service of a great American—dead all too soon.

To his loved ones goes our sincere sympathy. On this March day of 1965 our tribute may seem tardy—but it is indeed a timeless tribute in this Chamber where the memory of Clair Engle will be ever fresh—and always present.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I desire to be associated with those paying tribute to the late Senator Clair Engle, of California, with whom I served both in the House and in the Senate for many years. Clair Engle was a warm personal friend of mine, a most effective Member of the House, and a Senator steadily gaining in influence and prestige. His premature death came as a shock to us all and was a great loss to our Nation.

Clair Engle was a dedicated public servant with a zest for life and an abundance of energy and native ability. It is tragic indeed that one with such a brilliant future who loved life so much and served the public so well should be smitten at the heights of his career.

Mrs. Mundt joins me in extending to Mrs. Engle our sincerest sympathies and in paying tribute to a personal friend and a public servant who will be greatly missed by all of us.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the late Senator Clair Engle was a hard-working and valuable Member of Congress for more than 20 years, and if illness had not taken him from us in the prime of life he undoubtedly would have enjoyed the continued support of the people of California for many years to come.

I first knew him when we were both Members of the House. He began his career in that body in the fall of 1943, and I had a chance to observe his ability for about 3 years before I moved over to the Senate.

It was a source of satisfaction to me when the voters of California elected him to the Senate in 1958. He was still a comparatively young man, and continued to devote himself diligently to the problems that are paramount in the Far West.

Senator Engle also served with distinction on the Armed Services and Commerce Committees.

We all admired the courage he displayed in returning to his desk in this Chamber when important issues were up for decision, even though his physical condition made it difficult for him to do so.

I want to join today with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in letting Senator Engle's family know how much we here in the Senate thought of him.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, today we recall the sadness that afflicted us all when our good friend and colleague Clair Engle passed from the scene. I cannot forget the kindness and cordiality he extended me as a freshman Senator, even though I was of the opposite party and political disposition. I cannot forget his willingness to work with and cooperate with fellow westerners and southwesterners on matters that affected our section of the country. I cannot forget his warmth, his energy, his ability to contribute to a cheerful and friendly atmosphere which made more conducive the resolution of differences. His tenacity, his courage, his determination through months of pain and suffering should stand as an inspiration to us all.

How we miss Clair Engle.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, as this august body rises today in tribute to its trusted Member, wise statesman, and respected friend, Clair Engle, I am reminded once again of Robert Frost's cherished words:

> The woods are lovely, dark, and deep
> And I have miles to go before I sleep.

Mr. President, these words seem particularly appropriate on this occasion. Clair Engle was obviously a purposeful man and a dedicated public servant. He knew where he wanted to go and what he wanted to accomplish. Through law school, as district attorney of Tehama County, Calif., and later as a U.S. Senator, the goals Clair Engle pursued so untiringly were always those which were in the best interests of his State and the Nation.

His political philosophy was essentially one of optimism—he met opposition, from whatever source, with courage, and determination; he enjoyed victory with humility; and he accepted defeat with dignity. And when he became ill, we saw him, despite formidable handicaps, fight on with the same tenacity which had given his life meaning.

Mr. President, Clair Engle's friends and colleagues will remember him for having given this Nation his best and for having covered his last, longest mile with his eyes fixed firmly on the hopes and aspirations of the future. We can look forward to those who would follow in his footsteps.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a day of eulogy in the U.S. Senate is always a sad day for me. It is not a sadness in the sense of being depressed, but a sadness born out of memories of longtime associations cut short by the finality of death.

Today is such a day as we pause to pay tribute to a colleague with whom I had the privilege of serving on many committees and for whom I had the greatest personal admiration and respect. That respect and admiration for Clair Engle came from the recognition that he was a man of rare courage, sincerity, and dedication to principle. It came from a recognition that a devotion to his State and to its people was reflected in his every action, his every deed. It came from an awareness that Clair Engle was not a man who demanded respect, but that his dedication and sincerity commanded it.

Never was Clair's courage more apparent—and I am sure that each of us remember the occasion with great emotion—than on that day in 1964 when he was helped to the floor of the Senate to cast his vote on an issue of great human impact. That day will certainly be among those I remember most during my years in the Senate.

From the dramatic hush that fell over this Chamber when Clair's name was called for the vote, there came a faltering voice—but there was not a tear-filled heart on the floor of the Senate or in the galleries that doubted the voice came from a gallant and unfaltering spirit. It was this day, this occasion, my colleagues, that we should all remember as we reflect back on our association with Clair Engle. Such an example of courage and dedication could well become legend. And, of such legends other great deeds are born.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I want to join with my colleagues in the Senate in honoring and paying tribute to a great American—the late Senator from the State of California, the Honorable Clair Engle.

I had the privilege of serving with Clair Engle both here in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. He walked in the midst of his people—the champion of their cause, defender of their rights, servant to their needs. His greatest monument is the good works he performed during a lifetime of public service.

The courage of the man needed no testing but when struck by serious illness his every step and act from that time until his death was an act of courage. I shall never forget one incident. The Senate was in late session. We were nearing the end of the debate on the 1964 tax-cut bill. My amendment to encourage industry to install clean air and clean water facilities in their plants was scheduled for consideration that evening. As late as it was the Senator from California was in his chair waiting to help and lend his support to a cause he so long championed. The Senate adopted the amendment. I will never forget that one example of a man's devotion to that in which he believed and stood for. Clair Engle will be missed but the Nation and the world are better because of him.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the late Senator from California, Clair Engle, was a man of great strength of character and courage. Refusing to yield to the disabling effects of his tragic illness, he demonstrated to all of us in this Chamber the tremendous willpower which had served him so well throughout his entire political career. He began that career of service to the people of California modestly when he was chosen as a county district attorney in 1934, and culminated it with his election to the Senate of the United States in 1958.

During his 30 years, as a public servant, Clair Engle showed unwavering devotion both to his party and his country. But, his finest hours came in his darkest hours. Struck down by a disabling ailment in the prime of life, he carried on his work in the Senate with the able assistance of those who knew and loved him, until divine providence finally relieved him of his almost unbearable burden. Mr. President, Mrs. McClellan joins me in extending our sympathies to his devoted wife and their daughter, Yvonne.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I served in the House of Representatives for over 12 years with our late colleague from California, Clair Engle, and we came to the Senate together in 1959. In recent years we served together on the Senate Commerce Committee and the Select

Committee on Small Business. We also served as delegates to the Commonwealth Interparliamentary Conference at Canberra, Australia, in 1960, where I came to know him even better as a very warm, friendly, and human person. He carved a place in the history of his State and his country, and in the hearts of those of us who were privileged to know and work with him.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the untimely passing of Senator Clair Engle was for me the loss of an esteemed colleague and a dear friend. It was for California the loss of a capable and dedicated public servant. The Nation lost a great patriot.

My association with him was a rich and valuable experience. As I served with him on the Senate Armed Services Committee, I came to recognize his great drive and his interest in building the military strength of America. He was devoted to the philosophy and the causes he believed in, and he gave unsparingly of himself to attain his goals.

He was a man of great courage, a tireless worker, and a genial friend, who made many friends for his State, as well as for himself. He possessed the strong qualities of devotion to duty and constant awareness of the problems of the day. Many of the programs of the Department of the Interior are the result of his interest and influence.

A faithful public servant who fought valiantly for his causes and convictions, he devoted his energies and his ambitions to representing his State and his country in a superior manner. The spirit of this dedicated man will live in our hearts always, and our lives will be enriched because knew him.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in paying heartfelt tribute to the late, great Senator from California, Clair Engle. Those of us who served with him before his untimely passing last year, knew him for his many outstanding qualities—his remarkable energy, his legislative skills, his warm personality, his dedication to public service.

We were deeply saddened when he was struck down by his lengthy illness and by his enforced absence from the Senate. Yet, he rose above physical disability—literally from his sickbed—when vital issues were being decided in this Chamber. We who witnessed his courageous appearances on this floor to cast his votes under the most difficult and hazardous conditions will long remember and respect Clair Engle's indomitable spirit.

Although he devoted his energies and talents to legislative tasks in many areas, notably in the development of the vast natural resources of his great State of California and the western region of this Nation, I wish to pay tribute especially to his efforts in behalf of statehood for Hawaii. For a number of years, as a member of the House committee dealing with territorial matters and as its chairman for 4 years, prior to coming to the Senate, he was deeply involved in the question of statehood.

In the final push to pass the statehood bill in 1959, Senator Engle gave this vigorous statement in testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

> I am convinced without question that the Territory of Hawaii has long been ready for statehood and that we will be guilty of grave dereliction if we delay any longer to bring it about.

In the passing of Clair Engle, the Nation lost a most valuable member. Although only 52 at the time of his death, he had already amassed a vast amount of experience and background in his 30 years of public life—assets which would have continued to enrich this Senate if he had lived longer. The Senate is truly poorer for his passing.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, we pause today to honor the memory of the late Senator from California, whose untimely passing saddened his loved ones, many friends, and colleagues. The death of Senator Clair Engle was a great loss to this body, and especially was it felt by the citizens of the State of California whom he represented so long and so well in both the House of Representatives and here in this Chamber.

Those who knew and worked with him respected him for his wisdom, dedication to duty, and ability. The Nation and the State which Clair Engle served have lost a sincere, devoted, and valuable public servant, and his presence and the outstanding service which he rendered will be sorely missed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, with the untimely death of Senator Clair Engle, the citizens of California and the Nation have lost a responsible and effective public servant. Members of the Senate have lost a cherished and trusted friend.

The energy and courage of this man were an inspiration to all who worked with him in this body as he actively participated in the building of a better America. Clair Engle and I served together in the House of Representatives, and in the Senate we shared assignment as members of the Select Committee on Small Business and the Special Committee on Aging. I count it a privilege to have labored at his side during years of challenge and progress.

As a Senater from our most populous and one of our more prosperous States, Clair Engle was a participant in a process of growth and expansion which has materially affected the national economy, and hence, the lives of each of us. Through times of decision he was the forceful representative of, and eloquent spokesman for the interests of his friends and neighbors of the Pacific coast. He was knowledgeable in matters relating to the armed services of the United States, and was an experienced and informed counselor in aviation affairs.

Above all, Clair Engle was a dedicated and patriotic American—one whose talent and integrity were employed to enhance the lives of his fellow men and to insure that our way of life will endure for future generations. We meet today to express our sense of grief and loss at his passing, and to share heartfelt sympathies with his family and loved ones. Clair Engle will be remembered for his good works and his good life.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to join with the others in paying tribute to the late Senator Clair Engle, of the State of California.

We will always remember Clair Engle for the valiant and determined fight that he put up in the face of serious illness. His courage and his drive will forever be an encouragement to all who are faced with problems of health. Senator Engle appeared on this floor when no doubt it would have been wiser for him not to make the attempt. He was, however, striving to overcome a serious illness. He was making every effort to represent his State and to carry his part of the workload in this body. This was typical of Clair Engle. He was a well-prepared, thorough, and hard-working public servant. To serve was his determined course of action to the very end.

We will also remember Clair Engle for his contribution to the cause of conservation. During his service in the House of Representatives, as well as in the Senate, he held many important committee assignments. Included in his committee assignments was his service with great distinction as the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives. Senator Engle was an authority on water conservation. He knew his facts. He knew his law. His efforts were put forth for the lasting good of our country. Those of us who have been interested in the development of our water resources will forever be grateful to Clair Engle for his accomplishments in this field.

Clair Engle was a kindly and friendly man. He was a gentleman and a scholar. There are few people who are greater students of Shakespeare than was Clair Engle. This was one of his many accomplishments.

In paying my respects to the memory of Senator Clair Engle I want to embrace all the fine things that my colleagues have said about him today. I wish to extend to his dear ones my most sincere sympathy.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as we in the Senate pause this day in memory of a cherished colleague, one recalls the qualities of the man that endeared him to friend and foe. A competitor in the best American tradition, Senator Clair Engle lived with zest and gusto.

For 21 years he brought to the Nation's legislative chambers the indomitable spirit of the West and the forthright, colorful language that penetrated to the heart of the issues. I feel a deep sense of gratitude for having known Clair Engle.

An independent thinker, a fearless fighter, Clair Engle died as he lived, with gallantry and devotion to the cause of humankind. His summoning of strength and determination to come to these chambers by ambulance and wheelchair to lift his hand in favor of the civil rights bill last June was the mark of a man in whose character this Nation will long rejoice.

Some of the highlights in the life of Senator Clair Engle appeared in a moving article in the New York Herald Tribune at the time of his death. I ask

unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the New York Herald Tribune, July 31, 1964]

SENATOR CLAIR ENGLE OF CALIFORNIA DEAD OF BRAIN INJURY AT 52

(By John G. Rogers)

On April 13, only 3 months ago, Senator Clair Engle rose unsteadily from his seat in the U.S. Senate, helped to his feet by an aid. Leaning heavily against his desk, right arm in a black sling, the California Democrat struggled to summon up the few words needed to introduce a bill.

A painful silence prevailed as his colleagues watched Senator Engle—onetime cowboy, amateur boxer, and an active buzz saw of a man—fight against the partial paralysis that had gripped him since a brain operation 8 months earlier. After an agonizing moment, he could bring forth only one audible sound, but not a complete word.

A fellow Democrat, Senator PAT MCNAMARA, of Michigan, then introduced for him the bill to delay construction of a powerplant in a California earthquake zone. Senator Engle was virtually carried from the Chamber by two staff members.

Yesterday, at the age of 52, at his home in Washington, Senator Engle died in his sleep. He had been bedridden most of the time since a second brain operation 11 days after his brave attempt to introduce the bill in the Senate.

Despite this, he had answered the rollcall in June via ambulance and wheelchair to vote in favor of the civil rights bill.

A man of great determination and energy, a political campaigner who piloted his own plane to cover California's vast distances, Senator Engle insisted after his first brain operation that he would be a candidate for reelection this year.

Not until 5 days after his second operation did he make the final concession that his health simply was not up to it. He announced in a statement that he would not seek reelection, and added:

"I am now deep in another kind of battle."

Clair Engle was born in Bakersfield, Calif., on September 21, 1911, and grew up in Red Bluff in the northern part of the State where he learned to ride and rope a calf as a boy. In high school he was a basketball star and so rough a boxer that friends urged him to turn pro.

He received an appointment to West Point, but rejected it, turned to law and had his degree from the University of California at the age of 21. Returning to Red Bluff, he was elected Tehama County district attorney at 23, the youngest ever to hold such a post in California.

He became known as a tough prosecutor and a man pungent with words. "I'm sure goin' to throw a skunk into your henhouse," he'd snap at an opponent. Earl Warren, then California attorney general and now Chief Justice of the United States, asked Mr. Engle to handle a difficult case in an adjoining county. He accepted, got the conviction and a $2,000 bonus from the State legislature.

Mr. Engle used the money to finance a campaign for the State senate. After one term, he ran in 1943 for an expired term in the House of Representatives and was elected. He was reelected every 2 years from then on, usually winning both the Democratic and Republican primaries, until 1958, when he won his Senate seat.

A tobacco chewer since the days he campaigned among miners, Senator Engle had great zest for fighting politics. "Whenever I see three people together," he once said, "I adjust my tie and clear my throat."

He told an opponent, "You wouldn't know an irrigation ditch if you fell into it." In rodeo terms, he told an aid: "Son, come out of that chute with your spurs tied down, goin' for top money or dirt."

Senator Engle was a colonel in the Air Force Reserve.

Surviving are his wife, the former Lucretia Caldwell, of San Jose, Calif., and Yvonne Lorraine Engle Childs, a daughter by a previous marriage.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, it is a privilege to join with my colleagues in tribute to our late colleague and friend, Clair Engle, whose memory is still fresh and alive for us all.

He was a man of practical wisdom, and courage, and dedication to his fellow man, and all of us who knew him carry his spirit with us and draw strength from it.

His untimely death is mourned today, as it should be, but the character of his life and the stature of his accomplishments remain a source of courage and inspiration for us.

His passing has deprived a family of a husband and a father, and it has deprived California and our Nation of an able leader. But the memory of Clair Engle enriches the lives of us all who were fortunate enough to have known him and worked with him.

On this day, we mourn because of the unfulfilled destiny of a brilliant career, but we take heart at the quality of his achievements and public service.

I consider it an honor to have served in the U.S. Senate with Clair Engle, and to have been his friend.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I shared the universal feeling of sadness in the Senate when in the closing weeks of the last session of Congress, we received the news that the life of Senator Clair Engle had ebbed away. It is with an understanding of the great sense of loss on the part of the Members of this body that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to him. His qualities of determination and devotion to duty and to his home State of California were evident to me during the short time I was privileged to serve with him in this Chamber. But they were never so apparent nor impressive as when in his last days he insisted on leaving a sickbed and risking his life at every moment to come into this Chamber to cast his vote on issues of great importance to this Nation, and therefore, to him. His life's record shows him to have been a man of brilliance and many capabilities, demonstrated by a lifetime of public service. His energy and perseverance in the face of physical adversity could serve as a model to us all. I am sure that his State, and our Nation, and each of us are better for having known him. His family and his friends have my deep sympathy.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of the late Senator Clair Engle.

It was my privilege to know Clair Engle during his long and distinguished service in the House, where he established himself as an outstanding legislator. As chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, he left his mark on reclamation and conservation projects in all sections of our country, and particularly in his own State of California, where the Central Valley project and other reclamation and irrigation works will stand as lasting monuments to him. After his election to the Senate in 1958, he quickly established himself as an able representative of California and an effective member of the Armed Services Committees and the Commerce Committee.

The vigor and diligence of Clair Engle were an inspiration to all of us who served with him, both in the House and in the Senate. No Member of Congress ever worked harder or longer for his State and his country. He was an energetic crusader for the little men—workers and small businessmen. He was a strong supporter of an expanded Federal role in the field of education.

It is a tragic irony that one with such zeal and boundless energy should have been cruelly stricken with an illness which took its toll little by little, day by day. Yet, even in the tragic days which preceded his death, Clair Engle continued to fight for his convictions—as well as for his life. No man who served in the Senate during the 88th Congress will ever forget his courage in coming to the floor to cast his vote for cloture on the civil rights bill. This sacrifice made a lasting impression on proponents and opponents of that bill, alike. It was an act of physical courage which will live in American history.

Mr. President, it was an honor for me to serve in the Senate with Senator Clair Engle. We miss him.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, courage, good will and genuine ability are qualities rarely combined in the person of one man. To have known such a man is a rare privilege; to have worked as a colleague of such a man is an honor, indeed. Those of us who were so honored by Clair Engle feel a sense of loss which can never fully be assuaged.

Clair Engle was an outspoken man. He was a man of clear conviction who never feared to give voice to his conscience. He was a man of almost boundless energy who tirelessly channeled that energy to the service of his State and Nation.

Clair began his public career at the young age of 22. From that time forward he was never out of the service of the people. First as district attorney, then as California State senator, next as a U.S. Congressman for eight consecutive terms, and finally as a U.S. Senator he applied the same ideals of fairness and justness to all his endeavors.

None of us who served with him will forget the courageous way in which he fought his final battle. Although I came to know him only late in his career, my respect for him was great. So dedicated was he to his beliefs that he fought to see them prevail until the very end was near. We miss him. Mr. President, the country misses him.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I join in paying tribute to the memory of our late friend and colleague, Clair Engle. Even though many miles separated the States we served in the Senate, and although we did not vote alike

on many issues, I counted Clair Engle as a valued friend and an admired colleague. I had the pleasure of serving with the distinguished Senator from California on the Armed Services Committee and on the Commerce Committee. In working with him on these important committees, and on the Senate floor, I found Clair Engle to be an honorable and conscientious public servant, who faced the tasks confronting him with ability, vigor, and dedication. He had the respect and confidence of the people who honored him with a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives for so many years, and then in the U.S. Senate, until his untimely and tragic passing.

I know that the membership of this body will never forget the courage demonstrated by Clair Engle in fighting the ailment which finally took his life. They will not forget the strong sense of duty which prompted him to get out of his sickbed to be present and cast his vote in the Senate on an issue which was crucial to his convictions.

In the House of Representatives he was particularly noted for his distinguished service as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He gained wide respect and admiration in the House, just as he had attained in the Senate.

Clair Engle was held in high esteem by his colleagues in the House and Senate, not only because of the abilities he displayed, but also because he was such a warm and personable individual. He was never at a loss for a kind word or a lighthearted remark to suit the occasion. He was a person who tried to be helpful to everyone, both in his personal and business affairs.

Clair Engle will be greatly missed by his fellow colleagues in the Senate and by the people of the great State of California. I feel a deep personal loss in his passing, and extend my warm and sincere sympathy to his beloved wife, who was such an inspiration to him, and to the other members of his family.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the late Senator Clair Engle of California was an able, energetic individual whose passing was a great loss to this body and to his State and Nation as well.

He was kind. He was thoughtful. He was courageous. It was a privilege to know him and work with him. We miss his counsel. His memory will always remain with us.

Mrs. Boggs and I join in paying homage to the memory of this great Senator and extend our profound sympathies to his family.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to be among those in the Senate of the United States who today pay tribute to our late colleague, Clair Engle, of California.

It was my privilege to serve with him most closely on the Armed Services Committee. In that association I had the opportunity to learn at first hand of Senator Engle's fine patriotism and deep fidelity.

No one who saw his efforts here on the floor of the Senate could doubt his courage, and all of us who know him profited by his gentility and keen intellect.

Senator Engle spent most of his adult lifetime in the public service of his community, his State and his Nation. He was a man of outstanding capabilities.

His loss is felt deeply by the Senate, as I am sure it is by the State he represented, and as I know it is by all of us who knew and worked with him.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, it is not easy for any of us to talk about the loss of our colleague and friend, Clair Engle, even though he passed on some time ago. It is not easy, because we still cannot think about him without feeling that he should be here among us.

Clair Engle is the kind of man his friends will never forget. He was able, he was forceful, he was fair, and above all, he was gentle, friendly, and kind. I do not know of any person who had the privilege of knowing him who did not consider him a friend. He was the kind of man that people are compelled to like and admire regardless of political beliefs.

During the years we served together, I never had the privilege of serving on any committees with Senator Engle, but I came to know him through his work here in the Chamber and as a personal friend. In all the time I knew him, he was always friendly and cordial, and he always had a kind word and a smile for everyone, even in his final days. He had a way of making everybody around him feel good.

The history books will carry the story of the unselfish and constructive public service he gave to his country, but for those of us who knew him, this is just a part of the story of the man, and the qualities he possessed we will all remember all of our days.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I never had the privilege of serving with the late distinguished Senator from California in this body. However, I was honored to be one of his colleagues in the House of Representatives before he was elected to the Senate. I was also honored to be one of his contemporaries socially. I was the recipient of his friendship. Our wives are still friends.

The Congress and the Nation lost one of its great leaders with the passing of Clair Engle. His work in the field of reclamation and conservation while chairman of the Interior Committee of the House of Representatives as well as during his service in the Senate will serve forever as monuments to his memory. He will be missed by his generation but future generations will forever profit from his contributions to the progress of this Nation.

Mrs. Bass and I extend our sincere condolences to his lovely wife Lu and other members of his family.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in January, 1959, I came to the Senate along with an extraordinarily large group of new Members. Among them was the Honorable Clair Engle, of California.

Senator Engle and I subsequently served together at many committee meetings. We became social friends. We shared the daily experiences of both service and pleasantry.

Clair Engle was dedicated to his State and to his Nation. He was a man of talent and promise. He was a man of warm personality who worked hard, but who worked easily with others. He was, above all, a man.

This promise was cut off early in his career by untimely death. California, the Senate, and the United States of America are the poorer for having lost Clair Engle.

I am poorer for having lost a colleague who was a true friend.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Clair Engle, one of our dear friends and colleagues, has left us all a heritage of dedication, love for his home community, great patriotism, and a high order of ability. At a reverent memorial service like this one, we must speak in terms of personal experience. I was well acquainted with Clair's tremendous knowledge of military affairs and of public works development in the broad areas of his native State.

But personally, the happy memories of him that remain in my mind are his unique, original, and indeed joyous description of his 600-mile-long congressional district, and literally the adventures of campaigning it. Indeed, for him every single trip, even the one right after election, was a campaign trip because he could not hope to get to that town or hamlet again. As rich in stories as his love for cigars, Clair was a happy exponent of the Golden West. A second memory is of Clair rushing into the well of the Senate, chewing on his cigar, which constantly seemed to be slipping out of his mouth, and voting yea or nay with that crispness and decisiveness so typical of his character. He made one smile, for he saw himself, too, in the role of being overwhelmed with work and yet relishing every minute and standing off a bit to enjoy it and himself. Clair will always be in my memory as a happy part of the House and Senate, and this is probably the best heritage which any man can have of a friend and colleague.

Mrs. Javits and I extend most sincere condolences and sympathy to Mrs. Engle and the family.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I consider it an honor to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the man whose seat I am privileged to occupy in the U.S. Senate. This was a man who not only devotedly represented the people of our State of California with energy and capacity but who also did so with a grace and affability which earned for him a rare measure of affection as well as respect from those for whom he worked in this Chamber. It was this sincerity and personability which caused his loss to be so deeply and sorrowfully felt by the people of California. And it was because of this also that Clair Engle will always be remembered as a great spokesman for his State and for his Nation.

SENATOR ENGLE—MAGNIFICENT COURAGE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I am among the many who held Senator Clair Engle as a friend and a very knowledgeable and able legislator.

I remember with gratitude the friendly and helpful consideration he extended

to me when I was a new Member of the Senate, in 1961.

His friendship meant a great deal to me, as I am sure it did to all of us.

His magnificent courage in the last months of his tragic disability was in the finest tradition of the people of his great State and of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a number of our colleagues in the Senate who would like to have the opportunity to deliver addresses on the life, character, and public service of the late distinguished Senator Clair Engle are absent from the Senate today in performance of their duties. Every Senator should have the opportunity to express his thoughts and make memorial statements concerning the late Senator from the State of California. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that absent Senators be permitted to make memorial addresses and insert statements in the RECORD eulogizing the late Senator Clair Engle until March 15. Not enough can be said about the contributions the late Senator from California made to our country.

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

AUTHORITY FOR RECEIVING MESSAGES, FILING REPORTS, AND SIGNING ENROLLED BILLS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session until Thursday, March 4, 1965, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and the House of Representatives; that committees be authorized to file reports; and that the Vice President or President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my intention to move to adjourn the Senate until 11:30 a.m. Thursday next. The reason I desire the Senate to adjourn until 11:30 a.m. rather than the ordinary hour of 12 noon is to permit the recess of the Senate on that day from 12 noon until 1 o'clock to observe the exercises commemorating President Lincoln's second inauguration.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY AT 11:30 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Clair Engle, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11:30 a.m. on Thursday morning next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, March 4, 1965, at 11:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 1, 1965:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONER

John Williams Macy, Jr., of Connecticut, to be a Civil Service Commissioner for the term of 6 years expiring March 1, 1971. (Reappointment.)

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Armin H. Meyer, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

Dwight J. Porter, of Nebraska, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Lebanon.

THE JUDICIARY

Harold Leventhal, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. circuit judge for the District of Columbia circuit, vice Wilbur K. Miller, retired.

Howard F. Corcoran, of Maryland, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia, vice Charles F. McLaughlin, retired.

Edward Allen Tamm, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. circuit judge for the District of Columbia circuit, vice Walter M. Bastian, retiring.

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

William L. Taylor, of New York, to be staff director for the Commission on Civil Rights.

HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Michael Greenebaum, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1965, vice Joseph P. McMurray.

Michael Greenebaum, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the term of 4 years expiring June 30, 1969.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 1, 1965:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Luther L. Terry, of Alabama, to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for a term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., quoted these words of the psalmist: *Wait on the Lord; be of good courage, and He shall strengthen thy heart.*

Almighty God, as we wait on Thee in prayer, we feel that Thou art holding before us many high hopes and longings which must be enshrined and enthroned in the life of humanity.

Fortify us by Thy spirit against the moods of doubt and discouragement and may we be more dedicated and diligent in behalf of the kind of a life that is just and merciful and that seeks the welfare of the needy.

Inspire us with a new spirit of generosity and love that unites us in one great struggle to emancipate all mankind and help it to find and enjoy a free and fuller life.

Grant that the quality of the Master's life may be more clearly revealed in us and use us in leading the members of the human family to find the way to the more blessed and abundant life.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 25, 1965, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 45. An act to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. AIKEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 21. An act to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT PROPOSED FOR LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in the House a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State the power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the members of our State legislatures in accordance with law and with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Similar resolutions have been introduced in both the House and the Senate during this session.

A discharge petition has also been placed on the Speaker's desk on this issue, evidencing the much interest of the

Members of Congress, State legislatures, and others in this matter.

Many of our State legislatures are now in session working on reapportionment legislation.

Some 38 Members of the Senate have joined in cosponsoring similar legislation in the other body. Numerous State legislatures, including the General Assembly of Tennessee, have adopted resolutions memorializing Congress to act in this regard.

It is my feeling that a constitutional amendment which would invest in the people themselves the right to determine the makeup of their own State legislatures is needed and necessary in order that government by the consent of the people shall prevail.

I think this legislation is needed and that the House should promptly consider a proper amendment to the Constitution to be submitted to the States on reapportionment—and bicameral legislatures preserved on the basis and the pattern of the Federal Establishment.

REENACTMENT OF THE SECOND INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT LINCOLN ON EAST FRONT STEPS OF THE CAPITOL AT NOON ON THURSDAY

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to a resolution adopted in the 88th Congress, I take this opportunity to advise the Members of the House that the joint committee established under that resolution has completed arrangements to commemorate the second inauguration of Abraham Lincoln. There will be an authentic reenactment of the second inauguration of President Lincoln on the east front steps of the Capitol at noon on Thursday.

Mr. Speaker, the committee has secured the services gratis of the famous Broadway and movie producer, Dore Schary, to stage the reenactment. Arrangements have been made for the distinguished U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations and former Governor of Illinois, Adlai Stevenson, to narrate the reenactment. The famous actor, Robert Ryan, will play the role of Abraham Lincoln.

There will be a program including the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives [Mr. McCORMACK], and the famous historian, Bruce Catton.

Members may secure additional invitations by calling the office of the Doorkeeper. They may also secure tickets for the event. However, the reenactment ceremony is open to the public and no tickets will be required.

I hope that Members will participate in this important commemoration of the second inauguration of Abraham Lincoln, the theme of which was his famous and immortal words: "With malice toward none, and with charity toward all."

I do not know of a more fitting time in the history of our country than now to be reflecting back to those immortal words. I urge the Members to give their full participation and support to this program.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS AND RECREATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

MISSISSIPPI AND EQUAL RIGHTS

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday in Mississippi, U.S. District Judge Cox dismissed felony indictments against 17 defendants, who were accused in connection with the brutal slaying last summer of the 3 courageous young civil rights workers, including Sheriff Rainey and Deputy Sheriff Price of Neshoba County. In dismissing the indictment Judge Cox said:

> The indictment surely states a heinous crime against the State of Mississippi, but not a crime against the United States.

I urge the Department of Justice to appeal this case immediately, but more than that I urge the Department of Justice to review the adequacy of present laws to deal with police brutality.

I have introduced a bill called the Improvement of State and Local Justice Act—H.R. 5427—which would provide criminal and civil remedies for unlawful official violence. When I first proposed this bill on May 2, 1963, I said:

> Probably no civil rights issue is of more immediate concern to racial and ethnic minorities than the inequitable administration of justice. Police brutality is an old story to minority groups, but familiarity with the experience has made it no easier to bear. No reader of newspaper accounts of recent events in Mississippi will regard the problem as a thing of the past. Also, police power has been abused by refusal to protect members of minority groups from unlawful violence at the hands of private persons.

Two years later—and untold acts of violence under color of law later—that statement is still tragically true.

The acts for which the 17 defendants were indicted would violate at least four sections of H.R. 5427 which make it a Federal crime for anyone, acting under color of law to:

First. Subject any person to physical injury for an unlawful purpose.

Second. Subject any person to unnecessary force during the course of an arrest or while the person is being held in custody.

Third. Refuse to provide protection to any person from unlawful violence at the hands of private persons, knowing that such violence was planned or was then taking place.

Fourth. Aid or assist private persons in any way to carry out acts of unlawful violence.

In addition, the Improvement of State and Local Justice Act authorizes the Attorney General to institute proceedings for preventive relief against any individual who, under color of law, excludes any person or groups of persons from grand or petit jury service on account of their race, color, or national origin.

If justice is to prevail in the courtrooms of Mississippi, and similar jurisdictions, then discrimination in the selection of grand and petit jurors must cease.

All too often the abuse of police power with the concurrence of local juries has caused the legal system to be regarded with fear and cynicism.

Mr. Speaker, this kind of legislation is essential if the right of every individual to the equal protection of the law at every level—local, State, and Federal—is to be guaranteed.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S 2D INAUGURAL ADDRESS

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], in calling attention of the House to the ceremonies which will occur on Thursday noon on Capitol Plaza on the 100th anniversary of Lincoln's 2d inaugural.

The resolution to establish a joint House-Senate committee to commemorate this significant event was established at the initiative of a former Member of the House, the Honorable Fred Schwengel, of Iowa. Although the events of last November 3 retired him from this body, it did not mean any lessening of his interest in this particular project. He has continued to devote his full energies to making this ceremony the fitting event it should be.

I am sure that all Members have Lincoln clubs and Civil War groups in their district and they will want to know that the souvenir programs and souvenir tickets will become Lincoln items to be treasured in the years to come.

I therefore suggest the Members avail themselves of these items, which may be obtained at the Doorkeeper's office.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S 2D INAUGURAL

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday we will celebrate the 100th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's 2d inaugural.

This was a very historical occasion of course, but it was given lasting fame by his great address. That remarkable address, known for its famous phrase beginning, "With malice toward none, but with charity for all," summed up the civil war in concise, but above all in compassionate, terms.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, by act of this Congress Lincoln's second inaugural will be reenacted on Thursday. As a member of the joint committee planning this event, I want to reiterate to each Member of this body our cordial invitation to attend the ceremonies and participate in this historical event.

The famous film star, Robert Ryan, will play the role of Lincoln. Our Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, will narrate the reenactment. Dore Schary, the noted producer, writer, and director, will direct the scene, and also will produce a color film of the event for use throughout our Nation's schools.

We hope in this way not merely to call attention to the greatness of Lincoln, whose place in history certainly is secure; instead we hope to rekindle the magnificent vision which his words reveal and redirect our national purpose in line with his great goal.

I trust that a great number of the Members of this body as well as the members of their staffs will be present on this memorable occasion.

PEACE CORPS SCHOOL-TO-SCHOOL PROGRAM

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I want to add a word of commendation regarding the Peace Corps, and particularly to call attention to the Peace Corps school-to-school program.

Last week the director of this Peace Corps activity, Mr. Gene Bradley, received a special Freedom Leadership Award from the Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge, one of the highest awards granted this year.

Gene Bradley, as president of the Rosendale School PTA in Schenectady, N.Y., initiated the plan for the Rosendale PTA to provide funds for a schoolhouse in Casa Blanca, Colombia. With the cooperation of the Peace Corps and the support of its director, Sargent Shriver—but without any Federal financial support—the plan has gone forward.

The new schoolhouse in Colombia cost about $1,000 with most of the funds going for building materials. Local volunteer labor in Colombia was contributed for the actual construction of the school.

Following the initiation of the Rosendale PTA project, Mr. Bradley took a leave of absence from his post as editor of the General Electric Forum to head the school-to-school program within the Peace Corps.

It is the hope of the Peace Corps that under this program 3,000 schools may be built around the world within the next 3 years.

In addition to the promotion of greater international understanding, the program permits an active interest and benefit to our American citizens—particularly the young people—who share in the sponsorship of such school buildings.

In making its Leadership Award, the Freedom Foundation cited Mr. Bradley, in part, "for self-effacing effort that children everywhere might understand the principles of the free way of life, and find hope and personal dignity through education."

It is fitting on this fourth anniversary of the establishment of the Peace Corps to note the success and the promise of the school-to-school program, and to extend congratulations to the Peace Corps Director, Sargent Shriver, and to the director of the school-to-school program, Gene Bradley.

SARGENT SHRIVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to join other Members of the House in paying tribute to the Peace Corps. This project which began as an experiment in cooperation with other nations, on a people-to-people basis, has served as living evidence of America's desire to share the technological knowledge and modern-day skills which lead to economic and social progress. The Peace Corps has also served as an eminently successful ambassador of good will to the peoples of other lands. It has succeeded on a practical scale beyond our most hopeful expectations. Mr. Sargent Shriver, the Director of the Peace Corps, who was responsible for navigating the strange waters of this new undertaking, certainly is due much credit for its effectiveness. His administration has been exemplary not only in the history of foreign aid programs but in the history of Government administration itself.

President Johnson is to be commended upon having named Mr. Shriver to lead another new venture as Administrator of the Economic Opportunity Act designed to help Americans who up to now have been hemmed in by the barriers of poor and opportunity-shy environments and predict that Mr. Shriver will administer this new program with the same dynamism and proud results which have typified the Peace Corps during the past 4 years.

AMENDING INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK ACT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 45) to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PATMAN, MULTER, BARRETT, SULLIVAN, REUSS, ASHLEY, WIDNALL, FINO, and HALPERN.

SPECIAL DAY IN HONOR OF DR. ROBERT HUTCHINGS GODDARD

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 301) to promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in astronautics and related sciences through the designation of a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 301

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby finds that rapid advances and developments in the fields of astronautics and related sciences are having an increasing impact on the daily lives of the people, the national security, and long-range human progress. It is therefore desirable and appropriate that steps be taken to promote greater public knowledge of the progress and achievement being brought about in these fields, and for that purpose to provide for special recognition and honor to Doctor Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics, and to designate and set aside a special day to honor his memory and his accomplishments.

SEC. 2. (a) The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in the fields of astronautics and related sciences by providing for appropriate ceremonies, meetings, and other activities on March 16 of each year, a day to be known and celebrated as Goddard Day in honor of the epochal achievements in these fields by the late Doctor Robert Hutchings Goddard.

(b) The President is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government and

the public to participate in the ceremonies, meetings, and other activities held in observance of Goddard Day.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer several committee amendments, and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

On page 2, lines 6 through 8 strike the following: "promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in the fields of astronautics and related sciences by providing", and insert in lieu thereof the word "provide".

On page 2, line 10, strike the following: "of each year, a", and insert in lieu thereof ", 1965, said".

On page 2, line 14, strike the word "annually".

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I most earnestly urge this House to unanimously and immediately approve S. 301, as amended, because I very deeply believe it is one of the most meritorious legislative proposals ever presented to this House.

The summary purpose of this bill is to provide for the designation of March 16, 1965, as Goddard Day and to be known and celebrated as such in honor of the late Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rocketry.

At the early age of 17, Dr. Goddard had visions of an airship, rocket propelled, flying through space. With persevering faith and diligence, despite continued disappointments and even public ridicule, Dr. Goddard, in the town of Auburn, Mass., on March 16, 1926, successfully launched the first liquid-fuel rocket in world history. This first successful experiment formed the basis of the great U.S. developments in solid propellant rockets in the Second World War and it was the forerunner of continued and persistent research by Dr. Goddard leading to the advanced space age accomplishments we boast of today.

Dr. Goddard was the first modern man of science who recognized the potentiality of rockets and space flight and concentrated his energy upon the almost overwhelming task of nourishing them to practical fulfillment. Everyone in the world today acknowledges his work and his efforts in space flight experiment as among the most important technical accomplishments of our times marking as they do a turning point in the history of man.

Dr. Robert H. Goddard was born in my home city of Worcester, Mass., and was graduated from Worcester Polytechnic Institute there. This year, in the 100th anniversary of its existence, Worcester Polytechnic Institute is devoting a special program, on March 16, next, to commemorate the memory of Dr. Goddard.

Beyond other pertinent factors, it is most fitting that this House expedite approval of this bill today so that it may be finally enacted into law in time to be included as part of the special commemorative program being conducted on March 16, 1965, by Worcester Polytechnic Institute, the great educational institution that inspired and encouraged the scientific talents of a gifted young man whose achievements were destined to generate a whole new era and age of space exploration for a changed and hopefully better world to come.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE OF OBJECTORS, CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a statement on the rules of operations of the Consent Calendar members.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important procedures that the House follows in considering legislation is known as the Consent Calendar operation. It is under this procedure that most of the acts of Congress which become public laws are considered by the House of Representatives.

It has been the practice heretofore of the members of the Consent Calendar committees—the majority members and the minority members—to agree upon rules of procedure at the beginning of a session. I would suggest, to the new Members especially, that they read the statement, which has the approval of and bears the initials of all the members of the Consent Calendar committees, three members of the majority and three members of the minority.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT ON RULES OF OPERATION OF THE CONSENT CALENDAR MEMBERS

On February 3 and February 8, respectively, the majority and minority floor leaders appointed their respective personnel of the objectors committees, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. ALBERT, appointed three members of his party and the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, appointed three members of his party. The objectors committees are unofficial committees of the House of Representatives, existing at the request and at the pleasure of the respective floor leaders of the two parties who, in order to facilitate the proper screening of legislation which may be placed on the Consent Calendar, designate Members of each side of the aisle charged with the specific responsibility of seeing to it that legislation passing by such procedure is in the interest of good government. The rule which is applicable to Consent Calendar procedure is clause 4 of rule XIII, found in section 746 of the rules of the House of Representatives. The operation of such procedure is described in Cannon's Procedures in the House of Representatives.

For several sessions now objectors on both sides of the aisle have followed certain rules for consideration of Consent Calendar bills which they have made known to the Members at the beginning of a session. These rules are not publicized at this time to establish hard-and-fast procedures but rather to advise the Members of the House as to the manner in which the committee plans to operate throughout the 89th Congress.

The members of the committees feel that generally no legislation should pass by unanimous consent which involves an aggregate expenditure of more than $1 million; second, that no bill which changes national policy or international policy should be permitted to pass on the Consent Calendar but rather should be afforded the opportunity of open and extended debate; third, that any bill which appears on the Consent Calendar, even though it does not change national or international policy, or does not call for an expenditure of more than $1 million, should not be approved without the membership being fully informed of its contents, providing it is a measure that would apply to the districts of a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives, in which case the minimum amount of consideration that should be given such a bill would be clearance by the leadership of both parties being brought before the House on the Consent Calendar.

It has been the policy of the objectors on the Consent Calendar heretofore to put such a bill over without prejudice one or more times to give an opportunity to the Members to become fully informed as to the contents of such a bill, and the Consent Calendar objectors for the 89th Congress wish to follow like procedure; fourth, that if a bill has been placed on the Consent Calendar and the members of the committee having jurisdiction over the legislation show that it has not been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget, by the respective Departments affected by such legislation, or that such reports from the committee or from the Department show that the legislation is not in accord with the President's program, it should not pass on the Consent Calendar but that the chairman of the House committee having jurisdiction over the legislation should either call it up under suspension of the rules with the permission of the Speaker or should go to the Rules Committee for a rule for such legislation. While the members of the objectors' committees feel that a report from the Bureau of the Budget is necessary before a bill should be placed upon the Consent Calendar, they do not wish to take the position that the report from the Bureau of the Budget must necessarily show the approval of such legislation by the Bureau. However, if such approval is not shown, then in the consideration of the legislation, even if considered on the Consent Calendar, the chairman reporting the bill, or the sponsor of the bill, should be willing to accept the responsibility of stating to the Members the action of the Bureau of the Budget and the reasons for such action.

The members of the Consent Calendar objectors' committee also feel it fair to state to the membership that it is not their purpose to obstruct legislation or to object to bills or pass them over without prejudice because of any personal objection to said bill or bills by any one member or all of the members of the Consent Calendar objectors' committee, but rather that their real purpose, in addition to expediting legislation, is to protect the membership against having bills passed by unanimous consent which, in the opinion of the objectors, any Member of the House might have objection to.

The members of the Consent Calendar objectors committee earnestly request that the chairman of the standing committees of the House having the responsibility for bringing legislation before the House take into

consideration the contents of this statement before placing bills on the Consent Calendar. While it is not absolutely necessary that the sponsors of bills appearing on the Consent Calendar contact the various members of the Consent Calendar objectors committee, nevertheless, in the interest of saving time and avoiding the possibility of having bills laid over unnecessarily, it is good practice to do so; and the objectors welcome the continuance of the procedure of getting in touch with them at least 24 hours before the legislation is called up under the regular Consent Calendar procedure. In many instances such thoughtfulness on the part of the sponsors will clear away questions which the objectors have and consequently will make for the expeditious handling of legislation.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
JOHN J. MCFALL,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
Majority Objectors.
THOMAS M. PELLY,
DURWARD G. HALL,
ALBERT W. JOHNSON,
Minority Objectors.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day for the call of the Consent Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

MODIFYING THE FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT ON THE SCIOTO RIVER, OHIO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2208) to modify the flood control project on the Scioto River, Ohio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2208

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the flood control project for the Scioto River, Ohio, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962, is hereby modified to authorize the construction of the local protection works at Chillicothe, Ohio, at such time as the reservoirs on Alum, Mill, Big Darby, and Deer Creeks are under construction: *Provided,* That in the event the Mill Creek and Alum Creek Reservoirs are constructed by an agency other than the Federal Government, said agency shall furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that it will provide flood control storage in those reservoirs equivalent to that proposed for the Federal reservoir projects, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962, in accordance with the plan set forth in House Document No. 587, Eighty-seventh Congress: *And provided further,* That the Mill Creek and Alum Creek Reservoirs shall be operated for flood control in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MODIFYING THE FOUR RIVER BASINS PROJECT, FLORIDA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4606) to modify the flood control project for Four River Basins, Florida.

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

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I note that department reports are not printed in the committee report on this legislation. It has been stressed in previous Congresses, by both Democratic and Republican objectors, that the committee should have the department reports included in the committee report.

In this case, Mr. Speaker, the committee has stated that with similar legislation in the 88th Congress, the Department of the Army and the Bureau of the Budget had no objection to the legislation, so I am not going to ask that the bill be passed over, but I would like to point up the necessity for committee chairmen, when reporting bills, to include the department reports in the report on the bills.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I join with the gentleman from Washington in pointing out that there are no detailed reports from the departments with respect to this legislation.

I would further point out that last year, when this bill was before the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] and the gentleman from Iowa presently addressing the House made the point that there were no departmental reports.

Mr. Speaker, I simply cannot agree that bills on the Consent Calendar—or any other bills—should be considered in this session of the Congress without proper and detailed departmental reports.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I believe the gentleman will note from the report of the committee that the Department of the Army recommended enactment of a similar bill in the last session, with certain amendments, and those amendments have been incorporated in the bill now before the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of that. I have read the report and I am well aware of what the report says, and it does not conform to the accepted practice of having detailed reports from the departments.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I am opposed to this bill. It went through under unanimous consent last year. But I cannot stand by without protest to see this procedure started in this session of Congress.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will my friend from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. As I understand it, this is an identical bill to the one which passed in the House during the 88th Congress, and there has been no change in the position of the Department of the Army Engineers on this legislation.

I believe the history which has been made—that there has been no change—should satisfy my friend from Iowa.

I am in complete agreement with the position my friend takes, with the exception that this bill is similar to the one which passed in the 88th Congress, and there has been no objection from the department having jurisdiction.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman agree with me that the issue was made last year, that the absence of departmental reports was noted last year, and that there has been ample time, and more than ample time, for those interested in this legislation to produce departmental reports?

Mr. ASPINALL. I would agree with my colleague from Iowa, but I believe under the circumstances, with this admonition we are giving, there will not be any trespass upon this procedure in the future.

Mr. GROSS. And will the gentleman on the majority side and others on the panel on the Consent Calendar on the majority side join with me in this?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from Colorado now speaking is one of the originators of this idea that we should have departmental reports and in any other case, with this notice being given to our colleagues, I will certainly join with my friend.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Colorado is very persuasive, and with that assurance, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4606

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the flood control project for Four River Basins, Florida, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962, is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army to credit local interests against their required contribution to the remaining features of such project for any work done by such interests on the Lake Tarpon Basin feature of the project after July 1, 1963, if he approves such work as being in accordance with such project as authorized: *Provided,* That such credit shall not exceed the Federal share of this feature of the project, presently estimated at $1,255,300.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 25]

Andrews, Glenn	Dickinson	Grabowski
Bolling	Diggs	Griffin
Bonner	Dulski	Gurney
Celler	Findley	Hagen, Calif.
Cohelan	Fino	Halleck
Conyers	Fraser	Halpern
Derwinski	Frelinghuysen	Hanna
	Gonzalez	Hardy

Hays	Monagan	Stalbaum
Helstoski	Morton	Sullivan
Holland	O'Brien	Sweeney
Karsten	Olsen, Mont.	Teague, Tex.
Kastenmeier	Patman	Tuck
Kelly	Pickle	Tupper
King, N.Y.	Powell	Widnall
Kluczynski	Rivers, Alaska	Willis
Kornegay	Roosevelt	Wilson,
Long, Md.	Roudebush	Charles H.
Mailliard	Selden	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 377 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 249 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 249

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of any point of order, the text of the bill (H.R. 4466) as an amendment to the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of S. 3, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this rule calls for the consideration of the so-called Appalachian legislation. It provides for open rule and 4 hours debate.

I wish to commend the Committee on Public Works for the outstanding service they have rendered in presenting to the Congress this comprehensive legislation to further the development of the most economically stricken area in our Nation. The Appalachia area, if given the opportunity to develop its economy, has more natural resources and advantages through its potential industrial complex—minerals, forest, mines, agriculture, waterpower—than any similar area in our Nation. When this legislation is enacted into law, it will directly benefit the economic welfare of 15½ million people.

This legislation will combine the efforts of the Federal Government and the Governors and appointed commissions of their States to collectively aid and restore prosperity to millions of families in an area 10 times the size of Switzerland.

This bill has been brought about by reason of the joint effort of the Kennedy-Johnson administrations during the past several years. Many meetings have been held by representatives of the Federal Government and the various Appalachian States, before the completed study of the Appalachian Committee was submitted to the Congress for action.

The prime goal of the Appalachian program is that all public investments made in the region under this act shall be concentrated in areas where there is a significant potential for future growth, and where the expected return on public dollars invested will be greatest.

This legislation was enacted by the other body a few weeks ago by a majority of 2½ to 1. It covers parts of 10 States and the entire State of West Virginia.

ROADS AND HIGHWAYS

The major development of this legislation will be creating a system of main roads and highways, and also access lines of transportation for local residents as well as main highway transportation through the complete area. The heavy concentration on road construction in this bill is to accomplish not just the opening up of Appalachia to the rest of the Nation, but also to assure commuting to and from work for the local citizens. Some $840 million will be allotted for 2,300 miles of main highways and 1,000 miles of local access roads. States will contribute $360 million of this highway development.

EDUCATION

An extended program to expand vocational education will be placed in certain areas and locations because of high unemployment. Millions in this area have not had the opportunity to secure a basic educational training and also an opportunity to learn trade and craft skills, without which the unemployed are greatly handicapped to secure a job. There is heavy demand all over the country by industrialists, builders, businessmen, and contractors for trained workers. The vast percentage of unemployed today are citizens who never had an opportunity to learn a craft that demands skill and training. Since the end of World War II, technological advances in mining, heavy industry, and agriculture have contributed most to the unemployment problems which plague Appalachia today.

STATE CONTROL

One of the outstanding features of this legislation is that all projects under this bill will be in control of the Governors of the respective States or the various departments within the State government.

HEALTH

The hospital and medical services in our Nation have been a major factor in the progress we have enjoyed. Without said services, no community or subregion can hope to attract modern industry. In many sections of Appalachia, this problem of health is acute. The low income of these sections makes unavailable access to private medicine and the tax base to provide for public health facilities is nonexistent. From the health angle, this legislation will be a godsend to the people of these areas.

FORESTS AND COAL MINING

The hardwood forests of Appalachia were at one time counted among the Nation's most precious assets. House construction for generations had its primary lumber sources supplied from this area. It is estimated that 70 percent of the region's forest acres are held by individuals who possess 50 acres or less. Such small individual holdings make it almost impossible to improve the timber quality of the forests. The bill provides agreements to establish nonprofit timber development organizations, chartered under State law, which will permit a cooperative effort at better management. Five million dollars will be set aside for loans to timber development organizations to improve cutting and marketing of timber.

Special attention must be directed toward the unlimited bituminous coal deposits in this area. Coal is their largest single resource. Owing to a shrinking market and automation, mining operations have been curtailed and thousands have lost their jobs. The Federal and State Governments combined can greatly encourage the market for fuel and the expanded production of coal. Some $36 million will be authorized area restoration but the Federal Government cooperation will be limited to 75 percent of project costs.

LAND CONSERVATION

The bill authorizes $17 million in grants for soil conservation, erosion control, and land improvement purposes. Federal contribution limited to 80 percent and also a 50-acre limitation.

WATER RESOURCES AND SEWAGE TREATMENT

With proper control and management, Appalachia's water resources can become the region's most precious national asset, providing almost unlimited opportunities for recreational activities and incentives for industrial development.

Industrial waste treatment, through the lack of sewage treatment facilities, is a serious Appalachian problem and threatens the health of its people and discourages economic development. This bill provides that funds will be expended without regard to the national authorization ceiling or the allotment ceiling for each State contained in the Water Pollution Control Act.

URBAN PLANNING

This legislation will provide an urban planning program in order to assist State and local governments in solving their municipal problems resulting from the increasing concentration of population in metropolitan and other urban areas. This will include coordinating transportation systems and other related problems concerning urban growth. The bill provides for a termination of this legislation on July 1, 1971.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST OTHER AREAS

Opposition to this legislation was heard before the Rules Committee hearings that this legislation would discriminate against other areas of the Nation. We all remember during the first two terms of President Franklin Roosevelt the criticism that expenditures, to aid areas in expanding their economy and provide employment, would ruin our

Government's financial stability. Any program that expands industry and production and provides jobs also furnishes money and buying power for millions to keep the factories and mills working and to buy the farmer's products. The last 30 years have demonstrated that this expansion has contributed to our present prosperity. During the days of the depression in the early thirties, our gross national product was around $50 billion. Today, our national product or economy is around $620 billion and Secretary Dillon states that before the end of 1965 it will be $660 billion. After World War II, our national production was approximately only $211 billion. These facts alone should discount and refute all the arguments that have been heard on the floor of this House during the last 25 years in opposition to this type of legislation.

With restoring a prosperous economy to the 15-odd-million people in Appalachia it will help all industry and production located in all parts of our Nation.

It will expand the automobile industry. The increased purchase of cars in a prosperous Appalachia would expand the steel production in the Indiana Calumet region, Pittsburgh, Birmingham, Chicago, California, and other areas. Rubber and oil industry would feel the best expansion from a prosperous Appalachia. Refrigerators, farm machinery, tractors, wagons, clothing, building materials, food, and other of life's necessities would be in far greater demand and every town over the Nation would directly or indirectly enjoy the buying power of 15 million people in the Appalachian area.

I think it is time for all the members of this House to realize how important it is to expand the buying power of more millions of our citizens because that makes for more prosperity and it also calls for added millions of taxes into the Federal treasury.

This is an economic income producing and employment bill that will further contribute to the expansion of our economy and national production. This bill is a small blueprint of the legislation initiated in the middle thirties which eventually expanded our gross national product up to $625 billion in 25 years. Economy experts all agree that if this prosperity continues we will have a gross national product in 1977 of about $900 billion annually.

Our Nation learned an unforgettable lesson during the depression of 30 years ago. Our economy was ruined because millions of families were without buying power by reason of low wages and unemployment. This Appalachian legislation will eventually create production, employment, and buying power. It will bring added millions in taxes into the Federal treasury when Appalachia is restored. It will be a major program to make a reality of the economist's prediction of a gross national production of $900 billion in the next dozen years.

Members should remain on the floor and vote against any crippling amendments to this necessary economical legislation.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 249 provides for an open rule, with 4 hours of debate for the consideration of S. 3 which is entitled "Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965." The rule also makes in order as a substitute H.R. 4466, a bill entitled "The Resources Development Act of 1965" which was introduced by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER]. Incidentally, the word can be pronounced Appa-lay-chian, or Appa-latch-ian according to the dictionary.

S. 3 is an extensive, quite complicated, and controversial measure. I call your attention to the minority views starting on page 33 of the report which are signed by 9 members; to the additional views commencing on page 59 signed by 5 members; and to the additional views of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] on page 76.

S. 3 would establish a special massive Federal assistance program for the so-called Appalachian region which consists of 360 counties in 11 States. The 11 States are Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, and New York. The bill establishes an Appalachian Regional Commission, consisting of one representative from each of the 11 States, who will be the Governor or someone appointed by him, and a Federal representative who will be Cochairman. This Commission is authorized to develop plans and programs, and establish priorities for projects under the bill, and no Federal grant-in-aid or assistance program or project provided for in S. 3 can be implemented until plans therefor have been recommended by the Commission. Any decision made by the Commission requires the affirmative vote of a majority of the State members.

The major portion of the bill, which accounts for 77 percent of the funds authorized, is for the establishment of a new Appalachian development highway system, to consist of 2,350 miles, and the construction of an additional 1,000 miles of local access roads, for which $840 million is authorized to be appropriated to pay up to 70 percent of the cost of construction. An additional $252,400,000 would be authorized to be appropriated to defray the Federal costs for the first 2 years of other programs contained in the bill, which include the construction and operation of health facilities; a program for land stabilization, conservation and erosion control; technical assistance and loans for timber development organizations; the restoration and rehabilitation of mining areas and for a nationwide study relative to rehabilitation of strip and surface mining throughout the United States; a comprehensive water resources survey of the Appalachian region to be made by the Secretary of the Army; construction of vocational education facilities and sewage treatment works, a reenacted accelerated public works program for the Appalachian region alone, which would increase to 80 percent the Federal share of the cost of construction or equipment of facilities under all Federal-aid programs authorized by this bill, and such other programs provided for in existing law, except for the construction of highways, for which funds are available under the act authorized by such program; and, for certain administrative expenses and research and demonstration projects.

The total Federal funds authorized by the bill is $1,092,200,000; however, this amount will finance the program provided for in the legislation, other than highways, for only the first 2 years, and additional funds will have to be authorized in the future for the remaining 4 years of this 6-year program. The administration has been unable to estimate what the total cost of this program will be over the 6-year period; however, some have suggested that it may be as much as $4 billion.

Last year the other body passed a bill quite similar to the one under consideration here today. The House did not act. You may recall that during the campaign statements were made that this program would be one of the first orders of business this session. So, at least to some extent, we are being called upon to consider this measure because of administration campaign promises.

Every one of us sincerely hopes that no citizen will live in poverty, that every State will prosper, and that no areas will suffer if we can avoid it. But to select certain areas and attempt to lift them up whereby they will be on a par with other areas, simply by taxing and spending money from the other areas, seems to me to be an impossible thing to do.

In my opinion, this is a bad bill for the following reasons:

First. It would provide preferential treatment for one region of the United States, and thereby discriminate against all other areas of the Nation, some of which have equal or greater poverty, unemployment, and lack of economic development.

Second. There are no standards, based upon need, for determination of the eligibility of areas within Appalachia for which Federal assistance may be provided, and the bill provides assistance for prosperous as well as depressed counties. Seventy-six of the 360 counties do not qualify as eligible areas under the Area Redevelopment Act or the Public Works Acceleration Act.

Third. The Appalachian Regional Commission could be federally dominated by the Federal Cochairmen, whose vote on the Commission is equal to that of the 11 States, thereby giving him complete veto power over all programs and projects to be authorized by this bill. This places State and local officials in a subservient position to this Federal czar if they wish to get programs and projects approved.

Fourth. The highway program is particularly discriminatory against other parts of the country, for it authorizes an additional highway program for the Appalachian region alone, which is almost as large as the annual program for construction of Federal-aid primary and secondary highways and their urban extensions in all of the 50 States, in which regular program Appalachia already participates.

Fifth. It provides 80 percent Federal grants for land improvement, which would increase cropland and pastureland production, and promote uneconomic farm units, at a time when there is an overproduction of beef and crops in the country, and when the Government is paying farmers to take other and more productive land out of production.

Sixth. It reenacts the objectionable and ineffective Public Works Acceleration Act program, as applied to the Appalachian region, by increasing to 80 percent the Federal share of the cost of projects for which Federal grants-in-aid are provided for the construction or equipment of facilities under this bill and other existing Federal grants-in-aid programs, except for the construction of highways, which is even an increase over the 50- to 75-percent Federal share made available under the Public Works Acceleration Act.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, the rule will make it in order to substitute the language of H.R. 4466, the Resources Development Act of 1965, which is printed in the report of the Committee on Public Works on S. 3, commencing on page 60.

This substitute attempts to avoid the objectionable features of the Appalachian bill. It would extend Federal financial assistance to all areas throughout the United States which qualify as eligible areas under the Public Works Acceleration Act or the Area Redevelopment Act, and not just to a single project or to a prosperous advanced area.

It would authorize programs and projects to be initiated by State and local officials and to be administered by existing Federal officials, rather than creating a new Federal regional level of government that would have the ultimate control over programs and projects.

The substitute bill would authorize the appropriation of funds, with varying State matching requirements, for the period ending June 1967, for the following purposes and amounts of money:

	Millions
Economic development highways	$800
Demonstration health facilities	82
Timber development organizations	10
Mining area restoration	43
Water resource study	5
Vocational education facilities	32
Sewage treatment works	12
Grants for administrative expenses of local development districts and for research and development projects	11
Total	995

Mr. Speaker, if we embark on this new program for Appalachia, I wonder how long it will be before there will be similar programs requested for other so-called depressed areas, such as the Ozarks, or parts of the Northwest United States and other regions. We could eventually have several regional commissions operating in various parts of the United States, all in conflict and in duplication with existing Federal programs. How long will it then be until supply and demand, competition, and our free enterprise system will become things of the past? Certainly the nondepressed areas are having their tax problems today on a local, county, and State level. Are we going to eventually destroy them and have the entire United States turned into a depressed area?

I do not know the answer Mr. Speaker, but I am concerned over a program such as this. I think it is wrong. But if the majority so desires, it seems that the substitute, which is a proposed nationwide measure, treating labor and depressed areas alike, is preferable to the Appalachian bill.

I understand that some 18 amendments were offered in the committee, that none were accepted, and that S. 3 was practically "steamrolled" through. I assume many of these amendments will be offered here.

I know of no objection to the rule, Mr. Speaker, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, we have before us today on the floor of the House for consideration one of the most ill-conceived bills that has ever come before this body. The measure that is before us today was adopted in the Senate, sent over to the House, and after only 3 days of hearings in the Public Works Committee was reported out of that committee without the acceptance of a single amendment.

As a consequence, passage of this bill by this body will immediately send the legislation to the White House. It will not go to conference, and you will not have another opportunity to vote on this measure.

I want to confine my remarks today to two sections of the bill, section 202 in regard to health facilities, and section 203 in regard to land stabilization, conservation, and erosion control.

Section 202 in regard to health facilities, Mr. Speaker, sets up a 100-percent socialized medical program in the United States, notwithstanding the fact that the Committee on Ways and Means, the committee which is properly charged with jurisdiction in this field, has had extensive hearings on this subject and is currently in the process of marking up a bill.

Under the provisions of section 202, $41 million would be authorized to be appropriated for the construction of hospitals and health facilities, and $21 million would be authorized to be appropriated to take care of the operating expenses—bear that in mind, the cost of the operation of these hospitals.

What does this mean? I asked the chairman of the subcommittee in our hearings before the Rules Committee last week what "operation" meant. I said, "If some people came into one of these hospitals and they did not have sufficient funds to take care of their expenses, are they going to get free hospitalization, free doctor's care, free operations, free drugs, free medicine?"

Do you know what the reply was? "Yes, that is exactly what this bill would do."

Mr. Speaker, we are going all the way in this legislation. We are not going the limited way that the King-Anderson bill proposes, we are going all the way down the road to 100-percent socialized medicine in section 202 of this bill. This section should be deleted before final passage.

Let me talk to you about section 203. This is the part of the bill that has been changed somewhat, but only in a minor way, from the legislation that was before us last year passed by the Senate but on which no action was taken by this body. This was H.R. 11946 which was considered in the 88th Congress.

Let me read to you one or two lines from section 203 in the bill that we considered last year:

> Conveyance to any landowner under this section shall not exceed 80 per centum of the cost of improving or developing twenty-five acres of pasture land owned by said landowner.

Let me read to you the bill under consideration, S. 3. This is on page 18, line 20:

> *Provided,* That grants hereunder shall not exceed 80 per centum of the cost of carrying out such land uses and conservation treatment on fifty acres of land occupied by such owner, operator, or occupier.

What have they done? They have doubled the amount of land which can be assisted under this program up to 80 percent of the cost. In the bill last year, the benefits were to accrue only to the owner, but this year that has been enlarged also. In addition to the owner, the operator or the occupier of the land may qualify for this 80 percent grant.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I am sorry, I do not have much time left.

Mr. COOLEY. I just want to ask, What is an "occupier"?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I do not know. We would call him a renter out in our country in Nebraska; but that is the language of the bill, "owner, operator, or occupier." So you can see the terms of this section of the bill have been greatly broadened.

There was a great deal of talk last year that this particular section of the bill, and it is so stated in the report, was going to lead to the introduction of a cattle industry in the Appalachian region; in fact, it was hoped and predicted that eventually a million head of cattle would be brought into this area. Now we have had a change in the wording of the bill this year. We have had some changes in the wording of the report accompanying the bill. We have been assured by some of the members of the Public Works Committee that we need have no fear in this regard. Let me read from this report. This is on page 14:

> If the land of the Appalachian region is to play a role in the improvement of the economic level of the area, the acreage which currently is submarginal must be provided with a productive vegetative cover and other treatment measures in order to check its deterioration.

On page 15 of the report, it is stated:

> The problem in Appalachia is fundamentally one of erosion of the hillsides. Such practices as terracing, upstream tanks, flood-control ponds, and the planting of leguminous crops can be of great long-range benefit.

I checked the definition "leguminous crops" and this it what it says in the dictionary:

Any plant of the family leguminiosae especially one used for feed, food, or soil improving crops.

Feed is used by livestock, by animals. Page 15 specifically says they are going to cover this area that has been denuded with protective cover. This is alfafa, clover, and other grasses in that same category. It is only used for one purpose, to graze livestock, cattle. We have had a doubling of the number of acres in this bill over the bill we had last year, from 25 to 50 acres. The report on the bill last year stated that they are hoping to bring in a million head of cattle into the Appalachian region and to build up a cattle industry. They have doubled the acreage. Perhaps they hope to bring in 2 million cattle in the coming years under this program.

We have a very serious situation in the livestock industry today. We not only have overproduction, but we have tremendous imports of meat and beef from foreign countries that have drastically depressed the price of beef and cattle in our American market, and our cattlemen are faced with disastrous losses. Yet here we are to the tune of a $17 million subsidy going to set up a livestock industry in the Appalachian region under the terms of section 203 in competition with our ranchers and our feeders in private enterprise who are operating on their own funds under the American free enterprise system.

This is wrong, Mr. Speaker. I hope this section is taken out of the bill, and if that is not possible, I hope an amendment is adopted to prohibit specifically the use of any of this grassland that is planted under this program from being grazed by livestock, so that we need have absolutely no fear of any competition from the Appalachia region.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND].

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state at the outset of my remarks that the rule which has been granted for the consideration of the Appalachia bill is quite fair. I would also like to say that the majority of the public works ad hoc special committee that considered this legislation was also extremely fair in treating the minority and differing opinions on this legislation.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I cannot say that this legislative proposal itself is fair. I wish to speak on several points by which I will underscore the essential unfairness of this act.

THE NAME OF THE GAME IS PREFERENTIAL

First of all, Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary to state the fact that this is unfair legislation from my lips. I would like to quote you from the record of our hearings on page 42, Mr. Sweeney, Chairman of the Federal Development Planning Committee for Appalachia:

The name of the Appalachian game is preferential treatment.

In black and white the administration's witness has etched the hallmark of this legislation.

What this legislation does is to favor large areas over the small, the big over the small. This has been a regrettable trend in government today which I view with great alarm.

I wonder how many people in this House realize that one-half of the TVA service area is in Appalachia and that one-third of the Appalachia area is in TVA area. I wonder how many people really realize that this bill which is being offered to help the poor and the needy, includes the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., the favored town of Huntsville, Ala., the richest area of Alabama, and the Spartanburg area of South Carolina. Indeed, the wealthiest county of that fair State is located in Appalachia.

LEGISLATION IS UNFAIR

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is unfair. For the first time this House is authorizing the building of national highways on a sectional and discriminatory basis.

Many of you in this House have received letters from people in rural areas protesting the administration's cutting of soil conservation funds. The soil conservation program is designed to help small farmers in small areas. At the same time the administration is cutting soil conservation funds nationally, it is pouring an almost equal amount of money into Appalachia, to beef up soil conservation programs there.

This bill on its face is meant to help small rural communities. But read the transcript of the testimony. The administration openly admits there is no help for the small "ribbon" towns, as they call them in the valleys of Appalachia. The whole theory of the bill is to build up only those wealthy areas where in the terms of the bill there is a significant potential for future growth. In other words, this bill deliberately is encouraging the prosperous areas of Appalachia to become more prosperous.

JOB PIRACY AND INDUSTRIAL PIRACY

This is the essential unfairness of this legislation—by building up these centers of prosperity in Appalachia they help to lure into the Appalachian area more jobs and more industries, and this is why, in my additional views I call this an act of piracy. This is an act of job piracy. It is an act of industrial piracy, because the industries that are lured into the Appalachia area will have to come from someplace, and they are going to come from Indiana, and New Jersey, and New York, and they are going to come from New England; they have to come from somewhere.

The whole purpose of the Appalachia bill is to build the roads, to build the hospitals, to build the sewerage plants, to build the airports, to build the vocational schools, to build the libraries, to develop timber resources, to develop watershed resources, and to develop soil conservation, all with up to 80 percent of Federal money. Thus the area will be so attractive that no industry can refuse a bid to come there. This is why it is an act of job piracy, an act of industrial piracy. This is why the bill is essentially unfair to those States and communities who also need new industry, but whose own tax dollars are thus financing their competition.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in development of the Appalachian region.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 3, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] will be recognized for 2 hours, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] will be recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], the chairman of the committee.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I recommend immediate passage of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. I do so without reservation and with deep conviction—conviction that we all have a great stake in the provisions and purposes of this piece of legislation. For while geographically the Appalachian region may be far removed from many of our districts, economically its problems and, more important, its possibilities, are very close to us all.

For example, the great State of Hawaii is some 5,000 miles from Appalachia. Yet both of that State's Senators, representing different political parties, supported and voted for this bill in the Public Works Committee and on the floor of the Senate. What they saw was that the development of this strategically located region is of great economic importance to the whole country.

Basically, the problem in Appalachia is income level. The per capita income there is some 39 percent below the national average. If Appalachians had the same buying power as the average American, there are few industries in few districts that would not benefit. The 16 million Appalachians could buy more new cars from Detroit, more produce from our farm States, more clothes from the textile industry, and, of course, more products from every State.

But it is not only as a market that Appalachia has potential. For the people and the land there are capable of much industry: the kind of industry best suited to the growth potential of all the parts of the region. As a producer of jobs, products and income, Appalachia has several natural advantages. One of the most important of these is its central location. Appalachia lies between the Boston-Norfolk on the East and the lower Great Lakes population centers on the West. By 1980 these two areas will have a combined population of some 67 million—67 million who will want to tour through the scenic beauty of Appalachia, who will buy Appalachian products, and who will supply Appalachian needs.

But before all this will be possible, much has to be done. The legislation before you now will enable Appalachia to do it. I emphasize the fact that Appalachia will do the job, for this program is not one of support, but one of development. Certainly the resources of the Federal Government are being made available, but in close conjunction with State and local resources. For I believe that the most impressive thing about this program is not the money that will be spent, but the effort that will be organized—on all levels of government.

We have had evidence of this in the two-session history of this legislation. We have heard testimony from more than a dozen departments and agencies of the Federal Government and from the Governors of the 11 Appalachian States. The fact that the program was first requested by the States themselves, and is tailored to their needs, rights, and responsibilities augers well for its success.

Now I am fully aware that sometime during the course of the debate on this bill, someone will say "the Appalachian program discriminates against other regions." If discrimination is defined as helping one region so that all regions will benefit, then this program discriminates. My own district is not in Appalachia, but I know that the port and and city of Baltimore will benefit in many ways from an economically active Appalachia.

If conditions in Appalachia are holding down the level of our overall prosperity—and they are—employment, income, and retail sales there are all substantially below the national average—then I do not believe it is discriminatory to take measures that will eliminate such conditions. It is apparent that one way to develop our economy so that it will realize its greatest potential is to develop the lagging economy of Appalachia. In that pursuit Baltimore or New York, Los Angeles, Kansas City, Miami, Detroit, or Seattle all have a significant interest.

I know I speak for many when I say that this program is governmentally proper and progressive and economically sound and essential. There have been some questions asked and objections raised to the provisions of this bill. In its 2-year trip in Congress, all of these have been answered, met and, in many cases, incorporated into the legislation before you now.

It is the consensus of those who proposed, those who drafted, and those who will carry out this program, that it is the best possible answer for the problems and prospects of the Appalachian region.

I specifically invite your attention to those provisions of the bill which fully preserve and utilize the roles, rights, and responsibilities of the States. No project may be initiated in a State without its specific approval. Only the State's representative on the proposed Commission may recommend a project for that State. There is no giving up of State's prerogative to the Federal bureaucracy—indeed, the Appalachian Regional Commission itself is composed of State representatives who will have an equal voice with the Federal Cochairman.

As for the Federal Government, this program requires no new agency or vast bureaucracy to administer it—only a small staff to coordinate the efforts of existing programs and agencies.

And the dollars to be spent? I would characterize them as not massive but modest—and repayable many times over by way of the benefits that will flow from an economically healthy Appalachia.

I believe most of you are familiar with the essential elements of the program embodied in this legislation. I would only stress that in the field of human resources, there is no overlap with the efforts of the Office of Economic Opportunity. The money originally scheduled for this section has been deleted from the bill before you now and has since been made part of the President's war on poverty.

In conclusion, I would like to commend the Governors of the Appalachian States for their initiative and great contributions to this program. I would also commend the President's Appalachian Regional Commission and Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., for the tireless effort they have put into the research on, analysis of, and answers to, the problems of Appalachia.

I think it was Benjamin Franklin who once said that "there is nothing so uncommon as commonsense." That is a charge too often made against the Government, but I would emphatically say that this program for Appalachia is the commonsense of economic development. It is the intelligent use of the best that Government can offer to answer the needs of the people it serves. In Appalachia it will mean that a proud and determined people can be a contribution to prosperity and no longer an example of poverty. For I believe that the program in the bill before you now gives Appalachia what it needs most—a future and not just more of the present.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, when the House approves S. 3, a 5-year effort will be completed. This bill had its beginning in 1960 when the first meeting of the conference of Appalachian Governors was called together by Governor Tawes, of Maryland.

The conference of Appalachian Governors studied the problems of the Appalachian region for a period of 3 years—they then requested the help of the Federal Government to complete the work.

In April of 1963, President Kennedy created the President's Appalachian Regional Commission and directed it to report back to him with a program of action to meet the needs of the people of Appalachia.

One year later the Commission presented its report to President Lyndon B. Johnson. President Johnson's response was immediate. He submitted to the Congress the bill which is now before us, with minor changes worked by the Senate.

This bill is one of the most carefully drawn and well thought out pieces of legislation that I have seen.

It is not a pie-in-the-sky measure.

It is not the product of dreamers, but the product of men and women who have looked carefully at the difficulties this region has faced for more than a century. It contains hard practical solutions to these difficulties.

The Appalachian region stretches from the New York border down through and past the great steel city of Birmingham in my own State of Alabama.

The most striking feature—and the root cause of its more severe problems—is one of the oldest mountain ranges in the world—the Appalachian chain. Beneath those mountains lies some of the richest coal deposits of the world. These deposits have provided this country with more than half of its coal needs.

On the surface of those mountains once stood one of the world's greatest prime hardwood forests. That forest was stripped away to provide the housing and the railroad ties and the mine timbers which have contributed so much to the growth of this Nation.

And on these once heavily forested slopes, one of the highest average rainfalls in the country is deposited.

Scattered among the hollows and the valleys of this mountain range there are more than 16 million people.

Some of them live in the great cities of the region. But most of them live in what the President's Appalachian Regional Commission described as "ribbon towns."

The majority of the Appalachian are classified as rural, yet they do not farm. They are strung out in clusters of population trying the very best way they know how to support themselves and their families.

Because of these 16 million people, an independent people, Appalachia must be looked on as a land of promise—just as this great Nation of ours has always been regarded.

All that is needed to realize the kind of assistance that will enable the Appalachian themselves to solve their own problems.

That is what this bill is intended to provide—a minimum base of assistance upon which the Appalachians can build their own economy and standards of living.

Here are the highlights of this bill. The great mountain chain has been a barrier to commerce and prosperity since the Nation was founded. The settlers who moved west skirted the chain

at the top and bottom or slipped through the mountain gaps to the more fertile land of the West. The first major item in the Appalachian bill is the program of highway construction to overcome the isolation which the mountains have created.

We are asking for an authorization to construct 2,340 miles of major arterial roads to open up regions that now have no access. We also are asking for the construction of 1,000 miles of access roads to link up specific locations with the major highways.

One of the most serious problems which faces the region is its lack of adequate health facilities.

These facilities are needed to attract industry and tourist investment and they are just as important as the highways.

This bill provides a series of construction grants for regional health centers, each of which will serve a cluster of counties. We have also provided funds to meet the deficit in operating costs in the first years of operation of these centers.

The steep slopes of the Appalachian mountains put useful land at a premium. This bill contains three major programs to insure that every square foot of useful land is developed to its fullest potential.

First, we have provided a series of grants to control erosion and promote soil conservation. A landowner may obtain up to 80 percent of the cost of the conservation practices that are essential to restore up to 50 acres of his land, so that it can be used properly.

Second, a series of grants and loans are provided for small landowners to improve their timber stands.

Third, we have drafted a comprehensive program that will assist in restoring land that has been damaged by past mine practices.

Under this program, the voids left by underground mining can be filled in. Underground fires can be extinguished. The refuse piles from past mining can be removed. There are also funds to begin a program of restoring publicly owned lands that have been damaged by past strip mining.

To develop the best possible program for exploiting the heavy annual rainfall in the region, this program authorizes a comprehensive study to be coordinated by the Secretary of the Army with the assistance of all Federal, State, and local agencies.

In the past, most Appalachians have earned their income from three major activities—coal mining, lumbering, and farming. Each of these occupations has declined over the past quarter of a century. Each has declined nationally, but the effects in Appalachia have been particularly severe. That means that new skills must be provided and for that reason we have included in this bill a program that will accelerate the construction of vocational education facilities in Appalachia.

The great rivers and streams of this region offer a great attraction to industry and tourism. In order to provide for a better quality of water in these streams and rivers, we have provided funds to accelerate and expand the construction of waste treatment plants in Appalachia.

One of the most severe problems in the region is the low tax base in the majority of Appalachian States and communities. This low tax base creates several problems.

First, it prevents the Appalachians from providing for themselves an adequate level of public facilities and public services.

Second, it lessens their ability to take advantage of existing Federal grant-in-aid programs designed to provide those public facilities and services.

The Hill-Burton program of hospital construction is not utilized fully in the region because local matching funds are not available.

Airport construction has been retarded because the States or communities cannot match the program of the Federal Aviation Agency. The same is true in federally assisted programs for colleges and junior college construction, small watershed protection, sewage treatment facilities construction, vocational education school construction, educational television station construction, and other similar Federal grant-in-aid programs.

This bill establishes a fund which can be used to raise the total Federal contribution, within any of these construction and equipment programs, to 80 percent of the cost of the project.

The Appalachian people have taken many steps to raise their own standard of living. But because they do not have the financial means—they cannot obtain for themselves the skilled advice and counsel so necessary in modern America.

This bill provides a series of grants which will enable local communities to hire development specialists to guide them in their own bootstrap efforts. Grants are also provided to undertake economic development research to obtain better answers to the problems facing each section of Appalachia.

Finally, this bill creates an Appalachian Regional Commission. The Commission is charged with the planning and coordination of this new investment program. It will be composed of representatives of the 11 Appalachian States and one Federal member who will speak for the entire Federal Government.

In order to take action the votes of a majority of the State members and the vote of the Federal member are required. Thus the States cannot be imposed upon by the Federal Government. The Federal Government cannot be imposed upon by the States. A mutual purpose—a mutually satisfactory program—is essential.

All projects and proposals for the expenditure of funds under this program must originate with the States. No project and no program can be implemented in a State unless that State approves. In short, Mr. Chairman, this new Commission represents one of the strongest programs I have ever seen in the field of State-Federal relations.

It is a States rights program—it is even more a States responsibilities program. It represents a wise attempt to restore the vitality of our Federal system of Government. I believe it creates the kind of partnership between the States and the Federal Government which we have always sought but have never quite established.

In explaining the highlights of a bill as comprehensive as this, it is easy to lose sight of the major objective. I have always believed that politics and government can only have one objective. I believe that objective can be simply stated. We hold public office to insure that people have the means, the tools, the instruments, which will enable them to develop their full potential and to live a life of dignity.

I believe that this bill does that and only that. It is not a handout. It is rather a hand held out. It offers encouragement and promise. It is a hand which I believe will be grasped by the people of this region and in so grasping they will be able to pull themselves up a life of dignity and self-respect.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman and congratulate him on his very lucid statement on this bill. I also commend him on the fine job he has done in bringing this bill to the floor of the House today. The gentleman, of course, for many years has been a constructive and outstanding member of the great Committee on Public Works. This bill which he is managing today is evidence of the character and quality of his service.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am very pleased that the majority leader has made the remarks he has made about the outstanding legislative job that has been done in connection with this program by the gentleman from Alabama who is in the well of the House today. The hearings which were conducted on this particular program were hearings that lasted late into the day. The sessions that were conducted to mark up this bill were long and the discussions were often complicated. The feelings of the committee members in connection with this bill were very strong on a number of points in connection with it. The gentleman from Alabama did an outstanding job as the chairman of the subcommittee which handled this legislation. He demonstrated great tact, great understanding, and great firmness throughout the hearings and during the markup of the bill. Every citizen of the Appalachian region owes a great debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] for the statesmanlike job he has done in connection with this legislation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman is very kind. I would like to say that all the members of the committee were attentive and they worked as carefully as they could, both on the Democratic and the Republican side of the committee. It was a refreshing experience to me to serve as chairman of a subcommittee which has such devoted, understanding, and dedicated people in

the consideration of this major piece of legislation.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLORY. I am not familiar with the gentleman's chairmanship of the subcommittee which held hearings on this particular piece of legislation, but I do know intimately of the gentleman's chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations. I know of the gentleman's thorough investigation of the subject of water pollution and the subject of our water resources not only in the area of Appalachia but throughout the Nation.

I am particularly interested in the presentation that was made on the subject of the abandoned mines in this area. I do know the gentleman's concern about the problem of pollution as a result of acid mine drainage. I was wondering whether a program for combating or reducing acid mine drainage in this area is provided in this legislation. It is my understanding that most of the acid mine drainage pollution, at least the most serious conditions are in the area now covered by this legislation. I would like to know whether or not this legislation provides a program dealing with this problem.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. As the gentleman from Illinois well knows, we had information from the Department of the Interior last year to the effect that they had under study at that time the problem of acid mine drainage, particularly in West Virginia and Pennsylvania. That study will be extended under the terms of this bill. The conclusions of the Department of the Interior have not been formulated as of this moment. That is our information at least.

Mr. McCLORY. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has consumed 21 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, this bill was before the House Committee on Public Works last year. It went from the Committee on Public Works to the House Committee on Rules last year and after rather exhaustive hearings before the Committee on Rules last year, it was not acted upon by the Committee on Rules. This year, of course, it is again before the House.

In my opinion, the bill which has come before the House is a basically discriminatory bill.

I would like to use this map to show why. This map shows in the dark green areas, the areas that qualify under the Area Revelopment Act, section 5(a) for special financial relief under the area redevelopment bill. Those are the dark areas. You will see many of them in northern Michigan and northern Wisconsin and up in northern Idaho and northern Washington and in the lumber regions of California and other areas.

This map also shows, in the lighter green, the areas which qualify under the Area Redevelopment Act for special financial assistance for agricultural areas when their average income is not as high as it otherwise should be.

Members will see these lighter green areas in a large part of the State of Mississippi, a considerable part of the State of Texas, a large part of the State of Oklahoma and other States, as well as a great part of New Mexico and Arizona and many other areas, such as the northern part of Michigan. Those qualify under this particular section.

The third area on the map is shown in yellow, or perhaps orange would be a more appropriate description. These are the areas which qualify under the Accelerated Public Works Act for special financial assistance.

I might say that the Accelerated Public Works Act by its formula includes in its coverage all those areas which fall under the ARA bill plus additional areas which have what is termed excess or surplus unemployment. So the areas in gold or in yellow are those beyond the scope of the ARA bill that were also covered by the public works acceleration bill. Therefore, we find a considerable number in New England and a considerable number scattered through California. I might say there are none in my district, but some in other parts of California. There are a number in Oregon, Wyoming, and elsewhere, and a number all through the Southern States.

In my opinion, the discrimination in this particular bill is that this bill, the Appalachia bill, states that the only area under the bill which is entitled to the relief described in the bill is the specifically defined area defined as "Appalachia," with all the counties that fall within that defined area, no matter what may be their own individual qualities from the standpoint of surplus unemployment.

As it happens, therefore, an area which has just as high a degree of unemployment in northern Michigan or in northern Wisconsin or in the State of Washington or in the lumber region of the State of California, or perhaps even a higher degree of unemployment, cannot qualify for the various special benefit programs which the areas within the defined area of Appalachia can qualify for.

But there is an even worse problem of discrimination involved in this bill. It is not only true that areas with equal unemployment outside of Appalachia cannot qualify for the same benefits the areas in Appalachia can qualify for, if they have similar unemployment, but also there are today more than 70 counties in Appalachia which do not qualify under any of those programs—the ARA programs, either section 5a or section 5b, or the accelerated public works program.

If Members have copies of the committee report which we put out on the Appalachia bill, they will find on page 57 a list of the counties which do not qualify under any of these programs as counties that would qualify under ARA or APW; and they, in the last tabulation, February 10, 1965, total 76 in number out of 360 counties within the defined definition of Appalachia.

Let me tell Members what those 76 counties nevertheless can do. Those 76 counties are in themselves not depressed. In themselves they do not meet the test of ARA. In themselves they do not meet the test of accelerated APW. Those 76 counties in themselves are not depressed and, I might say, included in those 76 counties is the county in South Carolina which has the highest per capita income in the State, the county in Alabama which has the highest per capita income in the State, counties in Tennessee which the Governor of Tennessee before our committee last year acknowledged were not depressed, counties in Virginia which the official representative of the State of Virginia before our committee last year testified were not depressed—in fact, he said that some of them had practically the lowest rate of unemployment in the United States. Those 76 counties which do not have surplus unemployment and are not depressed nevertheless under the terms of the bill can qualify for all these special benefit programs, extra funds, and other items.

Let me say that all of these counties can qualify anyway under the antipoverty bill and all of these counties can qualify under the vocational education bill and all of these counties can qualify anyway under the manpower retraining bill. But these 76 counties which are in themselves not depressed, besides qualifying under all of those programs, can come in and get a second layer of benefits. They can get additional library aid, additional airport aid, and additional aid for construction of sewers that your counties cannot get if you happen to come from States outside of Appalachia, even though your counties may be depressed and therefore appear as a green-colored or gold-colored county on this map.

This is rank discrimination to me to say that a county which has a deep green category, with excess unemployment, or a deep gold category, with excess unemployment, located in upper Michigan or upper Minnesota or in Wyoming or in Oregon or Washington or the lumber region of California, has to pay special additional taxes in order to make it possible for 76 counties within the defined definition of Appalachia to get this special aid even though these 76 counties themselves are not depressed and do not meet the test of a depressed area. It is discrimination to give them a second separate layer of assistance which they are not rightfully entitled and should not receive. In my opinion, this is rank discrimination, and I do not think it should occur.

Mr. Chairman, I offered an amendment in the committee to restrict the application of this bill only to those counties in Appalachia which met the test under the APW bill of depressed counties, because if this bill is designed to meet the need of depressed counties, it seems to me it should be a rifle approach and be concentrated on counties that actually have some depression in them and have some excess unemployment in them. I offered an amendment in the subcommittee and in the full committee to limit the

application of this bill to those counties which met that test. That amendment was defeated both in the subcommittee and in the full committee, although by a narrow vote. However, in my opinion, this is the only proper amendment which will make this bill even barely palatable to those who feel there is some justification for a regional approach. I might say there is a serious doubt in my mind as to whether such a regional approach should be used. I think it is much fairer to use the approach that will be offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] in the form of a substitute which will make all counties in the United States which qualify under the ARA or the APW equally eligible for equivalent aid for the needs they must meet.

I might say that I cannot conceive of this House in good conscience allowing this bill to go through this House and forcing counties in other parts of the United States, which themselves are extremely depressed and have surplus unemployment, to pay additional taxes in order to pay for excess benefits for counties in another area although some of these counties have the highest per capita income in some of the States of our Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas. [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the Committee this afternoon that the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] who just spoke is suggesting that APW and ARA should be put into this bill. I am wondering if this is what he really meant and whether or not if an APW bill came before the Congress or another ARA bill came before the Congress he would support it.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman's question if my amendment is adopted which limits aid to the Appalachian region and only to those counties that meet the test of APW, I shall vote for the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Will the gentleman vote for an APW bill as such?

Mr. BALDWIN. I have just answered the gentleman's question.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, your Committee on Public Works last year and this year devoted a total of 32 separate sessions to the consideration, drafting, and perfecting of this bill that we have before us today. It has not been hastily devised nor quickly considered. It is, of course, one of the important legislative recommendations of our President. In the bill as it appears before us today are contained a number of amendments and suggestions which arose from the minority side during our consideration of this bill in the Public Works Committee last year. Contained also in the bill is a considerable amount of language suggested by the Governor of Pennsylvania, Mr. Scranton. It is in that sense a bipartisan product of the efforts of the President, the Governors of the Appalachian region, the Members of the other body, and of the Public Works Committee of this House.

I think a reference to the map which was cited in the speech just concluded by the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] will furnish any Member of this House quick and visible proof that this mountainous region known as Appalachia, stretching diagonally across the better part of 11 States, is unquestionably the largest and the longest lived depressed area anywhere in the United States. Family income within the Appalachian region lags fully 35 percent behind family income in the rest of the country. Unemployment in the Appalachian region is some 3 percentage points higher than it is for the rest of the country, and in certain sectors of the rural interior of Appalachia unemployment is reaching toward 10 percent.

Due to the rapid deterioration and decline of coal, timber, and marginal farm operations, the three pillars upon which the economy of this region was historically based, the people living in the Appalachian area have not shared in the prosperity and the progress which have been the lot of the rest of us in the 1960's.

Due to the rugged terrain and the inaccessibility of the vast rural interior of this region, industry has been discouraged from providing the wellsprings of development from which a new prosperity could flow.

Surely this generous and humanitarian nation of ours, which has given so unstintingly of our resources and of our substance to aid the underdeveloped areas overseas and throughout the world, will not now turn its back upon this vast underdeveloped area within our own borders. Charity, we are told, begins at home, though it need not necessarily end there. Yet certainly our primary responsibility is to those pockets of general need in our own country.

Much has been said today by the opponents of this measure to the effect that the bill provides a discriminatory favoritism for one region of the country. The implication is thus left that the bill is somehow unfair to the rest of the country. It must be admitted that it is a regional concept.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing new about that. From the very beginning of our Republic, it has been the policy of our Government to approach the problems of those less-favored, less-privileged regions of the Nation with strictly regional solutions. As early as 1785, just a very few years after the inception of the Republic, in the passage of the Northwest Land Ordinance, the citizens who lived along the relatively more prosperous and more developed eastern seaboard were asked to share of their bounty with those who lived north and west of the Ohio River.

Mr. Chairman, today there is not a single State in this Union which has not been to one extent or another the beneficiary of some essentially regional program of the Federal Government.

I would remind those of our colleagues who live in the 17 Western States that the reclamation program on which we have spent nearly $5 billion is essentially a regional program. It applies only to those Western States, and they are the primary beneficiaries of its works.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. WRIGHT. I would be happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. As the gentleman knows, under the reclamation program the users of the water have to pay back the amount of the investment over a 50-year period. If you offer such an amendment to this bill that the users of the area pay back the cost of the proposed program, it would be comparable to the reclamation program.

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not want to get into a long colloquy concerning comparabilities with the reclamation program, except this: It is a regional program available to only a limited area of the country and financed by taxes from the entire Nation. Water users are privileged to repay Government loans over a 50-year amortization period with no interest charges. Surely this is a subsidy and a substantial benefit. That does not necessarily mean that it is bad.

Mr. Chairman, I support the reclamation program. I think it is a good program. I believe it has paid for itself. I believe all of these regional programs have paid for themselves. There are many, many regional programs which I could cite, and I say that these highways and roads in Appalachia are going to pay for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, about 84 percent of the moneys provided in this bill are devoted to highways. The way to assist an area which has a natural problem of mountainous terrain preventing the accessibility of commerce and industry to its interior is through highways, just as the way to assist an arid section which needs water resource development is in the development of its water resources. The West was retarded in its economic development through lack of usable water; Appalachia is retarded through lack of roads and communications. And so in this sense we seek to do through this bill much the same as reclamation has done for the West—to open it up for industry and commerce.

Our history is replete with regional programs.

The St. Lawrence Seaway was a regional program. The Cross-Florida Barge Canal was a regional program. The Gulf Intracoastal Waterway was a regional program. The money spent on the Mississippi River represented a regional program, as all water resource development programs have been regional or local programs in their initial application.

Mr. Chairman, when he was a young Congressman from Illinois in 1848, Abraham Lincoln pointed out on the floor of the House that because these so-called regional programs do contribute to the economic development of the various regions of our country, ultimately they can be demonstrably proven to serve the economic development of the Nation as a

whole. Mr. Lincoln pointed out that because of a canal in Illinois, the sugar merchant in New Orleans was able "to sell his sugar a little dearer" and the housewife in New York "to sugar her coffee a little cheaper."

I believe it is just as true today as it was then. Many programs are essentially regional programs; yet each of them has strengthened the Nation. The Tennessee Valley Authority is strictly a regional program. The Great Plains Conservation Act is purely regional in scope.

Members of Congress from Appalachia have voted for the crop support programs, notwithstanding the fact that 91 percent of the money provided in the tobacco subsidy goes to only six States, notwithstanding the fact that 70 percent of the money provided in the wheat subsidy program, for which this Congress in a recent 4-year period appropriated more than $7 billion, has gone to nine States.

Mr. Chairman, were those Members of Congress from Appalachia to have taken a closeminded, narrow parochial attitude and said they were not going to vote for anything that does not directly benefit their own area, they would have voted against those programs.

I would remind my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. BALDWIN] who just preceded me that his State and mine, between them, consume something like almost one-half of the total Federal defense procurement dollars. In total dollar volume, of course, this means a great deal more than any of these other matters of which we have spoken. Yet, Members of Congress from the Appalachian region have voted for the Federal defense procurement program, notwithstanding that fact. And so, if we look at it from a long-range historical perspective, we come inescapably to the conclusion that this bill is not favoritism to this region.

Mr. Chairman, here is a region which contains 8½ percent of the population of the country, and it has received only 4.9 percent of the Federal tax expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I was pointing out that Appalachia contains 8½ percent of the population of the country. Yet is has received only 4.9 percent of the Federal tax revenues of the country.

So, when we look at it from that standpoint we cannot view this program as favoritism in the sense of some privilege they are entitled to, but rather as a redress of an historic imbalance or historic injustice.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma who has contributed so significantly to the committee consideration of this bill.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding because I wanted to compliment him not only upon the wonderful speech he is making which I think has caught the spirit of this program, but also upon the contribution he made in the committee to the passage of this legislation, because I think the record will show that in most of the committee sessions which were held, and whenever the gentleman from Alabama was temporarily involved in legislative activity which prevented him from presiding, the gentleman from Texas took over the gavel and did a fine job of chairing the meetings of the committee, and advancing the bill to final consideration. With his discussion of the various regional bills and the action which the Government has taken in the past on the basic problems of a region, he has highlighted the essential equity of this program as well as it would be possible for anyone I know of to outline.

The gentleman from California, in raising the point that in reclamation programs the users of water paid back the full sum that the Government invested in the program, skips over the whole thrust of the reclamation program. The gentleman from California knows, as well as all Members who have served during the period we have had the reclamation law on the statute books, that the users of the water will pay back only the percentage which is allocated to the provision of irrigation water, and that the portion which has gone into the construction of these reservoirs for flood control purposes or for the purpose of hydroelectric power is not paid back by your irrigation users at all. As a matter of fact, these big dams which have made possible our reclamation program in the West and which most of the gentlemen enthusiastically supported have been in very large measure the largess of the rest of the country to make possible the development of very important water resources of the West. While your irrigator has undoubtedly helped to make possible the overall program, there is a very large part to which the taxpayers back in the Appalachian region have been contributing through the years.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman, both for his very considerate remarks and for his further clarification of the reclamation benefits.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I would suggest to the gentleman from California that if he wants to get into a further discussion of reclamation he may wish to do it in his own time, since I have only a short while remaining.

I have one other illustration which goes to the whole concept of whether this is favoritism or not:

Last year this Congress passed a bill for the express purpose of assisting our fellow citizens in the State of Alaska to rehabilitate themselves from the ravages of a sudden natural disaster. Here we are asking that we assist the citizens of the Appalachian region to rehabilitate themselves from the ravages of a chronic, historic disaster. The conditions are in many ways the same. This is not a handout, this is not leaf-raking or make-work or anything of that sort. It does not aim at providing a job on the Federal payroll for the people of Appalachia. On the contrary, it is long range in its outlook and in its benefits. It attempts to provide only the basic infrastructure necessary to create a climate and an atmosphere conducive to economic growth. It relies upon the private sector with only sufficient stimulation to generate economic growth which alone can provide the dynamics that will bring this region into the full-fledged technologies of the 20th century.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SECREST. I might point out that in the area I represent several hundred million dollars of coal has been mined. The owners of these mines lived in Cleveland and other cities. The profits all went out. Our wealth has been used to enrich the rest of the United States. We are only asking that you help us to build back the area that has now been depleted of its natural resources, a thing upon which we had to depend entirely.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman for his timely contribution. I will now be glad to yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me.

The gentleman from Oklahoma made a point about the reclamation projects, in which he stated that part of the money must be repaid. Then he said that any additional benefits, for instance, the whole question of flood control, was not repaid. Of course this is true. But may I say while it is true on a countrywide basis, and all of the dams of the Tennessee Valley Authority have taken advantage of the flood control provision of our laws so that they may be built to preserve flood control protection and to prevent flooding below. The reclamation dams have taken advantage of that provision, just as all other areas of the country have done.

Mr. WRIGHT. I quite agree with the gentleman from California, just as I also agree with the gentleman from Oklahoma. I think the entire Nation benefits when any area is strengthened. But the point I was attempting to make is that the reclamation program is confined to 17 Western States and therefore is a regional program. I was not assailing the program. I think it has had great benefits for the Nation, just as other projects have had. The development of forest roads and trails, similarly, have benefited the entire country. Yet each of these programs is essentially a regional program, and there is no getting around it. Even crop support programs are regional, because they apply and limit their application to those areas which have an established history of growing certain crops, but they benefit the entire Nation, just as this will benefit the entire Nation.

We are not attempting to give Appalachia a handout but rather to give them a hand up. We are not attempting to assault just the symptoms of the disease but rather to go to the roots of the disease itself and let them rehabilitate their

own economy. The people of Appalachia are ready to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps, but they just do not have the bootstraps. The purpose of this bill is to provide for them the bootstraps—the roads and hospitals and vocational schools—which have been so helpful to the rest of the Nation in enjoying the prosperity of the 20th century.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND].

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I should like to compliment my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Texas. He became very persuasive in his remarks trying to convince this committee that this legislation is not unduly and unfairly helping a certain region. I became even more convinced of the fact that it must be as I heard him invoke the history of our country and the broad sweep of his knowledge of the history of our country. Indeed his remarks were persuasive. But nobody can deny that this legislation is highly discriminatory, highly unfair. Hear again the testimony of the person who it is understood will operate this act as the single Federal Commissioner:

On page 42 of the hearings Mr. SWEENEY stated:

> I think we ought to speak frankly. The name of the Appalachian game is preferential treatment.

The programs that the gentleman from Texas thought up to implore the House to think big are not in point. He spoke of the tobacco program, but every place that grows tobacco participates in the benefits of that program.

Consider the wheat program. Every place that grows wheat gets the benefits of the wheat program.

But not so the Appalachia program. You have rural poverty and disadvantaged pockets that have not shared in the national progress of the last 50 years, but they are not confined to Appalachia as defined in this bill.

As I pointed out in my own additional views in the report on this bill, when I heard witnesses speak about the plight of some of these sections of Appalachia, I could have been right back in parts of New Hampshire. The Appalachian Mountains are in New Hampshire—the valleys are just as deep and the hills, in fact, are a lot more beautiful and a lot higher. We have problems with timber development; problems with access roads and the cost of constructing them; problems in financing local sewage-treatment works; problems in financing health facilities; and problems involving proper use of water resources. We have unemployment problems which require vocational educational institutions for solution.

We have problems of out-migration, and we have the problems of distances from commercial industrial markets.

That part of Appalachia was left out unfairly is a matter of record. In the Senate the unfairness became so aggravated that the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], succeeded in adding 13 counties to Appalachia. He succeeded. But we now find that the 13 counties that he added were relatively prosperous counties. As a result, there will be an amendment before this committee to add counties in New York that are really part of Appalachia and are really in need of this treatment.

These are but surface indicia that show how completely unfair and narrow and discriminatory this legislation is.

The gentleman from Texas has missed this point or rather the point has hit home and he is desperately trying to avoid it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] kept speaking of the mountainous region as a requisite for this program. Am I seeing things on that map? Am I seeing the application of this program to the Rio Grande down in Texas—that low land down there?

Mr. CLEVELAND. No, I think this map that was offered in evidence by the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] shows the depressed areas as defined by the ARA and the Accelerated Public Works Act throughout the entire country.

Mr. GROSS. It has nothing whatever to do with Texas; is that right?

Mr. CLEVELAND. No, this map shows all the areas that are considered areas of high unemployment and as being depressed areas under the definition by the ARA and the APWP.

Mr. GROSS. This proposed program does not pertain to any part of Texas?

Mr. CLEVELAND. It pertains only to the Appalachian area which I am indicating with my hand—parts of Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and all of West Virginia. The gentleman would be interested to know that one of the parts of Alabama is the Huntsville area where they had more than a billion dollars of Government contracts a year ago. It also includes the Spartanburg area of South Carolina and the wealthiest county of South Carolina. I am sure the gentleman from Iowa will also be interested to know that it includes the impoverished little town of Pittsburgh and its Golden Triangle that the industrial revolution has apparently passed by. And we could go on and on. Indeed, there are 76 counties in the Appalachia region, the gentleman from Iowa I am sure would be interested to know, that are wealthy counties and do not even qualify under the ARA or the accelerated public works program.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I would not want to hear that Texas is involved in this because the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] just said that California and Texas are splitting up 50 percent of the defense procurement contracts. I would not think that Texas would have the nerve to come in on any part of the Appalachia program or any other poverty program.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I thank the gentleman. I hope the gentleman recalls that Texas also benefits from the beef import quotas which raise prices of meat in New England to consumers, from the residual oil quotas which raise the price of fuel in New England, and from the depletion allowance which permit large oil companies to pay practically no income taxes, not even to help Appalachia. But, as I have said, this is a day when you have to be big and think big to do business with big government.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I hate to disabuse the mind of my distinguished colleague from Iowa. Largely, the eastern tier of counties in Texas, which are the ARA and APW counties, will soon, I am sure, be joining the counties in Louisiana, Mississippi, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and a few other States, in what has already been described and apparently been committed as the next region to come before this body for money and programs, the Ozark region.

As a matter of fact, it was interesting to note the article in the Sunday Star for February 28, 1965. They have "cranked up" so far that the AFL–CIO is already talking about it. This is going to be the new demand.

This is what the article says:

> The AFL–CIO executive council warned yesterday that the Nation's booming economy threatens to lose its steam this year unless Congress acts swiftly.

As an aside, we have already provided for spending about $11 billion acting swiftly in the past 6 years.

> The council also recommended a series of special programs to develop depressed areas such as—

I might add, not exclusive of—

> the Appalachia States, the Upper Great Lakes areas and Ozarks. Only the Appalachian program is currently underway.

It has been estimated, in the testimony before the committee, by a witness—Mr. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., who is staff engineer and staff counsel for the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, which testimony appears on page 217 of the hearings—that there would be between $5 and $10 billion cost for these regional programs. The cost of Appalachia alone has been estimated by witnesses to be about $4 billion.

I believe it should be understood that this is only the beginning of a series. The gentleman from Iowa should fully recognize that. This is the beginning of a series of regional approaches, segmenting the United States, dividing America into regions, setting up supergovernments, giving the Federal representative veto power over any and all programs and projects. The final cost of these programs, it is estimated in the testimony, could be as high as $10 billion. Is that not correct?

Mr. CLEVELAND. There is testimony in the record to support the gentleman's statement.

Mr. CRAMER. I should like to ask the gentleman a further question, with respect to the discrimination. I believe this might be a good place to set the argument at rest at this time.

The argument is made, with respect to discrimination, that other communities

will indirectly benefit. The direct benefit will be to Appalachia, and there will be indirect benefits elsewhere, it is said.

Why not give a direct benefit to the rest of the Nation, where the communities, as are evidenced on the map in green and gold, have an equal need?

Mr. CLEVELAND. The answer to the question is, That if we are to have a truly fair national program all areas which suffer similar economic blight and disadvantage, such as suffered in parts of the Appalachian area, should share equally and fairly our national wealth to remedy the situation.

This is my understanding of what the gentleman's bill and the bill introduced by myself and other Members on our side, the Resources Development Act of 1965, will do. This is one reason why I support it, and for other reasons set forth in the record in our report on that legislation.

Mr. CRAMER. A second point has been made in answer to the charge of discrimination, which is obvious and cannot be refuted. The map speaks for itself.

The argument is made, "Well, there are other programs actually carried out in certain areas." They talk about the cross-Florida barge canal, the intercoastal waterway, the Mississippi River, and what have you. The fallacy of that reasoning is that those types of programs are available to any place in America where the economic justification can be established, and every State in America has the right to qualify if those standards are met.

Is that not correct?

Mr. CLEVELAND. That is true, and this type of legislation is handled by our Public Works Committee. This is why I feel that the gentleman from Texas was grievously wrong in using those as examples of regional preference. They are not examples of regional preference.

They are examples of the application of national legislation in particular places and to particular situations in the country, but which are equally available to every area of the country that can meet the standards established by the programs.

Mr. CRAMER. I ask the gentleman from New Hampshire further, is not one of the clearest examples, of the fact that our committee has not in the past dealt on a discriminatory regional basis with programs of this sort, the highway program, which comprises about 77 percent of this bill? We have at no time passed legislation involving a highway system which related solely to one region of America as against all of the rest of the country, when the rest of the Nation helps to pay the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. CLEVELAND. That is correct, and it probably is one of the most important things in highlighting the unfairness and discrimination involved in this bill. This violates the entire concept of our national highway program. I am sure when the full impact of it dawns on our country and the people of the country, the repercussions will be extremely serious.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

I would like to ask the gentleman an additional question. I ask the gentleman, is not the fact that it frankly discriminates against the rest of the Nation one of the principal reasons why in our opinion no witnesses outside of the Appalachian region were called in so as to determine what their attitude would be as it relates to this type of legislation, particularly with reference to highways.

Mr. CLEVELAND. We heard no witnesses from outside Appalachia other than certain people from downtown, as you could expect, who testified in favor of this bill.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. Just for a question.

Mr. DENT. I noted in your remarks you made reference to the city of Pittsburgh. It appeared to me—and correct me if I am wrong—that it was your opinion the city of Pittsburgh was not in need of the benefits which might accrue from the passage of this legislation.

Mr. CLEVELAND. My statement was that I have read about the city of Pittsburgh, although I have not had the pleasure of visiting the city of Pittsburgh recently; I know about the Golden Triangle and the Mellon Institute and your other fine institutes of higher learning. When I heard the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT], speak practically with tears in his eyes about how this bill will help areas that have been bypassed for the last 100 years by our industrial progress, I could not believe that Pittsburgh was among them. I do not think many people have thought that a place like Pittsburgh would be in this bill. That was my comment.

Mr. DENT. Might I say, coming from near that city, I have never been blinded by the glitter from the Golden Triangle, because it quit glittering years ago due to the pernicious unemployment existing in this area. Pittsburgh, Pa., at one time, up until very recently, had an unemployment ratio of 14.7 percent. We have the Mellon Institute, yes. We have the Golden Triangle of fable but not actuality. I guarantee you that it is nothing more than the mortar, mud, and bricks that make up the communities and the streets of every other community. We, in that area, believe it is time some of the assistance we have given so willingly over the years to regions all over the United States who needed it be returned to us.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, in my additional views I make a couple of points which I would like to repeat for the benefit of the committee. My essential complaint about this bill is the fact that it is unfair not only to many communities in my district but certainly to many communities and districts outside the Appalachian area. I wish to address this part of my remarks to what I call the industrial and job piracy inherent in this bill. All of us will agree, I think, that new industry and the development of new roads into an area is an important key to the economic improvement and development of an area. It is also true that many communities throughout the country are in direct competition for expanding industry and new industries that they hope to bring into their communities. What the Appalachia bill does, in the words of Government witnesses, is make these centers of prosperity not small towns in Appalachia, but centers of prosperity where there is a significant chance or potential for growth, as they term it, in the words of the bill—and the bill is confined to places that have such a significant potential. Its purpose is to strengthen these centers and make them almost unbearably attractive to new industry by building hospitals, schools, vocational training centers, libraries, sewage plants, and access roads and private roads running indeed right up to the door of a new industry or into a timber preserve or recreational area. It builds all of these facilities with up to 80 percent in Federal dollars. It hopes to make them so attractive that any new industry or any old industry that had expansion in mind would have to go to Appalachia. This is where the essential unfairness becomes clear, because there are many other areas, if we look at Mr. BALDWIN's map—and all of you must know of some of these in your own districts—which have the same acute need for help in bringing new industries and to help with the taxload that you have in those areas and to improve the economic climate. When the Federal Government gets into the act and makes it so attractive for the new industry to go into one small part of the country, then you have the Federal Government acting in direct competition with almost every industrial planning agency and almost every economic planning agency and every chamber of commerce and every city and town and community in America. This is what highlights the unfairness of this bill. This is industrial and job piracy.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished lady from Illinois [Mrs. REID].

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the legislation we are considering today is extremely complex. It would perhaps appear on the surface that the main issue to be decided is the desirability of improving the economic status of the people of the 11 States of the Appalachia area, and certainly the economic welfare of all our citizens should be of utmost concern to us in the Congress. But there are other compelling issues in this bill which we, as Representatives of our respective congressional districts, must also ponder; and the welfare objectives of S. 3 should not cause us to lose sight of the dominant questions involving basic changes in the direction of our public policy.

Few among us will argue the merits of improving the economic status of those who reside in areas which unfortunately have not been able to share in the normal prosperity of the times. An adequate

and comfortable standard of living for all Americans should be the ultimate goal of our domestic economic policy, and we all hope for the day when this can become a reality. But the attainment of this goal also involves the question as to the proper method of approach. Here today we are considering the establishment of a rather far-reaching precedent in our public policy, one which will authorize preferential treatment for one geographical region of America to the disadvantage of similar regions which are equally depressed in economic progress. Here, also, we are considering the proper limitations which should be placed on Federal grants-in-aid. Here, too, we are considering matters of economic justification, the feasibility of preferential highway development over and above our existing national Federal-aid highway programs, the inconsistency of the proposed land improvement program with our national agricultural policies, and the wisdom of authorizing 100 percent federally financed medical facilities.

Since S. 3 does involve basic issues of public policy, we should, therefore, give thoughtful consideration not only to the question of further extending the concept of Federal grants-in-aid, but also to the principle of providing special Federal assistance to a specific geographical area through such a new, broad, and costly program. It is difficult to see how we can in good conscience justify such a program, financed by all taxpayers of the Nation, for the benefit of the people of one particular region. It is also difficult to see why it is necessary to launch a new program of this magnitude which will overlap and duplicate existing authority which the Congress has previously provided for the same types of aid envisioned by the Appalachia bill. For example, we already have the Economic Opportunity Act, the Area Redevelopment Act, the Federal-Aid Highway Act, the Hill-Burton Act, the Vocational Education Act, and others which were originally designed to accomplish the same objectives sought by S. 3 and, at the same time, extend equal benefits to the entire Nation. This new program, if adopted, will without doubt bring forth similar requests from other regions of the United States where economic development is also substandard, and one can foresee serious future problems of Federal fiscal policy. This bill will, in my judgment, establish a disturbing precedent for increasing Federal grants-in-aid on a nationwide basis to the 70 and 80 percent formula which would be approved for Appalachia.

Another inequity in this legislation is the omission of proper standards for the determination of eligible areas for Federal grants, other than for highway construction. Clearly there is no justification for assistance to all of the 360 counties of Appalachia, for at least 76 counties included in this bill are now ineligible as depressed areas for financial assistance under current Government standards. Furthermore, the Appalachia program is to be a 6-year project, and no provision has been made for the exemption of eligible counties when their economic progress attains a certain level or, conversely, to later include currently eligible areas which may become substandard in the future. Also, it is interesting to note that according to 1960 census figures, which although outdated have been used in connection with the justification of this program, 229 of the 360 counties in Appalachia showed a median family income in excess of $3,000—above the administration's poverty definition. Standards of need, therefore, rather than geographical location, should be the determining factor in this type of legislation.

With reference to the highway provisions of the bill, it is obvious that the 70-percent highway grants represent special treatment for a particular area and are thus discriminatory nationwide. In some of the States in question, this program could result in minimization of highway construction under the regular 50–50 matching funds program in favor of the 70-percent aid program for Appalachia. All States in the area would also have the benefits of three highway programs—the Interstate System, the regular highway aid programs, and the Appalachia program. To my knowledge, no study has been made as to the ratio of capital cost of these highways to the long-range economic benefits to be derived from them, again leaving us in doubt as to the economic justification.

Another conflict in Federal policy appears in the land improvement provisions of this bill. The 80-percent grants which would be made available for soil and water conservation practices could in effect result in increased cropland and pastureland production, thereby promoting uneconomic farm units at a time when there is already overproduction and the Department of Agriculture is paying farmers to take land out of production.

Still another new precedent which would be established by this legislation is 100-percent Federal financing of operating costs of hospitals and other local health facilities. This is a principle which the Congress has consistently rejected in the past and, if considered by the appropriate committee and presented separately, would most likely reject again. The question which comes to my mind is—does such a policy not constitute another giant stride toward socialized medicine? In addition, does the fact that the Federal Government would provide 100-percent financing not mean that the States will abdicate their rights of control over these facilities? After all, our past experience in Federal-aid programs has clearly shown that such assistance also brings Federal control.

Section 214 of this bill also involves questionable legislative procedure since it is a tacit "back door" approach to the continuation and expansion of the Public Works Acceleration Act and the Area Redevelopment Act.

As a member of the Committee on Public Works, I have listened carefully to the testimony on this legislation and have also devoted a great deal of study to the supporting data made available to us. Although the initial cost of the Appalachia program is $1.1 billion, it is logical to assume that the total cost over the 6-year period will perhaps approximate $4 billion. The administration of a program of such magnitude is bound to result in further intrusion of Federal regulation and control in the affairs of the participating States, and the precedents embodied in this bill represent a drastic departure from our traditional view of the Federal-State relationship as far as assistance and grants-in-aid are concerned.

I feel, therefore, that this omnibus-type bill under consideration does represent unjustified preferential treatment for one region to the disadvantage of other areas perhaps equally as deserving and, furthermore, that it offers no assurance that the desired economic objectives can or will be achieved. As legislators, we must also consider the many ramifications of the precedents which would be established in this particular approach and the new Federal-aid policies to which we would be committed. For these many reasons, I do not expect to give this bill my support.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. REID of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois for her very learned discussion of this legislation. She has certainly been a loyal and hard-working member of our committee. I want to congratulate her on her very constructive and helpful remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, under the provisions of this $1 billion Appalachian development bill which is under consideration of the House today, assistance would be limited to areas in 11 States, or possibly in 1 more, if New York State is included. In these 11 preferentially treated States, there would be some 360 counties, as I understand, which would be qualified for assistance, and of these 360 counties, 76 are not even economically depressed, in accordance with the definition established for distressed areas under the Area Redevelopment Act. I do not think this is right.

Meanwhile, as an example, in the State of Washington, there are 15 out of our 39 counties that have areas which are depressed to the extent that they do qualify under the Area Redevelopment Act.

The question is, Can I, in all good conscience, representing the State of Washington, vote for a measure which would tax citizens in these 15 depressed areas in my State to assist the people that reside in 76 counties in 11 other States which do not have similar depressed conditions?

However, even more disturbing to me is a statement made during debate on

this bill in the other body by the majority leader. It lends substance to the frequently heard charge made in connection with passage in the Senate of the Appalachian bill, that it was motivated as an unprecedented opportunity for political logrolling. I have heard it said that the bill passed as a result of promises for similar legislation to aid other areas of the country, outside of the 11 States covered by this bill. The majority leader of the other body, in fact, openly stated that the administration was working on similar other regional programs.

In this regard, a letter from the Budget Bureau was read into the RECORD during the Senate debate, stating that the administration proposes, very shortly, through an extension of the area redevelopment program, to initiate measures to assist additional regional planning. So it seems clear, Mr. Chairman, that someone is looking toward the next election—just as has been the case with this present bill. This legislation appears to me to be a Pandora's box.

Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to the Federal Government assisting in the economic upbuilding of depressed areas where there is a reasonable chance of accomplishing the objective, and providing, further, that there is no discrimination to one region in favor of another, and providing that prosperous areas will not be receiving assistance at the expense of people of less prosperous areas. But this bill obviously does not conform to that criteria.

Likewise, Mr. Chairman, I have other objections and these are to the way S. 3 would operate in respect to State and local authorities so that in carrying out this law, they would be subject to dictation. As the additional views of the minority point out in the report on S. 3, this bill would create a new regional government with absolute veto authority and thereby establish dictatorial powers in the person of a single Federal representative on the Appalachian Regional Commission.

In short, I oppose S. 3, and instead, intend to vote for a substitute proposal which I understand will be offered. This alternate proposal would extend Federal financial assistance to all areas throughout the United States which qualify as areas of substantial unemployment, under the definition of existing law. The plan under this alternative proposal would utilize existing Government agencies and authorize State and local officials to initiate projects, and would require States to provide matching funds.

Under this latter arrangement, there would be no discrimination as between regions of the United States, and the local authorities would have a say as to their programs. In any event, I hope S. 3 is rejected. It is poor legislation and should be defeated.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD].

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in support of the administration's Appalachia program, bill S. 3. Most particularly, I wish to speak in support of section 211 thereof, that section which deals with aid for vocational education in Appalachia.

A quick glance at the statistics shows immediately that the Appalachian area has fallen far behind the rest of the country in education and training. Apparently the work being done in the academic area is not truly serving the needs of the young people of Appalachia. We find that 12 percent of these youngsters have not finished the fifth grade and that an astounding 68 percent—over two-thirds—have not finished high school. This should make it apparent indeed that if these young people are to grow up to be productive citizens, we need an increase in vocational training.

At the present time the Appalachia region receives Federal aid in the amount of $24 million a year. It has been estimated that $105 million is needed to enable this region to catch up with the rest of the country. The additional appropriation in bill S. 3 calls for an additional $8 million a year for 2 years. Certainly an annual appropriation totaling $32 million cannot be called extravagant if we are to make even a gesture toward the improvement of this serious problem. We must assure the young people of Appalachia that they will have a chance to become productive, self-sustaining citizens. We have the obligation to give them the tools, the skills, to enter into and compete in the labor market of future years.

Mr. Chairman, the children in Appalachia must look to us here in the Congress for their hopes for the future. They have no power to publicly persuade in behalf of any legislation. They cannot attend hearings; they cannot give testimony; they have no lobby. As our late President said, all of us as American citizens have a responsibility to future generations. We have the responsibility to hand over to those who follow us a nation that is prosperous. This we have often done but sometimes we have not. We have a responsibility to hand over to them a nation at peace. This we have often done but there have been times that we have not. We have a responsibility most of all to see that they enter adulthood in this Nation prepared to meet the contemporary demands that they will face intellectually, socially, and with proper training.

Mr. Chairman, in relation to this bill we have heard terms such as fraud and hoax. Without a doubt the greatest fraud, the most cruel hoax on these young people would be to thrust them into a world that is beyond their capabilities. History will judge us in future years as to how we meet this responsibility and these young people will judge us also. Let us not fail either.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCEWEN].

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Chairman, I share the concern that has been expressed by some of my colleagues here today over the fact that this bill, alleged to treat with poverty as it is, treats with it on a regional basis rather than national.

I hope the Members will permit my remarks to be, if you will, of a parochial or provincial nature, as I feel obliged to speak in relation to my own congressional district, which could be said to embrace northern Appalachia.

The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND], said that Appalachia reaches into the White Mountain region of New Hampshire. In my own congressional district, the 31st District of New York, we have counties that embrace the northern Adirondack Mountains. I should like to refer to this area in particular.

But a reference was just made by the gentleman from New Jersey to the educational disadvantage of the Appalachian region. The figures that I have on that, Mr. Chairman, from the Legislative Reference Service, indicate that the Appalachian region, as originally defined by the President's Appalachian Region Commission, had 32.3 percent of its people who have completed a high school education. I am advised that with the inclusion of more prosperous and progressive areas within Appalachia, that figure of 32.3 percent would now be somewhat higher.

In my own congressional district, 36.7 percent of our population have completed high school. In one county in particular, 32.5 percent, or merely two-tenths of a percent greater than that of Appalachia.

We have heard about unemployment in the Appalachian region, as if it were unique to this area alone. The Appalachian area as originally defined had an unemployment rate of 7.1 percent. In one county in the 31st Congressional District of New York, in the northern part of Appalachia, in the Adirondack Mountains, in the same period of time that Appalachia as a whole had 7.1 percent unemployment this county had 14.6 percent of unemployment.

For this, and other reasons, I find it impossible on the floor of this House to vote, as I found it impossible in committee as a result of the rejection of numerous amendments, to support this bill in its present form.

Here we are asking that people, such as in this one county that I cited, in my district, having twice the rate of unemployment that Appalachia has, support a program for a region that now embraces some of the most prosperous communities in America.

Reference has been made to Huntsville, Ala.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; and Spartanburg, S.C. I fail to appreciate why this regional approach should be taken.

I was interested in noting the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT], in his very persuasive argument for this regional concept, citing other regional legislation that this Congress has enacted in prior years. Among others, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] mentioned the St. Lawrence Seaway with which I have a degree of familiarity since it lies within my congressional district. But here as has been pointed out, there was a demonstrated need for the seaway and it was shown how this waterway, this great public

works undertaking, was going to serve the national interest. There was a demonstration of its economic justification. So I am sure was the case with the Intracoastal Waterway and with other regional plans and undertakings.

But in this instance, Mr. Chairman, I fail to appreciate why America should be taxed as a whole to take an approach at one limited segment of the problem of lack of economic growth and job opportunities.

I note that there was offered and accepted in the other body an amendment to this bill to permit, "on an appropriate basis," inclusion of some 13 New York counties in the Appalachian region. I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that of these 13 counties along or near the Pennsylvania border, only 1 of them is indicated as being eligible either under the ARA or APWP standards. The other 12 counties are not.

The amendment I offered in committee to the Senate bill would have changed this New York inclusion from these relatively prosperous southern tier counties to include Catskill and Adirondack counties—9 of the 11 being ARA or APWP eligible. It would have embraced 9 of the 13 such counties in the State of New York.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the bill in its present form is one that I cannot support and I fail to appreciate how anyone having a congressional district similar to mine, with substantial unemployment and a need for job opportunities, could support this limited regional approach to what has proved to be a national problem.

Also I have concern, Mr. Chairman, as to a number of other aspects of this bill, particularly that relating to access highways.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman gets to that subject, will he yield for a question relating to the Kennedy of New York amendment?

Mr. McEWEN. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. On page 44, line 19, it is indicated that the Commission is authorized and directed to invite the State of New York to participate in the Commission—and I quote "on an appropriate basis."

Now in our discussion on this amendment and in the hearings on it, as I recall, the Governor of the State of West Virginia indicated very clearly that he was not going to slice this pie up with New York and he was not going to vote to provide highway moneys as a member of the Commission, to put highway moneys into New York or other grant programs into New York. He said, to paraphrase what he said, because I do not recall exactly, that he would be willing to vote that certain studies take place in New York.

The gentleman, of course, heard that testimony and is familiar with that testimony.

Mr. McEWEN. Yes; I am.

Mr. CRAMER. Does this not end up making out of these 13 counties stepchildren as compared to the rest of the region?

Mr. McEWEN. I believe that "stepchildren," in answer to the gentleman, is a very apt description. They are certainly not to come in on the same basis as counties in the other 11 States, whatever the phrase "on an appropriate basis" might mean.

Since the gentleman referred to what the distinguished Governor said before the ad hoc committee, I believe the gentleman might anticipate that "an appropriate basis" would be something less than provided for the other States.

Mr. CRAMER. I also recall that the gentleman from New York took part in the discussions with respect to the meaning of the language. The gentleman from New York was asked by the gentleman from Florida the meaning of the language on page 44, lines 10, 11, and 12.

> What counties are to be included? It is true, is it not, that the counties are not set out by name as they are in the rest of the bill?

As it relates to New York.

Mr. McEWEN. That is true. My identification of the 13 counties comes from reading the proceedings of the other body.

Mr. CRAMER. The only record of the counties intended to be included by the author of the amendment, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], was the reference to the counties he stated in the RECORD, the 13 listed, which are defined as follows:

> The inclusion of such counties of the State of New York as are contiguous to the Appalachian region as defined in this section and counties contiguous thereto.

I have heard it suggested by some that this means one could go right on up with "contiguous to," "contiguous to," "contiguous to," and there is no limitation to any 13 counties in the wording of the amendment.

Does the gentleman understand that there is no limitation of 13 counties in the amendment?

Mr. McEWEN. To answer the gentleman's question, I believe that is true. There is no limitation.

Mr. CRAMER. This is the only section in which the counties are not listed. There is not even a number specified as to how many in that State are to be included. It is quite clear that whatever counties are included will probably be brought in under a decision to be made by the Commission members, and not by the Congress, as to exactly the basis on which they want to bring the counties in; is that not correct?

Mr. McEWEN. That is correct. As a matter of fact, pages 41 through 44 of the bill in detail set forth the counties in all the other States, except for the State of West Virginia which is included in its entirety. There is a detailed recitation of exactly which counties in the other States are to be included.

Mr. CRAMER. As I understand it, the gentleman's amendment offered in the committee would have brought into the Appalachian region the counties which are really depressed counties in his State, or a large percentage of them, which are those in the mountainous region; is that correct?

Mr. McEWEN. That is correct. It would have brought in 9 of the 13 counties in the State of New York which have been ARA eligible. It would have included 9 of the 13 in the State, and 9 of the 11 counties in this inclusion would be ARA eligible.

Mr. CRAMER. It is almost inconceivable to me that our committee would take an attitude, "you can't cross a 't' or dot an 'i' in this bill."

I believe this is perhaps one of the clearest examples of that, in that the gentleman offered a perfectly logical amendment. The gentleman is a member of the committee and his amendment was voted down summarily.

I likewise point out that a gentleman now on the floor, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN] properly made a request that one county which is surrounded by other counties which are depressed be included. Those other counties are in the legislation. The county which the gentleman from Alabama wished to add was Lamar County, which is surrounded by other depressed counties but was left out of the bill.

The committee did not even see fit to make that amendment, which was so obviously meritorious. The only conclusion to which I can come—and I ask the gentleman if he agrees with me—is that the orders had come down that they were not to cross a "t" or dot an "i" and this bill had to be ramrodded through the committee in exactly the form it came from the Senate, even though in the form it came from the Senate there were many shortcomings, as illustrated by the one New York amendment alone. Does the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. McEWEN. I would have to agree with the gentleman from Florida on that.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. My distinguished colleague from New York alluded to the committee amendment. If he will look at the record and read it closely, I think the name of that amendment, as he will see, should be the Kennedy-Javits amendment, because, as you will see, the distinguished senior Senator from New York concurred in the amendment offered by the junior Senator from New York, and modified it and proposed some changes which were accepted by the junior Senator. Then, of course, it was passed by the other body. This is just a point of clarification to show that it was really a bipartisan amendment.

Mr. McEWEN. I believe the gentleman is correct in that the senior Senator did have something to do with naming some counties in this area. He was trying to assist the junior Senator from New York in identifying this particular area, I think.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I did not mean to get the gentleman from New York off his subject of access roads in asking my questions. I will be glad to yield the gentleman additional time, if need be, to discuss that subject.

Mr. McEWEN. Thank you, Mr. CRAMER.

Mr. Chairman, on access roads, it does seem to me this is one of a number of features of this bill which appears to be rather unique. There is nothing in here specifying standards for these roads. There is no assurance from this bill that these roads will serve primarily, if at all, a public use. It has been brought out in discussions in committee—and I assume it will be brought out here on the floor, also—that the admitted purpose of these access roads is to help in the attraction and the location of industries and resorts. It does seem peculiar to me that we should be asked to enact for this one region the construction of highways to serve for private purposes and private profit for the use of those using a particular industry or resort rather than highways which will serve the general traveling public and the economy and the commerce of the Nation.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this additional time.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out to the committee that the gentleman from North Carolina who will address the committee has done considerable work on this proposal. He has been before the committee this year and last year rendering valuable assistance and has been most helpful in the considerations and deliberations of the committee. It is always good to have you working with the committee, Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill because it offers hope and economic uplift to a large section of our Nation. This is, in my opinion, the most important single piece of legislation for the people whom I represent that has been considered since I became a Member of Congress.

This is a program to rebuild and revitalize the economy of the entire Appalachian area. The highway building proposals in the Appalachian bill, coupled with its other features, promises relief to an area which has suffered economically because of an inadequate highway system.

The Appalachian area was settled in the early days by pioneers, who were adventurous and not content to sit still but wanted to advance and explore and seek new opportunities. They moved to a rugged mountain area which offered a challenge and a promise; and for a while, that promise was realized.

But as the years moved on, in many cases, timber and mineral resources were depleted. During recent years, the people in this area have been caught in the backlash of an industrial revolution. The revolution in American agriculture which took the mules from the farm and replaced them with expensive machinery destroyed small mountain farms or made them uneconomical. The 14 western North Carolina counties which I am privileged to represent in Congress lost 14,000 farm jobs between 1947 and 1957. In counties where additional jobs in industry have not been created, there has been much unemployment, underemployment, and outmigration.

In most sections of the Appalachian mountains, as in my area, the people have been active in trying to solve their own problems. Since 1948, Western North Carolina Associated Communities has been an active organization promoting regional development. This organization founded the Western North Carolina Regional Planning Commission which, with the aid of a professional planning agency, made an economic analysis of the area and outlined a development program. The development report stated that the key to the development of western North Carolina is roads and highways, and I know that the same applies to other sections of Appalachia.

The Appalachian bill is a historic landmark in Federal-State relationships. It embodies a unique State-Federal partnership approach. It places a tremendous responsibility on each State in developing the type of program that will work in that State and in helping provide the necessary matching funds. It preserves the rights of States by providing that a State must give its consent before any program is carried out within its boundaries. It represents a practical effort to put natural resources to work by means of roads, hospitals, soil conservation, and education. It helps the people in an area to help themselves.

This is primarily a roadbuilding bill with nearly 80 cents of each dollar going for highways.

Civilization moves with transportation and transportation has been an important factor in the development of each section of our great country. The Appalachian region lies close to great concentrations of people and wealth. But isolation caused by inadequate highways and transportation facilities has prevented the extension of such growth and economic prosperity into the Appalachian mountains. The establishment in this region of an adequate system of highways is the key to its development. Highways are needed to ease traffic congestion in some places and are needed as an instrument of economic development throughout the Appalachian area.

By opening the door to transportation, we lay the foundation for private enterprise to come in to build and develop wealth and jobs. The area is rich in climate, in water, and timber resources, and in human resources. Make the area accessible with modern highways and these resources will bring about its development along industrial and recreational lines and will convert it into a land of promise.

The various sections of our great country have individual needs and problems. In some cases, the economic need is harbor development; in other cases, dredging of rivers for commerce or other construction is needed. Out West, the need is development of water resources, and as a member of the House Interior Committee I have supported programs to meet these great public needs.

My colleague and friend, the gentleman from California, said that this bill is favoritism to the Appalachian area. In response I would say that if and after we pass this bill during the next 5 years, while it is in effect, more Federal money will still be spent in California than in the entire Appalachian area. I am proud of this prosperity that we have in California. I say we, because the prosperity of California benefits the entire country. Likewise the poverty of the Appalachian area hurts the entire country and hurts California, and Florida, and New York, and the other States. In geometry we learned the whole equals to the sum of its parts. As we strengthen any part of this country, we strengthen the entire country. This is a regional program which over a period of years will pay for itself.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I come to the members of the Committee today as a Member of Congress from the Appalachian region. I know that region well, specifically in my own area of the country.

Mr. Chairman, there does exist some poverty. There does exist some need.

Very frankly, Mr. Chairman, I explored, in my own conscience, the possibility of casting a vote in the affirmative on this bill. But I cannot do so in good conscience because there are other demands upon my conscience that call to a greater and higher purpose.

Mr. Chairman, as I sat in my seat this afternoon I looked at the young people today going in and out of the galleries. I am trying to let my mind project to a greater problem in our Nation, that of bringing into economic balance our income as compared to our outgo.

We have watched in the past several decades the devaluation of our dollar. We are concerned now today, paramount among all issues, outside of the peace of our country, with our economic stability.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot vote for a piece of legislation that weakens the economic stability of our country. I cannot vote for a piece of legislation today which has for its purpose the building of roads today and then send the bill to our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that the major portion of this bill, if enacted, would be devoted to road construction. I say to the gentlemen from the Appalachian area and of my own great State of Ala-

bama that we have done a good job in building roads. We have probed into many of these areas with good roads. We have taken upon ourselves the necessity to tax in the various States such items as gasoline that have brought into our States enough money to do a good job with a roadbuilding program. I say to the States that if this is not adequate, then look into your own State building program. The building of roads in these areas is not primarily that of a Federal function.

Mr. Chairman, already we have working a good combination of Federal and State cooperation in roadbuilding programs. Let us keep these programs working. But let us not add more and more and more. Where do we stop? Where does the all-powerful Central Government stop? Where do we stop abrogating our rights as States and communities and turn all of our problems over to the Federal Government?

Mr. Chairman, I will admit as a Member of the Congress who comes from a rather poor section of the country, Alabama, that I have to look back with pride upon how we solved some of our economic problems. We did so with hard work. We did so by pulling ourselves up by our bootstraps, because we do have bootstraps. We did it without any foreign aid from anyone, but with our own good minds and willing hands.

Mr. Chairman, I say that these people are wonderful people who live in the Appalachian area, people who will solve their problems. As I ride through the country I know that there are areas of unemployment. But I am not one of those who thinks that just because you put a slab of asphalt through a mountain road that is not now in too good condition that you are going to put an industry there.

Mr. Chairman, I served as president of the Associated Industries of my State. I have talked to a lot of men of industry about this great problem. One asphalt road will not bring an industry into any mountain area.

Mr. Chairman, I also know that we have a great problem of training people throughout the country. Surely they need training. My State, Alabama, is now in the process of undertaking a great program of building trade schools in which to train its people. We have been able to do that in spite of the fact that we have a lot if depressed areas on the map in the State of Alabama. We may be depressed in comparison to other areas of the country that are more wealthy. However, we are a proud people. We are working hard. We are producing enough taxes to become progressively one of the wealthier States of this Union.

Mr. Chairman, I watched as the map unfolded some of the counties which are located in the congressional district of my State which it is my privilege to represent. We have in the Appalachian region one section that we call Sand Mountain, a flat plateau of mountain area. It is one of the most productive farming areas in the United States. It is populated with mountain people who possess a lot of pride.

Mr. Chairman, I would hate for them to think that they wanted me to stand on the floor of this Congress and call them a people dependent upon the Federal Government and people who live there as depressed. They are not depressed. They have toiled with their hands and built a great land.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman is making a very impressive statement, but I wonder if he knows that over $500 million a year is going to relief and related programs in this region the gentleman represents for the cost of these people now?

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. I do not think this is going to solve that question. Can the gentleman prove it will take one man off the payroll?

Mr. GRAY. They have been depressed a long time. We would like to try something. I am not in the Appalachian region myself, but as a member of the Committee on Public Works I feel it is worth an effort to try to transfer relief checks into paychecks.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. I agree with the gentleman we should try to get relief checks into paychecks. But I am a believer in the free enterprise system as the answer to this problem. I do not think you will solve the problem by this bill.

Mr. GRAY. I would like to point out again to the gentleman that it is costing $500 million a year now. That is a lot of money.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. It is a lot of money, yes, but I think we are solving these problems in the framework of the free enterprise system of our country. You are not going to solve unemployment by passing an Appalachia bill.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I think the remarks of the gentleman from Illinios illustrate the fallacy, the proven fallacy, of the approach of the majority relating to depressed areas and unemployment in this country. We have heard assertions for the last 6 years now that the answer to unemployment is to spend Federal money. I recall the assertion that $900 million spent in a period of about 18 months for an accelerated public works program in all these areas evidenced on the map, some 1,407 areas, was the answer to the problem. It was stated this would put people to work. It was proven it did not put them to work in any substantial quantity, and when it did put them to work it cost the taxpayer an average of more than $10,000 per man-year.

I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there are new assertions in the programs proposed here as well as the ones already in existence. For instance, there is a request this year for fiscal 1966 for programs that have a relationship to combating poverty. I will ask unanimous consent to include a list of these in the RECORD at this point.

The material referred to follows:

TABLE 1.—*Federal programs currently operating to combat poverty (as provided for in the budget for fiscal year 1966)*

(NOTE.—These are Federal programs having the purpose or effect of helping to eliminate the causes of poverty or to ameliorate the conditions of poverty; many of these programs are aimed specifically at the poor, others are of a more general application.)

[In millions]

	Amount budgeted
Office of the President: Office of Economic Opportunity [1]	$1,465.5
Department of Agriculture:	
Agricultural research (Hatch Act) [2]	45.9
Cooperative extension (Smith-Lever Act)	70.8
Farmer Cooperative Service	1.2
Economic Research Service [3]	9.5
Special milk program [4]	100.0
School lunch program [5]	411.7
Food stamp program	100.0
Donation of commodities to needy persons (other than school lunch program) [6]	197.1
Farmers Home Administration (rural housing grants and loans):	
Development loans	1.4
Grants	10.4
Loans to elderly	19.0
Building loans	11.0
Total	41.8
Rural renewal loans	3.0
Direct loan accounts [7]	349.0
Real estate	49.0
Operating	300.0
Rural Community Development Service	0.1
Rental housing for elderly	5.0
Subtotal	1,335.1
Department of Commerce: Area Redevelopment Administration:	
Operations and technical assistance	4.1
Grants for public facilities (requires new legislation)	10.5
Area Redevelopment Loan Fund	0
Subtotal	14.6
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:	
Office of Education:	
Vocational education acts [8]	257.5
Student loan program (National Defense Education Act) [9]	179.3
Science, mathematics, foreign language instructional equipment and audiovisual equipment for elementary and high schools (National Defense Education Act)	79.2
Improved counseling, testing, and guidance in schools (National Defense Education Act) [10]	31.7
Cooperative research and demonstrations	25.0
Education of handicapped children [11]	21.5
Vocational rehabilitation Administration:	
Vocational rehabilitation grants to States [12]	124.0
Vocational rehabilitation research and training	45.8

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Federal programs currently operating to combat poverty (as provided for in the budget for fiscal year 1966)*—Continued

[In millions]

	Amount budgeted
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Continued	
Public Health Service:	
Chronic diseases and health of the aged [13]	$61.2
Communicable diseases	39.3
Community health practice	63.4
Hospital construction (amount here is that proposed for 5-year extension of Hill-Burton Act) [14]	303.0
Environmental engineering and sanitation [15]	15.9
Indian health activities [16]	66.0
Social Security Administration:	
Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund payments	17,800.0
Unemployment compensation and employment services	492.1
Welfare Administration:	
Public assistance grants to States [17]	2,966.4
Public Assistance Administration, services and training (grants to States) [18]	295.7
Bureau of Family Services [19]	6.2
Maternal and child welfare [20]	162.0
Office of Aging	7
Cooperative research for social security	2.0
Subtotal [21]	22,937,9
Department of the Interior: [22]	
Indian education and welfare	106.8
Indian resources management	0.1
(Indians) construction of facilities and irrigation systems	70.0
Subtotal	176.9
Department of Labor:	
Manpower training and development	16.8
Unemployment Insurance Service and U.S. Employment Service	13.4
Subtotal	30.2
Housing and Home Finance Agency:	
Low-income housing demonstration programs	.1
Public facility loans (1965 capital outlay)	100.0
Urban renewal grants	1,623.0
Low rent public housing grants	248.2
Low rent public housing development loans	646.8
Subtotal	2,618,1
Small Business Administration:	
Business loans	240.1
Investment and development company assistance; debenture purchase and loans	79.0
Subtotal	319.1
Total	28.897.4

[1] Includes the Job Corps, community action programs, migrant agricultural employees program, rural areas program, work experience program, adult literacy program, volunteer program, and general direction and administration

[2] Includes project for improving rural life.

[3] Farm economics and marketing economics.

[4] Whole milk for children in schools, day camps, etc.

[5] Includes both commodities and cash payments.

[6] The 1964 figure (1966 estimate not available) for donation of food for needy persons through public and private welfare and charitable agencies.

[7] 90 percent of loans go to farmers with income of $3,000 or less. Purpose identical to poverty act grants and loans to farmers.

[8] Includes funds to Commissioner for direct help for culturally deprived youth (residential schools, workstudy, and special projects), also, State plans include heavy emphasis on out-of-school youth.

[9] Specifically intended for needy but able college students fund is now meeting colleges' requests. States give priority to schools most in need of assistance to buy expensive equipment.

[10] Key part of efforts to prevent school dropouts.

[11] Program designed to prevent future dependency.

[12] These two programs heavily emphasize and assist in expanding, improving, and coordinating State and local services and facilities.

[13] These programs (9, 10, 11) make a major contribution to State and local efforts to improve general health and to prevent, control, and treat disease.

[14] Includes nursing homes, diagnostic and treatment centers, rehabilitation centers, and project grants for comprehensive area plans for medical facilities.

[15] Grant assistance to States, cities, industries, and researchers to eliminate health hazards from food and water.

[16] Full range of health, medical, and hospital services for Indians and Alaskan natives; health education.

[17] Payments to individual recipients, medical care for the aged.

[18] A major purpose of these grants is to finance State and local programs to prevent dependency and causes of dependency.

[19] Administers public assistance grants, coordinates Federal and State efforts, provides technical and other assistance for programs to prevent dependency.

[20] Grants to States, including research and demonstration for improved maternal and child health services (particularly in rural areas), child welfare services and crippled children's services.

[21] Includes $17.8 billion Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund payments (social security).

[22] These three programs, plus Public Health Service health services, relate to nearly every phase of Indian life.

TABLE 2.—*Existing Federal programs which overlap programs proposed in S. 3, the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965—Amount budgeted for fiscal year 1966*

[In millions]

Sec. 201—Appalachian Development Highway System: Federal-aid highway program:	
Interstate System	$2,660.0
Primary system	440.0
Secondary system	296.0
Urban highways	246.0
Total	3,642.0
Sec. 202—Demonstration Health Facilities:	
Title IV of the Public Health Service Act	260.0
Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act and the Community Mental Health Center Construction Act	22.0
Total	282.0
Sec. 203—Land stabilization, conservation, and erosion control:	
Agricultural conservation program	250.0
Cropland conservation program	10.0

TABLE 2.—*Existing Federal programs which overlap programs proposed in S. 3, the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965—Amount budgeted for fiscal year 1966*—Continued

[In millions]

SEC. 203—Land stabilization, conservation, and erosion control—Continued	
Conservation reserve program	$150.0
Soil conservation service	218.0
Total	628.0
Sec. 204—Timber Development Organizations:	
Forest Service programs	340.0
Farmers Home Administration credit programs	248.0
Total	588.0
Sec. 205—Mining Area Restoration:	
The act of Aug. 31, 1954; the act of July 15, 1955; and the act of Oct. 15, 1962	1.2
Sec. 206—Water resource survey:	
Civil works program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for surveys, research, and development of water resources	24.0
Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, general investigations, surveys, and studies on water resources	11.6
Total	35.6
Sec. 211—Vocational education facilities:	
The act of Mar. 1, 1931; the act of Mar. 18, 1950; the act of Aug. 1, 1956; the act of Sept. 25, 1962; the Vocational Education Act of 1946; and the Vocational Act of 1963	257.5
Sec. 212—Sewage treatment works:	
Sections 301, 311, and 361 of the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for water supply and water pollution control	40.6
Federal Water Pollution Control Act construction grants	100.0
Subtotal	140.6
Sec. 214—Supplements to Federal grant-in-aid programs (those programs in addition to secs. 201–212):	
Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act	5.7
Library Services Act	55.0
Federal Airport Act	75.0
Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963	641.8
Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965	125.0
National Defense Education Act of 1958	412.6
	1,315.1
Total	6,890.0

Mr. CRAMER. Including social security, it amounts to $28.897 billion. Taking social security out, it is $11 billion. Included in this aid to depressed areas and aid to unemployment this year, and in the bill we passed last year for the Office of Economic Opportunity, $1,465,500,000 is requested for the assistance of unemployed people in the area of the Job Corps, the community action program, the agricultural program, the rural area program, work programs, the adult literacy program, and others, and

in the area of vocational education, a duplication of what is in this bill. In addition to that, $100 million for the food stamp plan. You have the Manpower and Development Training Act program. There is also a figure in excess of $300 million for the next 5 years for hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act.

So I think the fallacy is obvious in the position of spending a few billion dollars for this, and this is a $1.92 billion program for Appalachia alone, for the right-to-work program, pumping Federal money into everything might employ a few more people, even though the cost is far disproportionate to the people employed.

Would not the gentleman agree to that?

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. CRAMER. Does not the gentleman agree further that one of the clearest examples where, in my opinion, we are going to have a bigger abuse, you will have more political shenanigans, you will get less benefit as a result, is the access road program in the highway section, that permits them to build highways without any standard of construction, without any responsibility to maintain those highways for the first time in the history of Federal aid legislation. Without any requirement of maintenance they can build these access roads, a thousand miles of them, to any motel or hotel or business, golf course, or almost any other private facility, providing all that without limitation.

Does not the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Yes; I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. I think the gentleman's remarks are really pertinent insofar as they discuss the fact that industry may or may not come into the area if they are provided with these benefits that the Appalachia bill would provide. I do not think there is any assurance that can be given in this kind of legislation that with all of the attractiveness, with the new highway construction and the other benefits that would be provided here, industry would go there.

I am reminded of the situation in Brazil, where the Brazilian Government undertook to construct a whole community called Brasilia out in the hinterlands with the idea that it was going to be a center of activities and was going to attract a lot of people there and provide a lot of benefits for the whole nation. It virtually destroyed the country, because of this great economic investment in that area and the fact that it was not attractive for industry or business or people to go there. The problems of the country have been monumental. The distress that has resulted from this effort on the part of the Brazilian Government has been far-reaching, practically to the point of destroying the nation itself as a nation.

I think this is the riskiest sort of governmental planning. It gives no real assurance that any benefits could come even to the area that is intended to be benefited.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. The gentleman from Illinois may not have attended the committee when the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] said something to the effect that the Duke Power Co., of South and North Carolina, has an application before the Federal Power Commission which, if granted, would call for the spending of almost as much money in the Appalachian area as this entire bill. It seems strange to me that we have the Federal Government here with one hand holding up the development of Appalachia, if the information given us by the gentleman from South Carolina is correct, and on the other hand pouring this largess in.

Is it true that 11 of the gentleman's 12 counties are in this area?

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I should like to nominate the gentleman for the "Profiles of Courage" award. I admire the gentleman's courage, if 11 of his 12 counties are in this area and he has decided to vote against this bill. I hope that there are enough people in the gentleman's district that will recognize this courageous action the gentleman has taken. I hope this will be recognized far beyond the area of the gentleman's district. It is most refreshing to me to know there are still people here in the Congress who have the courage to vote their convictions instead of just voting their districts. I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

In conclusion, I would remind the Members of this body that when we vote for this bill we should in good conscience, if we do vote for it, vote for bills for other areas. Since I am not of the view that we want to embark on another spending program for the entire United States, I cannot vote for my region and turn around and cast a vote for another region. Let us stop this trend of more spending. Let us stop this trend of doing now and putting our children in debt. When we have the money in the bank I am willing to do it, but not now.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the gentleman recall an amendment in committee when he tried to insert another county into the program?

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. I recall it because I wanted to bring out the unfairness to the gentleman and the other gentleman, that you had included counties of great wealth in my district but excluded one of extreme poverty. If I was not, under the circumstances the gentleman mentions, able to explain it sufficiently to you, how could I explain it to the people back home? I think if you are going to use it for poverty, you ought to put it where poverty is.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, the southern tier of New York State stretches for 350 miles from Delaware County on the east to Chautauqua County on the west. It is predominantly rural; covered with hills, some rolling and some jagged.

During the early months of the planning for this Appalachian program, New York participated. But after about a year, New York withdrew. In the early stages the 13 counties of New York, the southern tier, were included because geographically and economically they shared the characteristics of Appalachia. But when the Governor of New York withdrew, they were not included.

This omission I feel, Mr. Chairman, is contrary to the purposes of this bill which is to provide through regional planning and development. These counties certainly are part of the region of Appalachia. Now this omission was noted, as our distinguished colleague from New York pointed out earlier, by the junior Senator from New York. He introduced an amendment which was concurred in by the senior Senator from New York who proposed certain changes. The junior Senator accepted those modifications and the amendment was passed by the other body.

The amendment directs the Appalachian Region Commission to consider including the 13 southern tier New York counties. If, after consultation with New York, the Commission concludes that these counties share the social and economic characteristics of Appalachia and that their inclusion would further coordinate economic development of the entire region, it would then invite New York to participate. If the Governor of New York accepts, these counties would be included. Now there is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Chairman, that these counties do in fact share the social and economic characteristics of Appalachia and lag behind the rest of the Nation. They are poor. Two hundred thousand families in this area, 12 percent of the total, have incomes under $2,000 a year. In Delaware, Allegany, and Oswego Counties, 15 percent of all families have incomes in this bracket. This is more like West Virginia than the neighboring counties in Pennsylvania. In West Virginia 17 to 18 percent have incomes under $2,000 and in the neighboring counties of Pennsylvania there are only 11 percent. Now these facts have sad consequences. Young people more and more are fleeing from this region. In the Nation as a whole, 15 percent of our population are in the age bracket of 15 to 24. But in the southern tier of New York, only 12 percent of the population is in this bracket. The future of the southern tier of New York, like that of the Nation as a whole, lies in its youth. If the youth continue to flee from this region, the region will have no future.

This amendment definitely does not include the 13 counties because it is a voluntary program and the Governor of

our State despite the poverty that exists there has for some strange reason not seen fit to ask for their inclusion. But I believe that the door should be left open.

Mr. Chairman, opponents of this amendment have cited certain prosperity in this area; in Elmira, Binghamton, Jamestown, and Corning. It is true that there is prosperity, but I think that this is good for the overall bill. The fact that there are small pockets of prosperity tucked into this huge fabric of poverty does not change the case.

It strengthens the case, because these pockets of prosperity can be the affluent nuclei around which prosperous regional economies can be built. But modern arteries of concrete must be stretched out from the these pockets of prosperity. The penetration of the southern tier of New York by an adequate transportation network is the first requisite of its full participation in industrial America. An adequate highway system is an absolute essential to economic progress in these rolling hills.

I urge retention of this amendment.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE], a member of the committee.

Mr. KEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the 11 States of the Appalachian region had very serious economic problems of long-term duration. Because of these difficulties, the Governors met at Annapolis, Md., in 1960 for the purpose of finding out what could be done. These Governors requested the President of the United States to establish the President's Appalachian Regional Commission. This Commission was established on April 9, 1963.

This Commission included representatives of the Governors and a representative of the heads of major Federal departments and agencies, and it worked diligently to prepare a comprehensive program for the economic development of the region. The work of this Commission resulted in the legislative proposals we are considering on the floor of the House today.

In fact—this is one point which is absolutely clear and no man can deny it—these proposals came primarily from the Governors of the 11 States involved and not from the Federal Government.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I should certainly agree with the minority report on this bill that it would provide preferential treatment for one region, thereby discriminating against other areas with equal or greater need. In fact, my own Seventh District of Minnesota is a good example of areas that would certainly qualify for Appalachian funds according to the criteria put forth for such need. For instance, we are told that in the Appalachian area 30.7 percent of the families earn less than $3,000 a year, the statistical figure so often thrown about these days as the point of no return for the poverty stricken. In the Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota, 37 percent of the families earn less than $3,000 a year, but I have not heard anyone calling the area poverty stricken. The Seventh District needs realistic help in its efforts to improve its income level, but Appalachia is not going to do the job. In fact, the Appalachian Act will hurt such areas as the Seventh District of Minnesota.

This points out the wisdom of the minority who recognize the dangers and inherent unfairness of confining such sweeping aid to only one region of the Nation. This same minority also has proposed an alternative plan, a program for all of the Nation instead of just Appalachia. The Appalachian region, of course, would also benefit, but so would other areas of need. This Republican alternative recognizes the fact that if such large sums of money are to be spent, they should be available on an equal basis to all areas of need in this Nation.

One of the aspects of the bill before us today that has been noted in particular by the writers of the minority view concerns the section on highway construction. It is noted that 85 percent of the program is for highways, even though our National Highway System has been developed so that all of the States in the Union, on a time-tested formula, have shared in a fair manner in the Federal funds available for highway construction. But now, for the first time, 11 States are being singled out to receive $840 million of special funds for development of highways and access roads. Some of those States are among the largest and wealthiest in the Nation.

I always thought that when you built a better mousetrap, the public would beat a path to your door. Under this Appalachian bill, we are going to beat the path to the door first.

A disturbing aspect of assistance for Appalachia in such a massive form is contained in statistics that are finally coming to the attention of the Congress. We are led to believe that Appalachia will never recover or approach the national income average without this bill.

Unfortunately, most of the statistics thrown around were taken from the 1960 census and do not reflect progress made in the last 4 years by the communities themselves, through private capital moving into the area due to the availability of manpower and natural resources. Recent reports show that the gap between Appalachian income and the U.S. average is narrowing. In West Virginia, for instance, unemployment dropped from 105,000 in 1961 to under 60,000 in 1964. Such progress is commendable, and reflects the basic spirit of America that has always believed that Washington's job is to do only what the private and local sectors cannot do. But I can imagine how much initiative there will remain for such improvement after Uncle Sam takes over the job, at the expense of the rest of the taxpayers in the Nation. We must not lose sight of the fact that lasting prosperity is only created by policies encouraging expansion of job-creating, taxpaying enterprises.

Another section of the bill before us that concerns me is the section on land improvement, although the terminology has been changed to say "land stabilization, erosion, and sediment control, and reclamation through changes in land use, and conservation treatment." We should remember that this section was entitled, "Pasture Improvement and Development" in the Appalachian bill of the last Congress, and would have authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants to landowners in amounts up to 80 percent of the costs of improving and developing 25 acres of pastureland owned by such landowner in the region.

The only difference between that bill and the one before us today is that the acreage per farm has been increased from 25 acres to 50 acres and that cropland is included with the pastureland as eligible for improvements. What this section does is to transfer the pockets of poverty from marginal farms in Appalachia out onto the plains of America where beef and other crops are already being overproduced. Our Government recently spent $25 million to keep excess beef off the market, and we are already paying to keep 53 million acres of farmland out of production.

The relationship of the crop and pastureland improvement section of this bill on the rest of rural America is apparent. The Budget Director tells the rest of the Nation that 2½ million farmers must leave their lands because they are not "efficient" enough. But here in this bill we see this same administration attempting to set up another round of marginal farms to compete with the rest of the country, raising crops and commodities that already are in surplus. It is obvious that this scheme, like so many others we have noted in recent years, follow the very same pattern of transferring misery from one section of the Nation to another. You would think they would learn from past experience.

There is another aspect of this bill that does not make sense. Section 214 is, in effect, a reenactment of the discredited and ineffectual Public Works Acceleration Act for the Appalachian region. In fact, it is even worse than the forerunners, since this section provides for an increase to 80 percent for the Federal share of projects instead of the original 50 percent in the Public Works Acceleration Act.

Accelerated public works—APW—and the Area Redevelopment Administration—ARA—have long lists of dismal failures, unable to show any substantial reduction in unemployment actually attributable to the programs. Even the present administration appears to have deserted the continuation of these programs, which makes the inclusion in this bill even more strange.

ARA and APW are no strangers to Appalachia. ARA admitted last year that about 30 percent of its funds were spent in the Appalachian States, or that approximately 23 percent of the APW funds

were spent in Appalachian counties—without any apparent improvement in the employment picture attributable directly to such programs.

Add to this the fact that 76 of the Appalachian counties are not now eligible for grants under the Public Works Acceleration Act because they do not need it. But, under the Appalachian bill before us today, they would indeed become eligible.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest that the bill before us has too many deficiencies, that more thought is needed before this Congress or this Government can effectively combat poverty in this Nation. While I certainly am in favor of governmental efforts to assist our unfortunate citizens, I believe we need better programs than those offered in this bill that pours millions into a sweeping program for an isolated area. Let us reconsider.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in development of the Appalachian region, had come to no resolution thereon.

AMENDMENT TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill (H.R. 5577) to clarify the status of the Marshfield Clinic, Marshfield, Wis., for Federal tax purposes.

The Marshfield Clinic was incorporated in 1916 under the general business corporation law of Wisconsin. It has become a major economic factor in the community and a major medical institution in the State of Wisconsin.

During the almost 50 years of its existence, the clinic has operated as a corporation. During this period it has been taxed as a corporate employer. The doctors on its staff are salaried and have been treated as employees for withholding taxes, social security taxes, and unemployment compensation taxes, both State and Federal.

Coincidentally, the history of the Marshfield Clinic covers the same span of years as the Federal income tax. For some 49 years, no one has questioned its corporate existence for Federal tax purposes. At this late date, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has promulgated regulations with respect to so-called professional corporations which would take away from the Marshfield Clinic its corporate status.

Although the regulations in question were directed at a different type of professional corporation, organized under special laws enacted in recent years, no effort was made to limit the impact of the regulations to that type of corporation. Instead, the regulations would refuse to recognize any professional corporation, regardless when or how organized. In adopting this position, the Commissioner would reverse the long-standing rulings of his predecessors in office that the Marshfield Clinic is a corporation and that its doctors are employees of that corporation.

The Marshfield Clinic was granted a corporate charter by the State of Wisconsin in 1916. That status has stood unchallenged for almost 50 years. No claim is made that there has been any change in the manner of its operations over those years which would justify a change in position on the part of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. No claim is made that the Marshfield Clinic has abused its corporate status, or that it was organized for purposes of tax avoidance, or that it is not conducting the business—the practice of medicine—for which it was organized. I have reviewed the matter with competent legal authority. Under these circumstances, all agree that the regulations are invalid as applied to the Marshfield Clinic. The clinic would unquestionably win its case in court. However, I do not feel that the clinic should be compelled to resort to the courts in order to enjoy a right which it has had unchallenged for almost 50 years.

My bill provides that the Marshfield Clinic shall continue to be treated as a corporation. It is limited in scope to organizations of long standing, such as the clinic. As a practical matter, the Treasury Department advises that there are no other known organizations which would meet the tests laid down in the bill. Accordingly, the bill will not affect the regulations, whether valid or not, insofar as the newly organized professional corporations are involved.

CLOSING OF VA FACILITIES

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I just read an interesting article in the Washington Post by Mr. Leslie Carpenter and I ask unanimous consent that the article be made a part of the RECORD after my speech.

In his article, Mr. Carpenter states in essence that the present announced closures of the Veterans' Administration facilities, including Fort Bayard in New Mexico, are only the beginning. Mr. Carpenter says that there is more misery coming and it will be spread around to a greater extent. Mr. Carpenter indicates that there is now a report by the Veterans' Administration before the Bureau of the Budget which would reduce the Veterans' Administration regional offices to 15. Mr. Carpenter also asserts that there are about a dozen more Veterans' Administration hospitals which will probably be shut down in the not too distant future.

I hope the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee will ask questions of the Veterans' Administration to ascertain the names of the institutions to be closed in the next closings and the locations of the regional offices. Perhaps it would be enlightening to some of our colleagues because they, too, may soon be faced with the task of explaining why we are curtailing medical services to our veterans and, at the same time, are being asked to extend medical care to all citizens.

The column referred to follows:

NIXON CLEARS HIS DESK

There already are plenty of indications that Richard M. Nixon has started early to maneuver the 1968 GOP presidential nomination for himself but here is another: Nixon has arranged with his New York law partners to spend only Mondays at his legal desk, leaving the rest of the week for political activity.

In about 2 months, all the necessary papers will have been filed in the effort of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party to unseat Mississippi's four Democratic Congressmen. The FDP charges the Congressmen were illegally elected because Negroes were excluded from voting. Moderate Republican House Members, seeking to reverse the anti-Negro image Barry Goldwater gave the GOP, may team up with Northern liberal Democrats to give FDP a victory.

The behind-the-scenes reason Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat of Arkansas, did not appoint Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, Democrat of New York, to the famous McClellan Investigating Subcommittee is reportedly a conflict of interest in the TFX probe the subcommittee has not yet finished. MCCLELLAN is known to have strong feelings about the way the contract for the airplane was awarded and is said to believe KENNEDY, as his late brother's foremost adviser, may have had a hand in the decision. KENNEDY had been expected to go on the subcommittee, which he served for a number of years as general counsel.

Convinced that a tax cut during prosperity makes good times better, President Johnson has his advisers looking for what to slash next, once the excise tax reduction goes through Congress. Best bet: a new tax deduction for parents with kids in college, permitting them to write off tuition and book costs. When students are self-supporting, they would get the tax break.

About a dozen more VA hospitals and 35 more VA regional offices will probably be shut down in the not too distant future. That promises more lighting and thunder in the White House-Capitol relationship and threatens President Johnson's goal to go down in history as the President who achieved record-breaking legislative victories.

Yet, Mr. Johnson is a determined man when it comes to saving Federal funds where possible. While Members of Congress applaud the objective in general terms, they draw the line when it hits their own voters back home.

The VA has obviously long squandered money and gotten away with it because the huge veterans organizations are among the most powerful lobbies in Washington, feared by Congressmen, Senators, and Presidents alike.

Despite this political fact of life, the President showed no mercy for congressional rank in the first order to shutter 11 VA hospitals, 4 veterans homes, and 17 regional offices. One hospital is in Miles City, Mont., home territory of Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD. Another is in Dwight, Ill., the State of Senate Minority Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN. One of the regional offices is in Lubbock, Tex., hometown of House Appropriations Committee Chairman GEORGE MAHON.

The most miffed of all has been MANSFIELD, who notes that VA only recently described the Miles City hosptial as one of the most efficient VA had.

Key Members of Congress say flatly that, because of the political heat and ill feeling, Mr. Johnson will give a little in the original order and agree to permit a few of the hospitals, perhaps two or three, to remain open for the time being. The Miles City facility would seem the most likely to be salvaged.

More orders will be coming, however. VA feels many of its hospitals are located in the wrong places and wants to get rid of them. It wants to build new ones, locating each in important medical centers where there is access to top specialists.

VA's opinion also is that the need for veterans hospitals is diminishing with the likelihood of medicare and with more and more veterans covered by private hospital insurance by their employers in industry and business. New, too, is VA's nursing home programs. Such care, which is all many veterans require, is cheaper than hospitalization.

VA had 67 regional offices before the Johnson order cut them to 50. Before the Budget Bureau now is a VA report that it can get along satisfactorily with merely 15.

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in RECORD and include an article by Miss Linda Willis.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of pleasure and satisfaction that I learned that a young lady from a small community, but a wonderful section of Colorado was chosen to represent our State in the annual Veterans of Foreign Wars nationwide Voice of Democracy Contest. The achievement of this girl, Miss Linda Willis of Mancos, Colo., may not receive the wide attention that some act of violence might command, but, to me, it is worth every bit of publicity that the media care to give it. It represents, Mr. Speaker, a reminder to all of us that the young people of this Nation are, indeed, worthy of our hopes for the future. I ask that my colleagues share my pride by discovering the excellence of Miss Willis' winning speech.

The speech follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Miss Linda Willis)

As citizens of the United States, we enjoy many privileges. We are able to speak freely, worship God in our own way, stand up for what we think is right, oppose what we believe is wrong, and choose those who govern us. All of these are examples of the rights and privileges provided for us as citizens of this Nation, and as citizens of our churches, schools, communities, and homes.

However, citizenship means duties and responsibilities as well as privileges. So if we do nothing, we are not effective citizens. The challenge comes in assuming our duties and responsibilities. What are these obligations?

John and Paul are typical Americans. They enjoy the same benefits of citizenship. But how do they approach its challenges?

One challenge of citizenship is to be concerned actively about the conduct of public affairs and to accept willingly responsibilities.

John works hard at his job as a factory foreman. More than that he is always alert for ways to improve operations. John always votes in elections and he knows why and for whom he is voting. He often attends meetings of his own political party. If he is asked to do something by his party chairman he accepts and completes the assignment promptly and to the best of his ability.

Paul works as a clerk in the offices of a large company. He follows his supervisors instructions and obeys rules. But he cares little about his work. To Paul his job means only a pay check collected once a week. When elections are held, sometimes he votes and sometimes he does not. Usually if he does vote he does not know for whom or for what he is voting. When the chairman of his party asks him to do something he says that he simply does not have time.

Another challenge is to respect the human dignity and rights of others, and to learn to tolerate ideas that differ from our own. We should voice our opinion on the feelings we have, even though they may not agree with popular opinion. However, we should allow everyone else the same privilege of self-expression.

Let's see how John and Paul meet this challenge.

John does or says something constructive, rather than just complaining, when things go wrong or when someone disagrees with him. He treats other people as he would like them to treat him. He compromises when possible with others and respects their rights and opinions.

Paul clams up or shouts in defiance if someone disagrees with him. Paul is always right and everybody else is always wrong. He treats people as though they were inferior to him. He does not listen to others because he thinks he is the only one with something worth saying. He never compromises because he feels that that is admitting defeat and he does not believe that he can be defeated.

The third challenge of citizenship is to search for facts, interpret them, and use them constructively.

John learns about his country. He searches for facts such as the true heritage of the democracy in which he lives. He studies the facts that he has searched out and then with a clear and open mind, uses them to strengthen his citizenship.

Paul on the other hand, is too lazy to search for anything. He thinks he knows it all so he feels he shouldn't waste his time relearning something. He often doesn't interpret what he does know intelligently. He uses only the facts that will help him get ahead.

John and Paul, as citizens in their country, show what kind of citizens they are in their communities, homes, or churches and what kind of citizens they were in their schools. Why? Because they either meet the challenge of carrying out their duties and responsibilities or they do not.

Shall we be like John and raise our citizenship to new heights of excellence, or be like Paul and ignore the challenge?

I am a citizen and I can see,
That I must work to keep myself free.
What is my challenge then?
To stand for what I know,
Will help to make my country grow.
To search for truth, which makes us free,
And to tolerate the ones that disagree.
To have respect for someone else's ability,
To accept and complete all assignments willingly.
To try and accomplish all that I start,
In every way and everything, learn, to do my part.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL MAKES NUMEROUS AUDITS AND REPORTS ON WASTE AND EXTRAVAGANCE IN WIDE AREAS OF FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have had a continuing interest and concern in correcting and improving our foreign aid program, and have recently been provided with a report of the Comptroller General listing numerous instances in which irregularities have been shown to exist even in recent months in the foreign aid program.

The report from the Comptroller General comprises a listing of some 25 specific reports completed and a summary of 42 projects now in progress, as well as comments on other investigations being conducted by the Comptroller General of the United States.

The services of the Comptroller General are to be commended and I believe that this listing of investigations will be of much interest and concern to all Members. Under permission granted, I include the letter from the Comptroller General and the accompanying report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., February 23, 1965.

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. EVINS: In view of the concern for our work relating to the foreign aid programs which you expressed during our appropriation hearings on February 18, 1965, we believe it may be of interest to you to have a more complete summation of the reports on these matters which we have submitted to the Congress during the past year and the principal areas in which we are currently working or contemplate in our work plans.

Attached for your use are (1) a listing of the 25 reports which we have issued to the Congress relating to the general subject of foreign aid since January 1, 1964, (2) a summary of 42 work projects which we now have in progress, and (3) comments concerning our further plans and some particular areas in which we intend to expand our efforts.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE REPORTS ISSUED TO THE CONGRESS SINCE JANUARY 1, 1964, RELATING TO THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

(Report title, reference number, and date issued)

EUROPE, NEAR EAST, AND AFRICA

Examination of certain economic development projects for assistance to Central

Treaty Organization (fiscal years 1957–62), B–146849, March 5, 1964.

Followup review of Department of Defense action to obtain reimbursement from foreign countries for administrative expenses under the MAP (letter report), B–146749, March 18, 1964.

Inefficient utilization of personnel to administer the military assistance program functions in advanced Western European countries (including a classified supplement), B–133280, April 2, 1964.

Furnishing of military assistance to Ethiopia in excess of the country's ability to effectively use the equipment (classified), B–146887, May, 6, 1964.

Ineffective administration of U.S. assistance to Children's Hospital in Poland by the Agency for International Development and the Department of State, B–146787, June 17, 1964.

Examination of economic and technical assistance program for Turkey (fiscal years 1958–62), B–133026, June 30, 1964.

Followup review of Department of Defense action to cancel excessive procurement and redistribute aircraft spare parts programed for, or delivered to, Portugal under the military assistance program (letter report), B–146785, August 14, 1964.

Deficiencies in the military assistance program for the Spanish Army (classified), B–125086, August 25, 1964.

Inadequate consideration given to utilizing reserve fleet ships in lieu of providing new ships to Iran under the military assistance program (classified), B–133134, February 3, 1965.

FAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

Review of the military assistance program for Indonesia (classified), B–146839, May 6, 1964.

Certain problems relating to administration of the economic and technical assistance program for Vietnam for 1958–62, B–133001, July 24, 1964.

Review of the administration of assistance for financing commercial imports and other financial elements under the economic and technical assistance program for Vietnam, B–133001, July 24, 1964.

Unofficial use and overstated needs of commercial-type vehicles by the military assistance advisory group and the headquarters support activity, Taipei, Republic of China, B–146907, July 31, 1964.

Review of the military assistance program for a Far East country (classified), B–146941, September 29, 1964.

Loss of interest on U.S.-owned foreign currencies in the Republic of China (Taiwan), B–146749, November 24, 1964.

Ineffective and overly costly aspects of military and economic assistance provided to Thailand (classified), B–132913 and B–133258, February 17, 1965.

LATIN AMERICA

Deficiencies in the administration of the earthquake reconstruction and rehabilitation program for Chile (including a classified supplement), B–146754, June 29, 1964.

Additional interest costs to United States because of premature releases of funds to the Social Progress Trust Fund administered by the Inter-American Development Bank, B–146937, September 8, 1964.

Improper payment of Colombian port charges for surplus agricultural commodities sold under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, B–146820, November 17, 1964.

WORLDWIDE OR GENERAL MATTERS

Audit for fiscal year 1963, Export-Import Bank, B–114823, February 20, 1964.

Unnecessary or premature procurement and delivery of Sidewinder missile training systems to foreign countries under the MAP (including a classified supplement), B–146762, March 12, 1964.

Undercollections of interest and principal in foreign currencies on certain loans to foreign governments, B–146928, July 17, 1964.

Improper retention of dollar collections on loans made by corporate development loan fund, B–133220, September 3, 1964.

Summary of deficiencies related to the inadequate administration of military budget support funds provided to certain countries under the foreign assistance program, B–146943, September 28, 1964.

Excessive ocean transportation costs incurred under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, B–146820, October 30, 1964.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE WORK IN PROGRESS, FEBRUARY 18, 1965, RELATING TO THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

EUROPE, NEAR EAST, AND AFRICA

Expenditure of military assistance program funds for construction of the Shahabad Depot in Iran.

Transfer of dollars to Iran under the foreign assistance program.

Follow-up examination of certain aspects of U.S. assistance to the Central Treaty Organization for a rail link between Turkey and Iran.

Programing, delivery, and utilization of aircraft and related equipment furnished to the Pakistan Air Force under the military assistance program.

NATO cost sharing of military construction projects in Europe.

Administration of selected economic assistance projects and agreements in Iran.

Selected aspects of assistance to Ethiopia for airport facilities.

Grant of corn costing over $23,700,000 to the United Arab Republic.

Disposition of military assistance program materiel in France.

Use of sales proceeds from excess military assistance program materiel in the United Kingdom.

Sales of tallow under Public Law 480, title I, to the United Arab Republic.

Potential commercial markets for wheat in the United Arab Republic.

Expenditure of U.S. dollars for bags provided to the United Arab Republic for use in distributing corn granted under title II of Public Law 480.

FAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

Administration of a fixed communications system for the Government of Indonesia under the military assistance program.

Administration of military and economic assistance, Philippines.

Costs resulting from policy donating flour instead of wheat to voluntary relief agencies for distribution abroad under Public Law 480 (Taiwan).

Maintenance costs required to correct deficiencies in vehicles procured in Japan under the military assistance program.

Administration of agricultural market development activities in Japan.

Payments of living quarters allowances to certain military personnel on Taiwan.

Manpower utilized to administer military assistance in Japan.

Management of Nike Hercules missile systems furnished to the Republic of China (Taiwan) under the military assistance program.

Technical data received from Japanese vehicle manufacturers under the military assistance program.

Administration of U.S. assistance for selected development projects in Pakistan.

Management and utilization of commodities provided under the economic assistance program to the Republic of China (Taiwan).

Management of commodities provided to support the food-for-work program in Taiwan.

Management of local currencies owned or available to the United States in the Republic of Korea.

LATIN AMERICA

Dollar costs incurred in financing purchases of commodities produced in Brazil.

Costs incurred due to the use of an unfavorable exchange rate in converting dollars into Ecuadoran currency.

Administration of loans made to the Government of Costa Rica for budgetary support.

Justification of budgetary support loans made to the Government of Ecuador.

Administration of accommodation exchange service in Brazil.

Administration of the Public Law 480 program in Chile.

Payment of Colombian port charges for commodities donated under title III, Public Law 480.

WORLDWIDE OR GENERAL MATTERS

Administration of the training of foreign personnel under the military assistance program (Greece, Iran, Japan, Taiwan).

Audit of Export-Import Bank of Washington, fiscal year 1964.

Utilization of excess personal property in foreign assistance program (Japan, Korea, Thailand, Taiwan, Germany, Turkey).

Practice of transporting overseas U.S. Government personnel to and from work (Korea, Philippines, Thailand, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Bolivia, Paraguay).

Ocean transportation costs for surplus agricultural commodities donated under titles II and III, Public Law 480.

Use of excess U.S.-owned foreign currencies to pay international air travel ticket costs being paid in dollars.

Use of excess U.S.-owned foreign currencies to pay costs of transporting personal effects of U.S. officials traveling overseas.

Administration of claims from foreign governments for recovery of ocean transportation costs financed under Public Law 480.

Audit of consolidated financial statements for AID lending activities.

RECAPITULATION

Europe, Near East, and Africa	13
Far East and south Asia	13
Latin America	7
Worldwide or general matters	9
Total	42

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE WORK PLANS RELATING TO THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

We plan to give increasing attention to activities or programs for which several agencies or departments have responsibilities, such as the activities relating to the food-for-peace program (Public Law 480), the utilization and management of U.S.-owned foreign currencies, and the use and disposition of excess property in relation to foreign aid programs. We expect to search for opportunities to reduce costs without adverse effect on the objectives of these programs and wherever possible to develop specific recommendations for improved management controls over them. We expect to focus attention to the fullest extent practicable on the management aspects.

In recognition of the increasing proportion of foreign aid to Latin America in relation to other parts of the world we plan to increase our application of effort in Latin America as a geographic area. This will be accomplished by staffs traveling from the United States without decreasing our efforts in the Far East or Europe.

Our continuing plans and test reviews must of necessity be flexible and selective in order to recognize and be responsive to areas of congressional interest, changing conditions, and relative significance of the many aspects of the foreign aid activities. Primary emphasis will be toward completing and reporting to the Congress on the assignments

we have already in progress. Further work proposed for 1965 and 1966 includes selective projects for reviews within the areas of the following:

1. Public Law 480 activities: Algeria, Brazil, India, Korea, Mexico, specific elements affecting the program as a whole, such as transportation costs, foreign agents' commissions, budgetary controls, etc.

2. Administration of economic and military assistance: Brazil, India, Korea, Peru, specific elements of program management affecting more than one country, such as loan administration.

3. General:

Utilization and management of foreign currencies including top coordination among the several departments and agencies concerned, with test reviews in countries or of specific facets to be selected.

Excess property to be included as an element for consideration in reviews of economic and military assistance activities, and of AID management of excess property uses.

Followup of matters previously reported.

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. I am pleased to notice that Miss Bonnie Ann Utter of Wheatland, Wyo., is the winner of this contest for my State and I am pleased to insert at this point in my remarks her excellent paper entitled "The Challenge of Citizenship."

Her rallying cry is to "stand tall" to live up to the responsibilities of being an American in today's world and it is indeed a challenge which should win the support of all.

The paper referred to follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Bonnie Utter)

Standing tall in the crowds, looking high in the sky, we are citizens and our challenge is greater than all others.

Fifty years ago our Nation was in the midst of a great and terrible conflict. In World War I almost 9 million lives were lost. Twenty-five years later we were caught in another battle—the second of the world wars. Thirty-six million lives were lost.

In 50 years, vast changes have come about. Our positions as citizens differ, for better and for worse, from the position of our fathers and grandfathers 25 and 50 years ago. But the challenge has not changed from that of our fathers and grandfathers. In 1914 the world was dominated by fears and by the ambitions of a few great powers. In the 1930's the world was confronted with the horrors of dictatorship and by the prejudices of one people against another. Today, in the sixties, we face all these crises and we must overcome them. Our capacity to face realities must be developed to allow us to settle disputes that would have led to a major war in the strained conditions of 1914. Our challenge is to meet today's dangers and deal with them in a common effort to quiet the fears, to turn ambitions into peaceful strength, to develop dictatorships into stronger governments and to kill the cancer of racialism.

Citizenship extends beyond our own doors to the doorsteps of people of other lands. It is no longer morally or politically acceptable for advanced nations to ignore the backward helplessness of a less advanced nation. Ours is the obligation to avoid disaster and misery for ourselves and others. To prevent war is to not only save our country from untold sorrow but other countries also. Our challenge is to strive for peace for the good of all.

With peace as our goal, other great challenges are met too. Individual dignity as well as united strength develops with patriotism. We are able to stand in a crowd and be free and united in one person. We have the satisfaction of knowing that our brother standing next to us, be he white or black, has the same freedom of feeling that we have. With dedicated citizens comes a pride in national economic and political standards.

Our challenge is to evaluate the past, deal with the present and prepare for the future. If we answer our challenge we can stand tall and look up to a peaceful and prideful reward.

FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the fourth anniversary in the life of the Peace Corps. When President John Kennedy signed the Executive order for this agency on March 1, 1962, few of us anticipated the successes which the Peace Corps would achieve for the United States.

The successes are, indeed, many, and are meaningful. How many of us realized 4 years ago that we would have on this date requests from over 70 countries for Peace Corps volunteers? Even more, how many of us realized that almost 9,000 volunteers would be abroad in 46 countries, and that by the end of the summer we would have in training and at work almost 15,000 volunteers? It is a remarkable achievement for this Nation.

The concept and creation of the Peace Corps stands as a tribute to President Kennedy. It will be to President Johnson's lasting credit that he has so strongly supported an expansion of the capability of the Peace Corps by requesting legislation which will allow 17,000 volunteers to be put into training or actual service by the end of August 1966.

The complexities of balancing the interests of this country's citizens with those of other nations is a delicate one. As citizens and as Members of Congress, we face problems which require the fullest utilization of our energies and the strongest assertion of our leadership. We are continually looking for a better way to help freedom-loving nations around the globe. Some of the proposed solutions have not been as effective as we would like them to be—others have.

We realize that we may not find total answers, and that problems will continue to persist throughout our generation and beyond. In the Peace Corps programs, we have found, after 4 years, a partial answer to some of the complex problems with which we are confronted. With the Peace Corps volunteers as our envoys, this country can demonstrate its sincere and worthwhile desire to exist with all nations without conflict. We can show that our citizens, from every corner of the United States, have a sincere desire to exchange ideas and to work for the betterment of our friends, to teach them, to help them improve their abilities to help themselves. The idea of the Peace Corps is relatively new in the histories of nations. In the long mark of time, the Peace Corps has not accomplished absolutes. The volunteers have not provided a total change or total development for the citizens of any country.

What it has done is begin, just begin, to show men and women in all parts of the world that we do want to help, in whatever way we are able. The Peace Corps has brought for some the first gleam of promise. It has shown the way for some people who have enjoyed no succcess, and who have little or no understanding of how to succeed. These Peace Corps volunteers who are living with the people of 46 nations bring with them some measure of ability to provide new ideas, new hope, and a new spirit. The 4 years of the Peace Corps have been just the start on a long pull. But these 4 years have provided a solid base for the further development of nations and the strengthening of friendships between nations.

I take great pride in having seen the Peace Corps come into being and become an integral part of our way of life here in the United States. I am glad to wish the best to the Peace Corps on its anniversary, and to extend my congratulations for its 4 successful years.

FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my esteemed chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], in calling to the attention of our colleagues the fact that today is the fourth anniversary of the Peace Corps.

It was 4 years ago that the late President John F. Kennedy signed into law the legislation establishing the Peace Corps organization. Many of us here today witnessed that historic event.

How short a time ago that seems. Yet in months since, the Peace Corps sent thousands of American men and women of all ages into foreign lands around the globe. Of those, many already have returned to enrich the fabric of American life with their experiences. Thousands more have taken their places and now labor abroad.

In 4 short years the Peace Corps has gone from an idea embodied in an act of Congress to an organization which enjoys the respect of all Americans and a worldwide reputation for accomplishment.

For this new agency, the 4 years have been busy ones and full of some difficult times. The achievements have been significant, however, and the praises deserving.

The concept of the Peace Corps is a unique one. Perhaps the concept can be illustrated through an old world proverb which has been repeated many times in this country. It goes something like this: If I give you a dollar, and you give me a dollar, we do not realize any gain; but if I give you an idea, and you give me an idea in return, then each of us has two ideas and we have truly made a profit.

This old saying illustrates what the Peace Corps has been doing in its 4 years. The agency is not intended to administer the exchange of material goods. The Peace Corps is designed to serve as a catalyst of ideas and ideals. With the volunteers' enthusiasm and desire as the magic ingredient, we are able to take small parts of this country's way of life and offer it to the people who want our help.

The volunteers are, in many ways, the reflection of what this country has best to offer its friends: an intense desire, an honest one, to take the extra step toward peace; to walk the extra mile to help our neighbors where we can; to journey down any road to do what we hope is our share of accepting the responsibilities of a successful nation.

I am advised there will be nearly 15,000 volunteers overseas by the end of this year. Their stock-in-trade is the good will of the American people. In their kit bags are the simple American tools of hard work, patience, some know-how, but more than anything else—a desire to help.

The Peace Corps is people to people. The volunteers get out into the villages and rural areas. They live in the crowded neighborhoods of the large cities. They shop in the marketplace, and work shoulder to shoulder with men and women in all levels of the communities.

The Peace Corps has a vitality which seems to be contagious. The number of applications for volunteer openings continues to grow, providing the source for a continued expansion. Rather than showing signs of middle age, I would say the Peace Corps is taking on the look of increased determination to do its job, confident with the knowledge that it has done a good job, and that it can do more.

In commemorating this notable occasion, I want to extend my sincere congratulations to Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver. He, more than any other individual, can be credited with organizing the Peace Corps, formulating its programs and guiding it through 4 years of successful operation.

Commendations must also go to the fine professional staff which Director Shriver has assembled. Both in the field and in the Corps' Washington headquarters, they have served with an enthusiasm and a dedication which is an example to all who serve in the Government of the United States.

Further, our Nation owes a debt of sincere gratitude to all those who are serving, or who have served, in the Peace Corps. These volunteers have left the comforts of their homes and the security of the familiar to work for the betterment of their fellowmen in far-off places of the world which are neither comfortable nor secure.

In doing so they have written a glorious, indelible page in American history. Long after the alarms and excursions of our own day are long forgotten, men will still be inspired and motivated by the sacrifices of these thousands of Americans.

Therefore, I am proud today to take note of the Peace Corps' fourth anniversary, to wish it happy birthday. I hope for its continued success, and wish its staff and volunteers Godspeed.

CLOSING DOWN OF VA HOSPITALS AND REGIONAL OFFICES—IT'S TIME FOR SOME ANSWERS

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, for several weeks now a rumor has been circulating among Members of this House that VA closings announced January 14 were only the first in a series of wholesale closings of VA facilities. It would now appear that the cat is so far out of the bag that a syndicated columnist thinks he has good reason to state it in print.

I refer to the disturbing statements of the columnist, Leslie Carpenter, in his column "Washington Beat," appearing in the Washington Post of Saturday, February 27. That column not only reports that about a dozen more VA hospitals and many more regional offices will be shut down in the near future, but it also alludes to a Veterans' Administration report now pending before the Bureau of the Budget that the VA "can get along satisfactorily with 15 regional offices," a substantial reduction from the current 67 offices.

But that is not all. In this same story Mr. Carpenter points out that VA officials believe "the need for Veterans' Administration hospitals is diminishing with the likelihood of medicare."

Does this mean passage of a hospital insurance program will force all veterans to accept the limited and inadequate coverage provided therein? If so, we are about to witness a complete departure from the time honored concept of the role of the Veterans' Administration in providing full medical services to our aging and chronically ill veteran population.

Mr. Speaker, if there is a plan to reduce further the number of VA hospitals in this country by at least a dozen and reduce VA regional offices to only 15, and if there is some scheme in the planning stage to transfer some functions of the Veterans' Administration to Health, Education, and Welfare or some other welfare agency after enactment of the proposed hospital insurance program, then Mr. Driver has a responsibility and a duty to spell out his plans right now before the Congress works its will on the proposed medicare bill—not several months or a year from now. If the reports of the Administrator's plans are correct, Congress should have an opportunity to provide adequate alternatives and safeguards for our aging veteran population under the initial provisions of any medical care bill that might be enacted.

If the VA Administrator is not inclined to come forward of his own accord with a clear statement of his long-range plans, then the members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs should interrogate him thoroughly, so that all Members of the Congress and the people of this country can know what measure of care our veterans can expect to receive in the future.

It is time for straight talk without any evasive answers. Let us find out now whether the Veterans' Administration is about to change its policy of providing full and adequate care for America's aging and disabled veterans.

FEDERAL TAX EXEMPTION FOR STATE AND LOCAL FINANCING OF INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL FACILITIES MUST BE ENDED

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I submit a joint statement by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] and by myself, issued today in connection with the introduction of H.R. 5586, H.R. 5598, H.R. 5587, and H.R. 5599:

STATEMENT CONCERNING FEDERAL TAX EXEMPTION FOR STATE AND LOCAL FINANCING OF INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL FACILITIES

(By Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI and Congressman HENRY S. REUSS)

The Federal Government has long accorded to State and local governments the privilege of issuing tax-exempt securities to finance public facilities and services—like schools, hospitals, roads, and sewers. On such tax-exempt securities, the Federal Government foregoes tax revenues which are, in effect, subsidies to local governments. So long as these subsidies are for basic public purposes, the burden on the Federal taxpayer can be justified.

But when States, their subdivisions, or their dummy corporations issue tax-exempt securities to finance the construction of industrial or commercial facilities for sale or lease to private, profitmaking corporations, they are invading the private domain. Under the cloak of public purpose, they are merely funneling the benefits of cheaper, tax-exempt financing to private entities which have no right whatsoever to tax exemption. This raid on the Federal Treasury, through abuse of a tax privilege intended for other purposes, cannot be justified.

The cash benefits which a large corporation can receive from tax-exempt financing of industrial facilities are substantial. In the

first place, tax exemption reduces the cost of borrowing to build plants from 1 to 2 percentage points for even the most creditworthy industrial corporation. Secondly, by electing to lease rather than to purchase publicly financed facilities, the tenant can frequently charge off rental cost on a basis more advantageous than it can by taking depreciation on self-financed facilities. Also, as a lessor rather than an owner of industrial property, a corporation can avoid paying property taxes. Thirdly, by itself purchasing the tax-exempt securities, a corporation can earn tax-exempt income while it enjoys a lower rental cost due to tax-exempt borrowing.

THE RACE TO MISUSE LOCAL TAX-EXEMPTION PRIVILEGES

Until the mid-1950's, few States had provided themselves or their subdivisions with the authority to issue tax-exempt bonds for industrial purposes. But from about 1957 on, the race has been on. States, cities, towns, villages, development agencies, and even artificially created "municipal" districts have scurried to avail themselves of this key to the Federal Treasury.

As late as 1960 only nine States had legislation permitting local governments or their creatures to engage in tax-exempt industrial financing. Today, 27 States have passed such legislation. The local communities of less than 10 States are using the authority today in a substantial way. But soon, local governments of every States in the Union may feel they must do likewise in self-defense.

The volume of tax-exempt industrial financing undertaken by States and local governments has climbed alarmingly in the past few years. A recent University of Wisconsin study puts the total to date at around $1 billion. This total is likely to continue to grow at an accelerating rate. Not only will more localities get into the act. The size of individual issues can be expected to increase. The reason is that the device of the tax-exempt industrial revenue bond enables even tiny communities to market huge issues—issues based on the credit ratings of beneficiary corporations rather than the credit ratings of the issuing public entity.

Here are some recent examples of large-scale diversions of tax-exemption benefits to major corporations:

1. Cutler-Hammer Corp. of Milwaukee: On March 12, 1964, this Milwaukee company announced that it would move a part of its manufacturing operations to Bowling Green, Ky., sometime in 1965. Some 750 skilled workers will lose their Milwaukee jobs as a result. While the company stated that lower wages and taxes in the new location were responsible for its decision, an important reason was the offer by the city of Bowling Green to build a new factory for the company. The city council on March 13, 1964, voted to authorize the issuance of $6,500,000 in tax-free revenue bonds for use to build a plant for Cutler-Hammer Corp.

2. Harvey Aluminum Co.: In October 1963, Lewisport, Ky., announced a $50 million revenue bond issue to build a new aluminum rolling mill for Harvey Aluminum Co. This is like a gnat trying to carry an elephant. Harvey Aluminum enjoys $75 million per year annual sales. It is the fifth largest aluminum producer in the United States. Lewisport, Ky., is a community of 780 persons on the Ohio River. How was Lewisport able to find buyers for its huge bond issue? Though Lewisport can confer its tax exemption privilege on the bonds, Harvey Aluminum's soundness as a business was the indispensable ingredient for making the bonds attractive to investors. One of the company's bankers, the Bank of America, headed a syndicate to take up an $8 million share.

3. R. H. Macy & Co.: Macy's, the well-known New York department store, suggested to the city of Topeka that Macy's buy land in downtown Topeka, build a store and a 300-car parking garage, and then sell the whole thing to the city, on a lease-back arrangement. To pay for this purchase, the city offered to issue a tax-exempt $3,700,000 revenue bond, and to rent the facilities to Macy's for 40 years. Since the city will own the building, Macy's will not be subject to real estate taxes for 10 years. In lieu of these taxes, it is reported that Macy's will pay Topeka about $50,000 annually for 40 years on a prime downtown location.

ECONOMIC DANGERS OF LOCAL TAX-EXEMPT INDUSTRIAL FINANCING

The economic effects of local tax-exempt industrial financing are no less objectionable than its effect on the Federal tax structure. The do-it-yourself system of diverting Federal funds to private enterprises avoids the inconvenience of having to obtain the consent of the Federal Government. But it is a costly and self-defeating way to stimulate industrial development for the local communities concerned as well as for the Nation as a whole.

1. It undermines Federal economic programs for local development.

The Federal Government is concerned not only to keep the economy as a whole expanding through general economic policies like the tax cut. It is also very much concerned with the special problems of States and localities with high and persistent unemployment. To this end, the area redevelopment, small business, and accelerated public works programs were devised, and there is now pending a new general program for the multi-State Appalachian region.

In each of these programs it is an objective to help particular areas in ways which will not create distress in others. For example, both the area redevelopment and public works programs expressly prohibit the use of Federal funds for plant pirating and the export of unemployment to presently healthy areas. It is the aim of all these programs to establish and to encourage industrial development which is appropriate for the resource base of a given locality and economically beneficial for the country as a whole.

But efforts to administer Federal programs in a responsible manner will be undermined if an increasing number of local governments help themselves to Federal funds. Few States require their local units to observe standards approaching those of Federal programs, and local governments themselves show no disposition to go in for self-denying guidelines.

2. It encourages plant pirating. With the lure of tax-exempt financing, major companies can be enticed away from their present locations. When this happens, unemployment, reduced purchasing power, higher welfare costs, and a reduced tax base are the lot of communities losing plants.

The Milwaukee Association of Commerce estimated that the loss of 750 manufacturing jobs due to the shift of Cutler-Hammer operations from Milwaukee to Kentucky would result in losses of $5,325,000 in personal incomes; $2,482,500 in retail sales; $1,717,500 in bank deposits; and nearly 500 additional jobs in trade, services, and other nonmanufacturing occupations which depend on the good incomes earned by Milwaukee's manufacturing workers. This is a high price to pay for the development of industry in Kentucky.

3. It encourages uneconomic plant location. Even when the pirating of existing facilities does not take place, local governments acting independently can bring about uneconomic location of new industrial capacity. When the powerful cost incentives of tax-exempt financing are thrown into the balance, businesses can be tempted to pass up locations better suited to their future expansion. This is tantamount to plant piracy postponed to the future. It ill serves the Nation faced with the problem of providing for productive employment of millions coming into the labor force in the years immediately ahead. This will be possible only if the economic base is strong and healthy and able to grow under all competitor conditions, without the prop of public subsidy.

4. It encourages costly, self-defeating bidding for plants.

Interstate competition for industry through the subsidy route is costly and self-defeating. If established industrial areas lose existing plants or fail to get their share of new plants, they also will be driven to pay out subsidies. This in turn will push communities gaining plants to raise the ante on subsidies to hold their gains.

The Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, which has been concerned with this "war between the States," predicted in a December 1963, report that the step following tax-exempt financing might be interest-free loans to corporations. And, then, it said, outright capital gifts might be necessary.

This beggar-thy-neighbor competition can only result in beggaring all the participants.

5. It erodes the tax base of local government.

The direct cost of payments to private businesses will be only part of the cost of this type of competition for industry. As more and more industrial property moves into State ownership, the tax base of States and local communities is diminished. Meanwhile, the demand for public services will continue to go up sharply. This means higher local taxes on individuals and businesses not enjoying subsidy privileges.

More pressure will be placed on Federal taxpayers to increase their direct aid to State and local governments to meet the needs for more schools, more hospitals, more utilities, and other public services.

6. It aids low-wage, nonunionized areas.

The whole country loses when job security rights and good wages obtained through collective bargaining are canceled by departures of large corporations to small, nonunionized, low-wage areas. If this happens in the normal course of competition, it is regrettable but not the responsibility of the Federal Government. But if it happens with the aid of Federal subsidy, the Government must recognize that its economic power is being used in an undesirable way.

7. It weakens the private enterprise system.

When local governments use tax-exempt funds to construct plants for corporations and retain ownership of the plants over the lifetime of 20- to 40-year leases, they distort and weaken basic features of the free enterprise system.

State ownership of plants run for profit is itself a big step torward socialism and alien to the private enterprise system. More subtle damage occurs to established businesses when a few of them get large tax subsidies that are denied the rest. This is especially true when local governments hand over the windfall gains of tax-exempt financing to the biggest, best heeled corporations which already have financial and economic advantages over their competitors. Furthermore, the withdrawal of such corporations from the normal private capital market weakens the corporate bond market. At the same time, the municipal bond market dealing in ordinary public issues of States and their subdivisions is thrown into chaos by the hybird corporate bonds purporting to be municipals.

RESPONSIBLE OPINION AGAINST TAX-EXEMPTION FOR INDUSTRIAL FINANCING

Responsible opinion is lining up against the abuse by local governments of the Federal tax-exemption privilege to subsidize private businesses.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, established by Congress in 1959 and composed of a blue-ribbon group of State Governors, mayors, Congressmen, and other public officials made a major study of the problem in 1963.

Opposition to the tax-exemption abuse or warnings against the practice have been expressed by the Investment Bankers Association, the National Association of Counties, the American Bar Association, the Municipal Finance Officers Association, and the Securities and Exchange Commission. Barron's and the Bond Buyer have condemned the practice in strong editorials.

The Area Redevelopment Administration, charged with the duty of increasing industrial employment in depressed local communities, is opposed to the practice of offering tax-exempt financing to lure industries to those areas. Mr. Victor Roterus, Economic Adviser to the ARA Administrator, said in his April 20, 1964, speech to the State Fiscal Officers' convention in Atlanta:

"ARA is definitely against the use of the device. Growing usage of this device—particularly its adoption by relatively prosperous urban areas—can result only in nonproductive raiding of industries at the outset, and ultimately in a more or less equalized competitive situation among the areas. In such a situation, no one benefits and, indeed, everyone suffers because public tax revenues have been sacrificed and normal taxing and tax burden patterns have become disorganized.

"Factory raiding by one area at the expense of another by and large merely creates a new economic problem in the attempt to solve an old one. The practice, from the national viewpoint, is largely nonproductive and disrupting, and tends to provoke rancor among the various sections of the country.

"The effect of the bond device on the relations between various areas is no less disquieting. The use of tax-exempt bonds to build factories puts an unwarranted strain on Federal practices to equalize educational opportunities and other public services, and tends to distort these patterns to the point where compensating adjustments in policy may be occasioned."

In an appearance before the House Banking and Currency Committee on February 9, 1965, Treasury Secretary Dillon said that in his opinion, the use of tax-exempt bonds for industrial purposes was "a dangerous practice, and it would be wise for Congress to put an end to it." The Secretary said that the area redevelopment and the proposed Appalachia programs are the proper ways to bring new industry into depressed areas and not "indiscriminate use of the tax system." He agreed that unless the issuance of tax-exempt bonds for industrial development were curtailed by congressional action, "sooner or later, it is perfectly inevitable that practically every State will adopt this procedure." He went on to say that this competition among States would result in a "substantial erosion of Federal revenues."

Chairman Gardiner Ackley, of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, stated to the Joint Economic Committee on February 19, 1965:

"I think it does appear to be a problem and I would—if it is feasible, it sounds to me as though Secretary Dillon is on the right track in suggesting that this is a problem which may require legislation."

Budget Director Kermit Gordon, in response to a question during Joint Economic Committee hearings on February 23, 1965, replied:

"I must say that it strikes me as an individual that this may well be a quite questionable use of the tax exemption authority and there is a question in my mind as to whether the whole purpose of tax exemption was meant to extend to this kind of borrowing."

The West Allis Chamber of Commerce of the city of Milwaukee unanimously adopted a resolution condemning tax-exempt financing of industry and requesting remedial legislation by the Congress. The text of the resolution follows:

"Whereas the use of tax exempt State and local government securities continues to become more widespread; and

"Whereas this practice compels other communities to adopt the same procedures to be able to remain competitive in the field of attracting new industry and the expansion of existing plants; and

"Whereas industry raiding by one area at the expense of another, creates a new economic problem, is nonproductive, disrupting, tends to provoke rancor among States and municipalities and in addition, public tax revenues are sacrificed; and

"Whereas the continued intervention of government in business decisions, weakens the free enterprise economy: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the West Allis Chamber of Commerce again reiterate, its support of the free enterprise system particularly when government intervenes to affect entirely industry decisions; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the preferable course of action is to apply solutions that are built upon the firm foundation of a private enterprise economic system, which would result in a strengthening of individual initiative and incentive, free competitive markets and limited government; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the West Allis Chamber of Commerce urge the Wisconsin congressional delegation to seek immediate remedial legislation in the 89th Congress, which would halt this undesirable, disruptive trend on the part of government; and be it finally

"*Resolved,* That the West Allis Chamber of Commerce seek widespread support of other organizations in implementing the purposes of this resolution."

PROPOSED ACTION

There are two ways in which tax-exempt industrial financing can be stopped while the traditional tax immunity of State and local financing for public purposes is safeguarded.

One way, which seeks to impose indirect curbs, is set forth in H.R. 5586 and in H.R. 5598, which we have submitted today. These bills provide that whenever proceeds from a tax-exempt bond issue are used to construct facilities for sale or lease to private, profitmaking firms, firms occupying such facilities may not deduct rent or other payments related to the use of the facilities in computing their Federal income tax liability.

The second way is incorporated in H.R. 5587 and in H.R. 5599, also submitted today. These bills take the direct approach and provide that tax exemption shall be removed on State and local obligations to the extent that proceeds of any issue are used to construct industrial or commercial facilities for sale or lease to private profitmaking enterprises. Purchasers of such securities can be assured of the extent to which tax exemption applies through a certification procedure stipulated in the bills. Further, it is stipulated that the removal of the tax exemption applies only to funds used to build and equip factory buildings and not to the purchase of land. This distinction is made to protect local governments in activities such as the urban renewal or land bank programs where purchase of land is required for public purposes. There is also added a provision to make clear that the removal of tax exemption under the circumstances detailed in the bill in no way encroaches upon the privilege of States and their subdivisions to enjoy continued tax immunity on securities issued for traditional public purposes.

We express no strong preference for either approach. Each has strengths that the alternative does not. We believe that during committee hearings, the proponents of each approach should be heard. The important thing is that the Congress should act promptly to end the growing abuse of the tax-exemption privilege.

H.R. 5586

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to curb the tax-exempt financing of industrial or commercial facilities used for private profitmaking purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part IX of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items not deductible) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 276. CERTAIN PAYMENTS TO ISSUER OF TAX-EXEMPT OBLIGATIONS.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—No deductions shall be allowed for any amount paid or accrued (including interest on a mortgage and taxes) to a State, the District of Columbia, a possession of the United States, or any political subdivision or instrumentality of any of the foregoing, relating to the use or occupancy of an industrial or commercial facility acquired, constructed, or improved (in whole or in part) out of the proceeds of industrial development obligations.

"(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) INDUSTRIAL OR COMMERCIAL FACILITY.—The term 'industrial or commercial facility' means any building or equipment—

"(A) which is or will be used primarily for the mining, manufacturing, assembling, fabricating, storing, processing, or sale of articles or commodities (including any building or equipment the use of which is incidental to such mining, manufacturing, assembling, fabricating, storing, processing, or sale), and

"(B) a substantial portion of which has been or will be sold or leased to nonpublic enterprises.

Such term does not include land (or interests in land).

"(2) INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT OBLIGATION.—The term 'industrial development obligation' means any obligation which is issued (whether before or after the acquisition, construction, or improvement of the industrial or commercial facility involved) by a State, the District of Columbia, a possession of the United States, or any political subdivision or instrumentality of any of the foregoing, to finance directly or indirectly the acquisition, construction, or improvement of an industrial or commercial facility, and the interest on which is wholly exempt from the taxes imposed by this subtitle. For purposes of the preceding sentence, where a State or other governmental unit borrows money through a bank loan or otherwise, such governmental unit shall be treated as having issued an obligation at the time of such borrowing."

(b) The table of sections for part IX of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 276. Certain payments to issuer of tax-exempt obligations."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act, and only in the case of amounts paid or accrued with respect to the use or occupancy of an industrial plant acquired, constructed, or improved with the proceeds of industrial development obligations issued after the date of the enactment of this Act.

H.R. 5598

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to curb the tax-exempt financing of industrial or commercial facilities used for private profitmaking purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part IX of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items not deductible) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 276. CERTAIN PAYMENTS TO ISSUER OF TAX-EXEMPT OBLIGATIONS.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—No deduction shall be allowed for any amount paid or accrued (including interest on a mortgage and taxes) to a State, the District of Columbia, a possession of the United States, or any political subdivision or instrumentality of any of the foregoing, relating to the use of occupancy of an industrial or commercial facility acquired, constructed, or improved (in whole or in part) out of the proceeds of industrial development obligations.

"(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) INDUSTRIAL OR COMMERCIAL FACILITY.—The term 'industrial or commercial facility' means any building or equipment—

"(A) which is or will be used primarily for the mining, manufacturing, assembling, fabricating, storing, processing, or sale of articles or commodities (including any building or equipment the use of which is incidental to such mining, manufacturing, assembling, fabricating, storing, processing, or sale), and

"(B) a substantial portion of which has been or will be sold or leased to nonpublic enterprises.

Such term does not include land (or interests in land).

"(2) INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT OBLIGATION.—The term 'industrial development obligation' means any obligation which is issued (whether before or after the acquisition, construction, or improvement of the industrial or commercial facility involved) by a State, the District of Columbia, a possession of the United States, or any political subdivision or instrumentality of any of the foregoing, to finance directly or indirectly the acquisition, construction, or improvement of an industrial or commercial facility, and the interest on which is wholly exempt from the taxes imposed by this subtitle. For purposes of the preceding sentence, where a State or other governmental unit borrows money through a bank loan or otherwise, such governmental unit shall be treated as having issued an obligation at the time of such borrowing."

(b) The table of sections of part IX of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 276. Certain payments to issuer of tax-exempt obligations."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act, and only in the case of amounts paid or accrued with respect to the use or occupancy of an industrial plant acquired, constructed, or improved with the proceeds of industrial development obligations issued after the date of the enactment of this Act.

H.R. 5587

A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the tax exemption for interest on State or local obligations issued to finance industrial or commercial facilities to be sold or leased to private profitmaking enterprises

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress and the purpose of this legislation—

(1) to encroach in no way whatsoever upon the rights of the States and local governments to issue for any purpose which may be a public purpose obligations the interest on which is wholly exempt from Federal income taxation, but

(2) to provide that a similar exemption will not continue to be available for subsidizing the financing of industrial and commercial facilities to be sold or leased to private profitmaking enterprises.

SEC. 2. Section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to interest on certain governmental obligations) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) OBLIGATIONS TO FINANCE INDUSTRIAL OR COMMERCIAL FACILITIES.—

"(1) INCLUSION IN INCOME.—Notwithstanding subsection (a)(1), where part or all of the amount which the issuing authority receives from the issuance of an obligation described in subsection (a)(1) is to be used for industrial development purposes, a like percentage of each interest installment on such obligation shall be included in gross income. For purposes of the preceding sentence, where a State or other governmental unit borrows money through a bank loan or otherwise, such governmental unit shall be treated as having issued an obligation at the time of such borrowing.

"(2) CERTIFICATION BY ISSUING AUTHORITY TO BE FINAL.—For purposes of this subsection, a certification by the issuing authority—

"(A) that no part of the amount received from the issuance of an obligation is to be used for industrial development purposes, or

"(B) specifying the percentage of the amount received from the issuance of an obligation which is to be used for industrial development purposes,

shall be final and conclusive.

"(3) USE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT PURPOSES.—

"(A) For purposes of this subsection, an amount is to be used for industrial development purposes to the extent it is to be used to finance directly or indirectly the acquisition, construction, or improvement (whether occurring before or after the issuance of the obligation) of one or more industrial or commercial facilities.

"(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'industrial or commercial facility' means any building or equipment—

"(i) which is or will be used primarily for the mining, manufacturing, assembling, fabricating, storing, processing, or sale of articles or commodities (including any building or equipment the use of which is incidental to such mining, manufacturing, assembling, fabricating, storing, processing, or sale), and

"(ii) a substantial portion of which has been or will be sold or leased to nonpublic enterprises.

Such term does not include land (or interests in land)."

SEC. 3. The amendment made by section 2 of this Act shall apply only to obligations issued after the date of the enactment of this Act.

H.R. 5599

A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the tax exemption for interest on State or local obligations issued to finance industrial or commercial facilities to be sold or leased to private profitmaking enterprises

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress and the purpose of this legislation—

(1) to encroach in no way whatsoever upon the rights of the States and local governments to issue for any purpose which may be a public purpose obligations the interest on which is wholly exempt from Federal income taxation, but

(2) to provide that a similar exemption will not continue to be available for subsidizing the financing of industrial and commercial facilities to be sold or leased to private profitmaking enterprises.

SEC. 2. Section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to interest on certain governmental obligations) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) OBLIGATION TO FINANCIAL INDUSTRIAL OR COMMERCIAL FACILITIES.—

"(1) INCLUSION IN INCOME.—Notwithstanding subsection (a)(1), where part or all of the amount which the issuing authority receives from the issuance of an obligation described in subsection (a)(1) is to be used for industrial development purposes, a like percentage of each interest installment on such obligation shall be included in gross income. For purposes of the preceding sentence, where a State or other governmental unit borrows money through a bank loan or otherwise, such governmental unit shall be treated as having issued an obligation at the time of such borrowing.

"(2) CERTIFICATION BY ISSUING AUTHORITY TO BE FINAL.—For purposes of this subsection, a certification by the issuing authority—

"(A) that no part of the amount received from the issuance of an obligation is to be used for industrial development purposes, or

"(B) specifying the percentage of the amount received from the issuance of an obligation which is to be used for industrial development purposes, shall be final and conclusive.

"(3) USE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT PURPOSES.—

"(A) For purposes of this subsection, an amount is to be used for industrial development purposes to the extent it is to be used to finance directly or indirectly the acquisition, construction, or improvement (whether occurring before or after the issuance of the obligation) of one or more industrial or commercial facilities.

"(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'industrial or commercial facility' means any building or equipment—

"(i) which is or will be used primarily for the mining, manufacturing, assembling, fabricating, storing, processing, or sale of articles or commodities (including any building or equipment the use of which is incidental to such mining, manufacturing, assembling, fabricating, storing, processing, or sale), and

"(ii) a substantial portion of which has been or will be sold or leased to nonpublic enterprises.

Such term does not include land (or interests in land)."

SEC. 3. The amendment made by section 2 of this Act shall apply only to obligations issued after the date of the enactment of this Act.

COMMENDATION TO EDITORS OF THE DAILY NORTHWESTERN

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, there is poetic justice in the fact that com-

plaints of college students have caused Federal, county, and city authorities in Seattle, Wash., to launch an investigation of an automatic device which appears to be tailored to encourage classroom cheating by U.S. college students.

I commend the editors of the Daily Northwestern, student newspaper of Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., for their series of articles exposing the sale by mail of this device. Their action shows that the quality of honesty is not strained among all the students of our universities.

While these particular students attend Northwestern University, I am certain they could just as well have been enrolled at any one of our universities. This incident demonstrates that American college students are quick to see a challenge to their integrity and character.

I am especially pleased to commend Al From, editor of the Daily Northwestern and a native of South Bend, Ind., in my congressional district, for his fine efforts in this public disclosure, and I want also to salute Andrew H. Malcolm for his outstanding contribution to college journalism.

The editors of the Daily Northwestern first learned of the "PockeTutor" when a Northwestern freshman told them of receiving a pamphlet in the mail advertisting a battery-powered, pocket-viewing study-aid device that propels a self-transcribed tape past a viewing window.

The pamphlet stated:

You may study at a moment's notice since you carry it with you in your pocket or handbag. By simply glancing at the viewing window, you study material, formulas, equations; text items can be easily visible to you, even without others knowing * * * PockeTutor can put you at the top of your class.

The producer listed a Seattle address.

The pamphlet pictured the device as barely larger than a package of cigarettes—comfortable, use in shirt or packet pocket.

In addition to the "PockeTutor," listed for sale at $19.95, the pamphlet advertised a wristwatch control accessory which affords an ultimate of convenience and ease of operation—requires only a tilt of the wrist to start or stop the viewing tape.

Mr. Malcolm's articles, which led to the investigation of the "PockeTutor" follow:

[From the Daily Northwestern, Feb. 19, 1965]

WEST COAST FIRM BUILDS MACHINES TO STOP AWFUL CHEATING SCANDALS

(By Andrew H. Malcolm, assistant managing editor)

American capitalism has done it again. It has developed a product to eliminate the type of cheating exposed recently at the Air Force Academy.

Not by eliminating the cheating. But by eliminating the catching.

A west coast firm has built and is selling a tiny, battery-powered machine "barely larger than a package of cigarettes" which fits in a shirt pocket and is controlled by a switch under the student's wristwatch (honest).

THE POCKETCHEATER

To avoid libel problems (this is for real), we'll change the product's name to "the Pocketcheater."

The firm calls the mechanism "truly a dramatic breakthrough in easier learning through repeated exposure of facts, drawings, figures under direct, immediate viewing."

The company's slogan goes: "Better Grades Through Study Aids."

Before an exam all a student must do is write answers, equations, verb forms, or anything on a small tape. When he flicks his wrist, the tape winds slowly and silently past a viewing window on the top of the packet.

Thus all you need to do is casually bend your wrist and look down. Then when the answer passes by the window, you unbend your wrist. And you've got an A.

The firm has evidently sent out flyers to several Northwestern University students. These colorful pamphlets proclaim Pocketcheater "can put you at the top of your class."

FILLS "UNUSUAL NEED"

According to its builders, Pocketcheater (which sells for $19.95) "can fill an unusual need of memory requirement in many fields and assist in quick results a great variety of ways."

And for an extra $9.95 the company will include a fake wristwatch which controls the mechanism. It even has different speeds, probably one for mid-terms and one for longer finals.

"Now you can study or memorize on impulse," the pamphlet says. And it adds: "By simply glancing at the viewing window, your study material, formulas, equations, text items can be easily visible to you, even without others knowing.

"You will study during moments you might otherwise find wasted."

And as for coeducation schools: "Women students slip it into your purse or handbag for handy use anywhere."

With the Vietnam situation the way it is, the only patriotic thing to do is mail in your check and get your Pocketcheater so you won't flunk out and get drafted.

[From the Daily Northwestern, Feb. 23, 1965]

AT DAILY NORTHWESTERN PROMPTING: SEATTLE BETTER BUSINESS BUREAU WILL PROBE "TUTOR"

(By Andrew H. Malcolm, assistant managing editor)

The Seattle, Wash., Better Business Bureau, prompted by a Daily Northwestern inquiry, promised to open a full-scale investigation today of a mail-order firm's selling pocket-size "visual prompters" to college students.

Frank J. Zeorlin, the bureau's director, told the Daily Monday he would begin the investigation this morning.

The visual prompter, called PockeTutor, sells for $19.95. Its makers, Study Aid Products, list a Seattle address. Several Northwestern students received hand-addressed brochures by mail last week.

Described as "barely larger than a package of cigarettes," the battery-powered machine fits in a shirt pocket and can be controlled by a switch under a fake wristwatch.

TRANSPARENT WINDOW

When a student bends his wrist, a roll of paper (with equations, formulas, or anything on it) unwinds past a transparent window on the top of the package. The machine has obvious possibilities for cheating on exams, though no such mention is made in the advertisement.

Zeorlin, reached by telephone at his Seattle home, said the first step in the investigation would be to check the bureau's downtown files. Offices were closed Monday for George Washington's Birthday.

HADN'T HEARD

"I haven't heard of this company," Zeorlin said.

He said that his staff would consult with Seattle police.

"I don't like the looks of this," Zeorlin said after hearing a description of the product and the brochure sent to Northwestern University students.

"This isn't good for students, business, or Seattle. And we, along with the bunko squad, will take a close look at the operation in the next couple days."

The Daily first learned of the project when a Northwestern University freshman told of receiving the pamphlet in the mail. All Northwestern University students who have received such brochures should notify the Daily, campus 3200 or 475–6455.

Some North Shore State legislators also expressed interest in investigating the product.

PROMISES INVESTIGATION

Representative John A. Kennedy, Democrat, of Winnetka, said he would investigate the possibility of a State law against such products or similar advertising. "Personally, I think this is the kind of thing that should be brought before the State senate and house," he said.

"If we can't stop its sale, at least we can warn people and control its advertising."

In its advertisements the company claims "PockeTutor Can Put You at the Top of Your Class." And adds, "text items can be easily visible to you, even without others knowing."

PERFECT MEMORY

"Available to you now * * * a perfect memory in your pocket," the brochure says.

The machine also has various speeds and direction of the tape may be reversed.

The fake wristwatch control costs an added $9.95. "Women students slip it into purse or handbag for handy use anywhere," the brochure says.

And the advertisement adds, "Because of the enthusiastic acceptance of PockeTutor by college students, teachers, coaches, professional and executive leaders across the country, demand occasionally exceeds our immediate supply * * * so order now and avoid any unnecessary delay."

Order blanks were enclosed with the brochures sent to the Northwestern students.

[From the Daily Northwestern, Feb. 24, 1965]

OPEN "TUTOR" PROBE: DAILY NORTHWESTERN SPURS ACTION

(By Andrew H. Malcolm, assistant managing editor)

Federal, county, and city authorities in Seattle, Wash., began an intensive probe Tuesday into "PockeTutors."

The investigation followed a copyrighted story in the Daily Northwestern Tuesday.

The Federal authority, Virgil Worthington, assistant postal inspector in Seattle, said he would call the product's originator in for a conference today.

He is Darrell N. Markey, 27, who told the Daily Tuesday he "dreamed up the PockeTutor idea" a year ago.

The postal inspector said, "We want to take a close look at the operation. We'll have him up here with his entire sales program, brochures, the whole works Wednesday morning."

After hearing a description of the product and its accompanying brochure, Worthington said he wanted to investigate the possibility of mail fraud and false advertising.

BROCHURE STATEMENT

The brochure says, "Because of the enthusiastic acceptance of PockeTutor by college students, teachers, coaches, professional and executive leaders across the country, demand occasionally exceeds our immediate supply."

Markey admitted the product has not been manufactured "though we do have a prototype."

He said a Seattle company has agreed to build the pocket-sized visual prompters "if demand is great enough.

"It's too risky to go ahead and build some of these without having an idea of the potential response," he said.

"It also costs a good deal to send out these brochures. It runs about $100 per thousand."

PockeTutor, which sells for $19.95, is a small packet run by twin penlight batteries, which fits in a shirt pocket. A roll of paper inside (with equations, formulas, or anything on it) rolls past a transparent window on the top of the gadget.

It comes with a short wire pushbutton control or for another $9.95 with a fake wristwatch which, when tilted, turns on the machine.

Although PockeTutor's advertising says nothing about cheating on examinations, the possibilities are obvious.

William A. Forant, chief investigator for the King County prosecutor's office, said he would be working closely with both U.S. Post Office investigators and the bunco squad of the Seattle City Police.

"I have talked with Worthington and the police on this," Forant said. "We're all investigating and should come up with something soon.

"I'll inform the county prosecutor, Charles O. Carroll, and he may plan some further action."

In the city Frank J. Zeorlin, general manager of the Seattle Better Business Bureau, said he had turned the entire case over to the police.

Zeorlin said the Better Business Bureau had checked its files Tuesday morning and found nothing on Markey or on Study Aid Products, the firm listed as the PockeTutor manufacturer.

"It's out of our hands now," he said, "but we'll be following it closely with the police."

Detective George O'Brien, chief of the city's bunco squad, opened a preliminary investigation within an hour after hearing of the Daily's story.

"This is right down our line here," he said.

Two hours later O'Brien and his squad had gathered a considerable amount of background information on the product's maker and his wife.

When told Markey admitted to the Daily that he was selling the machines, O'Brien said he would have his men contact Markey immediately.

"I imagine the postal boys will move in on this case, too," he said.

OTHER NEWSPAPERS JOIN IN

The Daily's investigation prompted four others. In Chicago the Tribune and Sun-Times both showed interest in similar stories.

In Seattle, both newspapers, the Times and Post-Intelligencer, were reported conducting their own probes of the case.

At Northwestern, 17 students have informed the Daily they received the PockeTutor brochures in the mail last week.

All the letters were postmarked Seattle and hand addressed. Order forms were included.

Markey said Tuesday he had mailed out 2,000 such brochures early last week—250 of them to Northwestern—as a "test mailing to sample student response."

Markey also said he sent brochures and order blanks to students at Tulane University, in New Orleans; the University of Kentucky, in Lexington; and Oregon State University, in Corvallis, Oreg.

MAKER SAYS "TUTOR" NOT FOR CHEATING

"It doesn't take a genius to realize PockeTutor could be used for cheating, but that wasn't the idea," Darrell N. Markey, the gadget's self-proclaimed inventor, said Tuesday.

Markey, 27, an insurance adjustor who lives at the Seattle address he gives for Study Aid Products, said, "We certainly don't want to advocate cheating. We didn't have that in mind at all.

"I got the idea about a year ago that it would be handy to have such a thing, for instance, to study during coffee breaks at work if you're a student and work part time.

"Or you could study on the bus to school," he said. "We haven't even explored all the possibilities."

Markey, who said he graduated from the University of Washington in 1961, also said he has a partner in the company—Robert Nemyre, 50, a Seattle advertising man.

He said he has received no orders for PockeTutor yet, through some order blanks have been returned.

"We asked for comments from students," Markey said. "Most of the comments have been derogatory, intimating we had designed the machine solely for cheating on exams.

"I should think that would depend on the person's motivation," Markey said. "Cars are used for bank robberies too, but they aren't necessarily built for it."

Asked if the brochure's phrase "text items can be easily visible to you, even without others knowing" didn't intimate cheating, he said, "I suppose it could be taken both ways.

"Actually any student who uses PockeTutor for exam cheating is foolish. It's impractical because all the faculty members will know about it.

"If we do get enough orders, it would take about 3 weeks to get them out," he said. "To break even just on our advertising we have to sell 10 PockeTutors for every 1,000 brochures we mail out.

"If we don't get enough orders, we'll return the money."

He said the fake wristwatch control, which costs an extra $9.95, is "just an accessory, a little extra moneymaker.

"We found," he said, "we could get a good price on a large batch of these watches, so we tacked them on.

"You know we didn't mean to alarm anyone."

[From the Daily Northwestern, Feb. 25, 1965]

POCKETUTOR PROBE INTENSIFIED—TWO PROMOTERS CITED AS POSSIBLE STATUTE VIOLATORS

(By Andrew H. Malcolm, assistant managing editor)

Washington State officials are investigating today whether the Seattle PockeTutor firm is registered to do business in that State.

And a postal inspector in Seattle said he will take his information to the U.S. attorney there for possible Federal action.

Mail solicitation of orders for PockeTutors from Northwestern students was revealed Tuesday in a copyrighted story in the Daily Northwestern.

William A. Forant, chief investigator for the King County prosecutor's office, said Darrell N. Markey, the originator of PockeTutor, and his partner, Robert Nemyre, may be violating two State statutes: (1) Failure to register their business; (2) false advertising.

"I have verbal confirmation from the State tax commissioner that Markey has not registered his business," Forant said. "We're waiting for the commissioner's written statement to get here from the capital."

A 1935 Washington State statute requires all businesses in the State to register their firms and purchase a $1.25 license.

GROSS MISDEMEANOR

Failure to do so is a gross misdemeanor and is punishable upon conviction by 1 year in prison or a $1,000 fine or both.

Forant also said King County may prosecute the pair for false advertising on their brochure.

At two separate places on the pamphlet the firm, Study Aid Products, intimates an "enthusiastic acceptance of PockeTutor * * * across the country," and that an order upon receipt of $19.95 the device "will be forwarded prepaid at once."

Markey told the Daily, Tuesday, that once he received "enough orders" it would take at least 3 weeks to produce any. "All we have is a prototype," he said.

CONTRACT WITH FIRM

At the conference Markey said they had contracted with a Seattle plastics firm to build PockeTutors. Detective George O'Brien of the city's bunco squad told the Daily, Wednesday, he hoped to meet late Wednesday night or early this morning with the company's owner.

"We want to see if a contract was really made," he said.

O'Brien also said Markey told him they had mailed 4,000 brochures to students at Southern Methodist University, North Texas State, and Stanford University.

Markey told the Daily, Tuesday, he mailed 2,000 brochures to students at Northwestern University, Tulane, the University of Kentucky, and Oregon State University.

Virgil Worthington, assistant postal inspector in Seattle, said Wednesday he was going to present evidence gathered by both Seattle police and his own investigation to William Goodwin, the U.S. attorney in Seattle.

"If we prosecute, it would be for using the mails for false advertising," Worthington said. "And that's a Federal law."

Worthington also suggested possible prosecution if the firm failed to produce PockeTutor for those who purchased them and the postal inspector received any formal complaints.

[From the Daily Northwestern, Feb. 26, 1965]

THE PROBE

Tuesday this newspaper exposed the attempt of a Seattle firm that calls itself Study Aid Products to peddle its PockeTutor to Northwestern students through the mails.

Throughout the week the Daily Northwestern has followed up on the progress of a Federal, State, and local investigation of the product.

Why has this newspaper which concentrates on campus news devoted so much space this week to a story occurring 2,000 miles from the shores of Lake Michigan?

The answer is simple. The investigation of the PockeTutors is relevant to the Northwestern campus. It's relevant because Northwestern was one of a few selected campuses on which Darrell N. Markey has tried to sell his gadget.

But most importantly, the PockeTutor story is relevant to a campus community because the device appeals so blatantly to academic dishonesty. And academic dishonesty is an important question on this or any other campus. The fact that a story on that problem gains national prominence does not alter its relevance to a campus community.

Had Markey been permitted to penetrate this and other campuses with his study-aid device, undoubtedly the PockeTutors would have popped up during examinations. Then the story would have been different.

TO PRODUCE POCKETUTOR: BUILDER REVEALS HE NEEDS 3 WEEKS

(By Andrew H. Malcolm, assistant managing editor)

The Seattle manufacturer of PockeTutor has revealed to police that it would take 23 to 30 days to put the device into production, the Daily Northwestern learned Thursday.

Detective George O'Brien, of the Seattle Bunco Squad, said the manufacturer, James W. Hawley, president of the Hawley Training Devices Inc., admitted that in a written statement to police.

Darrell N. Markey, originator of PockeTutor, has advertised immediate delivery on the brochures he sent to college students across the country.

"Because of the enthusiastic acceptance of PockeTutor * * * demand occasionally exceeds our immediate supply" the pamphlet says.

And, it adds, when an order is received, "Your PockeTutor will be forwarded prepaid at once."

The Daily Northwestern revealed the mail socilitation of college students in a copyrighted story Tuesday.

O'Brien said Thursday he had turned his entire investigation file over to William A. Forant, chief inspector for the King County prosecutor.

Forant said actual production of PockeTutors "is definitely not a crime." But he added the State was investigating whether the PockeTutor brochure might fall under the State's false advertising statute.

"We have not yet received written confirmation that Markey has not registered his business with the tax commissioner," Forant said. He said he had already received oral confirmation.

Hawley, the manufacturer, said Thursday, running a PockeTutor could be heard "in quiet surroundings."

"To anticipate your question," he said, the noise of PockeTutor would be evident in quiet surroundings like those in an examination. It would sound like a small fan or one of those quieter electric shavers on the market now."

He said Markey and his partner, Robert Nemyre, debated over putting a handle on the mechanism to prop it up for a speaker.

"We just decided against the handle because it was just another part, would cost more, and a person could just as easily prop it up on anything handy," Hawley said.

Hawley, who said his firm does some subcontract work for Boeing Aircraft, also revealed PockeTutor does not operate at different speeds, as intimated in the advertising.

The pamphlet says, "Material * * * can be viewed by skipping back and forth as frequently as you choose and at any desired speed."

He said Markey would have to invest about another $700 for molds and materials before production could actually start. "He already has a considerable amount (police said $650) invested in this thing. We worked 7 months developing the prototype," Hawley said.

"I know this cheating never occurred to Markey," he added.

THE ELDERCARE BILL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as we in the Congress approach the time of decision on so-called medicaretype legislation, I think we must recognize that, by the time such legislation becomes effective, we will be dealing with the needs of almost 20 million citizens over age 65.

In recent days, some labor leaders, including Walter Reuther, have charged that the eldercare bill, which I and others are sponsoring, is too costly.

The time has come to set the record straight. Proponents of H.R. 1 and S. 1 admit that the administration-backed bill will cost $3.788 billion annually. This does not take into consideration the well-known "abuse factor," characteristically greater in Federal programs.

I submit that the eldercare bill will not and, in fact, could not cost more than $847 million annually, and a portion of this amount would be paid for by the States. Let me illustrate the validity of this comparison.

As you know, under the eldercare bill, there are three categories of people set up as determined by their own statements of income. Federal-State funds would be used to pay all insurance premiums for those in the lowest category, and approximately half the cost of the premium for those in the second category.

Testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee reveals that approximately 20 percent of the aged would require full Federal-State payment of their health insurance premium.

Twenty percent of 20 million people is 4 million, multiplied by $250 annual insurance premium equals $1 billion annually. The $250 figure was used by the Ways and Means Committee chairman to describe the cost of good and adequate insurance protection for the aged equal to the benefits available to Government employees under their present program.

Then, to this we must add possibly another 30 percent of the aging, or 6 million persons who would qualify for approximately one-half—$125—of their premium being paid by Federal-State funds; 6 million times $125 equals $750 million annually. Thus, the total cost of this bill would be $1,750,000 annually, from which must be subtracted the $803 million spent on Kerr-Mills—OAA and MAA—the last fiscal year, giving us a net cost of $847 million annually.

This, then, is the figure to compare with the $3.788 billion figure of the administration, with its much lesser Kerr-Mills deductions which would have to be maintained to supply the other 75 percent of the unmet needs of this group.

And, let us not forget that, under eldercare, we would have good and adequate protection equal to that currently afforded Federal employees, as opposed to the very minimal benefits—25 percent—offered under the administration bill.

An honest portrayal of this comparison will show that "eldercare makes medicare look sick."

As a basis for further comparison, the administration proposes to spend $3.26 billion this fiscal year on foreign aid. Is one-fourth of this amount too much to allocate for a sound medical program for the aged?

REAPPORTIONMENT DECISION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues of the House, my purpose in arranging this special order is to cast some light on the intentions of those who have introduced constitutional amendments on the subject of State legislative reapportionment and to clarify the issues presented by the efforts of those of us who are working to bring this matter before the House for final disposition under the rules of the House.

Let me say at the outset that there is no question as to whether this Congress will make a final decision on the issue. It is merely a question of when and by what means. The House will reach a final vote on the matter either by discharge petition, which has been filed by Congressman PATMAN, by a rule from the Committee on Rules, or by a measure reported out of the Committee on the Judiciary. This will happen because a majority of the House are in favor of some form of constitutional amendment being presented to the legislatures of the 50 States for ratification. We do have a majority. Whether we have a two-thirds majority required for the passage of a constitutional amendment is another question. Because time is of the essence, Mr. Speaker, as several States are already under court order to reapportion, including my own State of Missouri, I have signed the discharge petition filed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. To date 67 Members have signed the petition, which is an unusual number, taking into consideration the very short time that the petition has been on file.

May I say that the issue that will be presented ultimately by the discharge petition and the amendment which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has agreed to accept, will not be a question of whether or not the Supreme Court has improperly invaded an area reserved to the States under the Constitution or whether or not the Court reached the right decision. The issue will not concern the case of Baker against Carr, the Tennessee reapportionment case, or Reynolds against Simms, or the New York or Virginia cases. The issue presented will deal with the Colorado case alone. The issue will be solely, one, as to whether or not American citizens are to be given the right to decide through the ballot box that one house of their State legislature may be constituted on the basis of factors other than population if a majority of the citizens of those States so desire.

Now, let us examine the so-called reapportionment cases and the reasons why I think it is so important that the House decide this issue at an early date.

Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court, on June 15 of 1964, I submit, finished its work of completely devastating one of the most basic and one of the most revered concepts of American constitutional government. The framers of the Constitution took care to define the duties of each of our three branches of Government with the purpose of guaranteeing that each should have final authority in its particular field and have no authority to interfere with the affairs of any other branch. Thus, every American schoolchild has been proudly told that the legislative makes the laws, the judiciary interprets them, and the executive enforces them. Because of this separation of powers concept, each branch of our Federal Government has historically taken great care to refrain from crossing the constitutional boundaries of its own authority. Adhering to this important distinction between jurisdictional

boundaries, the Supreme Court early determined that it could not hear cases which were essentially political in nature. Such questions were, in the Court's opinion, matters for the consideration of the legislature and not cognizable by the Court or, as the Court said, they were not justiciable.

From the beginning of this Nation until March of 1962 it was generally conceded in case after case that each State was responsible for setting up and maintaining its own plan for the election of State representatives and State senators. However, in Baker against Carr, decided March 26, 1962, the Supreme Court ruled that the citizens of Tennessee were entitled to have their complaint against the State legislative apportionment plan adjudicated. Thus, the Court entered into the political arena and has, without doubt, assumed a legislative role.

I am not here, Mr. Speaker, to defend the rampant abuse of legislative apportionment which exists throughout the breadth of this great land. I am here, however, to argue that the Supreme Court is no place for reform as argued by Justice Harlan in his dissenting opinion in the Alabama case. I am here to argue that the end does not justify the means. I am here to say that the Supreme Court has not properly interpreted the Constitution but rather has amended it by judicial decree. I am here to point out the dangers of those decisions.

I am not here to castigate the Supreme Court although the Court, by intruding into the political field, into the legislative field, has opened itself to valid political criticism. As President Truman said, "If you can't stand the heat get out of the kitchen." The Supreme Court has entered into the political kitchen. The Supreme Court is now legislating irrespective of whether that legislation is good or bad. In doing so it has converted a political philosophy into a constitutional rule and has applied the so-called "one-man, one-vote" principle so arbitrarily that it does great damage to the genius of the Federal system.

Mr. Speaker, the late Justice Frankfurter, one of the greatest judicial liberals of this century, sounded the alarm in Baker against Carr when he pointed out the following in his dissenting opinion:

> The Court today reverses a uniform course of decisions established by a dozen cases, including one by which the very claim now sustained was unanimously rejected only 5 years ago. The impressive body of rulings thus cast aside reflected the equally uniform course of our political history regarding the relationship between population. Such a massive repudiation of the experience of our past in asserting destructively novel judicial power demands a detailed analysis of the role of this Court in our constitutional scheme. Disregard of inherent limits in the effective exercise of the Court's "judicial power" not only presages the futility of judicial intervention in the essentially political conflict of forces by which the relation between population and representation has time out of mind been and is now determined. It may well impair the Court's position as the ultimate organ of the supreme law of the land.

The last thought of Justice Frankfurter in the foregoing quote is the one that concerns me.

There is great danger in these cases which could spell disaster ahead in our judicial system.

Mr. Speaker, Justice Harlan said in his dissenting opinion in June 1964 that:

> The majority has cut deeply into the fabric of our Federal system and that these decisions have the effect of placing the basic aspects of State political systems under the persuasive overlordship of the Federal judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, Justice Stewart in his dissenting opinion in the Colorado case said this:

> The Court's Draconian pronouncement makes unconstitutional the legislatures of most of the 50 States and finds no support in the words of the Constitution in any prior decisions of this Court or in the 176-year political history of the Federal Union.

Mr. Speaker, I have some of the same fears voiced by Justices Frankfurter, Stewart, and Harlan. Justice Stewart, in effect, observed that to ascertain the meaning of the Constitution you no longer look to the Constitution itself but into the changing channels of the complex minds of the members of the Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, this is a real issue, and in this respect I have been deeply concerned about the tendency of Americans, including many prominent political figures, to put this issue on the basis of rural interests versus urban interests. If they are associated with rural America they are opposed to legislative reapportionment. If they are from urban America, they stand to gain in legislative seats and, so, are in favor of the Supreme Court's decisions.

Mr. Speaker, let us take for example this excerpt from a speech made by a very prominent former Governor of the State of California:

> Many California counties are far more important in the life of the State than their population bears to the entire population of the State. It is for this reason that I have never been in favor of restricting their representation to the State senate to a strictly population basis. It is for the same reason that the Founding Fathers of our country gave balanced representation to the States of the Union, equal representation in one House and proportionate representation in the other. Moves have been made to upset the balanced representation in our State even though it has served us well and is strictly in accord with the American tradition and the pattern of our National Government. Our State has made almost unbelievable progress under our present system of legislative representation. I believe we should keep it.

Mr. Speaker, the Governor that was speaking of California in that speech in 1948 was none other than the now Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. This, ladies and gentlemen of the House, points out an attribute of the decisions which to me is absolutely terrifying. Shall we have a government of men or shall we have a government of law? Who will we have on the Supreme Court tomorrow, or next year, or the next decade? Will we have a Mr. Earl Warren as Governor of the State of California or will we have a Mr. Earl Warren, the Chief Justice of the United States, the writer of the opinion in the case of Reynolds against Simms.

Mr. Speaker, this portrays to me the danger of the Supreme Court amending the Constitution by judicial decree. This emphasizes the need for law and precedent if we are to maintain a stable republic. The minds of men change. The Constitution should not be changed until it has been changed by the American people from whom all governmental power is derived.

Mr. Speaker, I have read innumerable papers supporting the position of the Supreme Court, but I have yet to find anyone citing any precedent that the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment means that both houses of a State legislature must be apportioned on the basis of population.

Is there anyone in this body who will seriously maintain that when the Congress of the United States debated the 14th amendment it intended it to apply to State legislative apportionment? Was the matter even referred to when the 14th amendment was debated? Was the matter even remotely discussed in any of the State legislatures when they ratified the 14th amendment?

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. First of all I want to compliment the gentleman from Missouri on the most eloquent and learned statement that he made here today in the House of Representatives, also because of the timeliness of the statement. I am not confident of the figures, but I do know that most of the State legislatures of the Nation are meeting in session this year, and that the opportunity for having such a proposed constitutional amendment ratified exists now provided the House of Representatives acts now.

In my own case, I have signed the discharge petition, at the Speaker's desk. This is the first discharge petition I have ever signed, and is a departure from a rule I made for myself with regard to the signing of discharge petitions. However, I cannot help but be impressed by the importance and by the immediacy of the situation. I know in my experience as a former member of the State Legislature of Illinois I had the experience of recommending an amendment to the Illinois constitution to provide exactly what the constitutional amendment proposed here would authorize, namely, the establishment in Illinois of one House of the Illinois General Assembly based upon population alone, that is, the House of Representatives of the Illinois General Assembly, and that the State Senate of Illinois take into consideration subjects other than population.

The proposition in Illinois was submitted to the voters at the 1954 general election and overwhelmingly approved by the voters of the urban and rural areas alike as a fair and reasonable solution to the problem of legislative representation in the State of Illinois.

This is the type of constitutional provision which would be permitted in the 50 States of the Nation if the constitu-

tional amendment which we are proposing and recommending, and which is referred to in the discharge petition, is adopted.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I might say that the discharge petition has been filed on the constitutional amendment which has been introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. His constitutional amendment merely provides that nothing in the Constitution shall prohibit a State from having a bicameral legislature, from having one house based on factors other than population. However, we propose to introduce an amendment and vote for an amendment which will require that the legislative scheme of apportionment be approved by a majority of the people in the State.

Mr. McCLORY. In addition to ratification by the State legislative body or the State convention, whichever is employed?

Mr. ICHORD. That is right.

Mr. McCLORY. I certainly want to congratulate the gentleman on the very fine and important statement he is making here in the House of Representatives today, and to pledge my support.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to move away from the law and precedents and consider the decisions solely on a moral basis. Assume that there is no Constitution, and that the supreme law flows only from the political philosophy of the members of the Supreme Court. Let us get away from the Federal analogy and the obvious intent of the founders of the Constitution to permit area representation as well as population representation, and consider only the situation existing in the various States.

I personally cannot defend the malapportionment on a moral basis which existed in Alabama, and I might say several other States. First we must take cognizance of the fact that America has changed. We are no longer a rural Nation, we are now an urban Nation, and becoming increasingly urban with the passing of each day. Rural legislators in many cases have unjustly failed to give urban areas proper representation, not only by making it difficult for a majority of the people to reapportion, but also by simply ignoring their State constitution and declining to reapportion legislative districts so as to follow population shifts.

Considering the widespread existence of malapportionment, we must conclude that reform was needed, and this is the reason why the Supreme Court has been able to amend the Constitution by judicial decree, and with the support of so many people. It is regrettable that reform had to come about in this manner. History has shown the danger of reform taken in such manner.

During the French Revolution, for example, the revolutionaries were impatient with the revolutionary processes and acted through bodies that were less and less representative. You will remember that the French revolutionaries moved from the National Assembly to the Legislative Assembly, then to the Paris Commune, then to the Committee of Public Safety, then to the Directorate, and then to Napoleon.

Mr. Speaker, I can only quarrel with the means in the New York, Virginia, Maryland, and Alabama cases. I cannot quarrel with the end. But in the Colorado case the Supreme Court refuted its own one-man, one-vote principle. In that case the people of Colorado had spoken. All of the people of Colorado had spoken, applying the one-man, one-vote principle. They had chosen overwhelmingly to have a bicameral legislature with one house based upon population and the other house based on geography and other factors. This is the aspect of the decision that has appalled me.

My home State of Missouri has a bicameral legislature with the upper house based on population and the lower house based on a combination of geography and population.

The people of Missouri have approved this system time and time again. I cannot accept the preposterous principle that when the legislatures of three-fourths of the States of this Nation adopted the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment that they surrendered their right to have such a bicameral legislature.

Again I ask that anyone come forth with evidence that it was intended by the Congress and by the legislatures that ratified the 14th amendment that this result was intended. If not, have we changed our rules of constitutional construction? This, however, is what the Colorado case held. It said to the people of Missouri and to the people of Colorado and to the people of all of the 50 States that it makes no difference what kind of State legislature you might want to have, even if you want the system that you have had since the birth of the Republic, even if you vote statewide using the one-man, one-vote principle and decide 3 to 1 to keep your system, you are still prohibited from having it. The equal protection clause of the 14th amendment forbids you to experiment.

The Chief Justice of the United States supported by a majority of the Justices has changed his mind—you have been wrong for 177 years.

Thus our proposal, I submit, is moderate indeed. We merely want to give the majority of the people of every State voting statewide the right to decide whether or not they shall have the same system that prevails in the Federal legislature.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Missouri for bringing this to the attention of the House, and also to acquaint the Members of the House with this gentleman's vast knowledge in this great area that we are discussing today. He is a former speaker of the Missouri Legislature and most certainly is very capable, learned, and qualified to present this important subject to the House of Representatives.

I want also to commend the gentleman for making it very clear that this is not a rural versus urban matter or an urban versus rural matter. This is a fight for those people who believe in the principle of a bicameral system of the legislature. The fact of the matter is that you have three branches instead of two. You have the house of representatives and a senate, one of the houses based on the factor of population and the other body on other factors. Then you have a Governor of a State who is also elected by a majority of the people who does participate in the legislative process whether it be by the veto power of legislation or by the threat of a veto. So we do have in effect three houses of our legislature and the principle of the bicameral legislature is to take into consideration other factors than just the population factor. We do have economic factors and other matters of affinity which affect the contiguousness of areas—germaneness and other things that they have in common that can be and very vividly should be considered in matters of legislative apportionment.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I do not think any of us condone malapportioned legislatures. Even though we cannot say that it has always been true that we have had ideally apportioned legislatures. If they have an opportunity to work as they work on every other problem, they can resolve these very critical problems. I am certainly not a part of the effort to try to say we have rural domination or urban domination. I think there is a balance that leads to good government.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank the gentleman for bringing this to the attention of the House.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida for his very penetrating observations and thank him also for his kind remarks.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. I should like to join my colleague from Missouri in his remarks this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important items of unfinished business left by the previous 88th Congress was that involving the reapportionment of State legislatures. This legislation was extensively debated last year, and the fact that it was not approved before adjournment in no way lessens the urgency of the problem.

On the opening day of the 89th Congress, January 4, 1965, I reintroduced my bill on this subject, House Joint Resolution 18, which would provide for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population. A number of my colleagues in the House of Representatives and the Senate have introduced similar resolutions. In view of the widespread feeling throughout the Nation that an immediate solution to this controversy is essential, it is my opinion that the Congress is duty

bound to forthrightly face this issue and promptly consider this legislation.

This is the time of year when State legislatures are convening throughout the country, and they are naturally anxious to know what action the Congress will take. In my own State of Illinois, our State legislature is now in session and meets only every 2 years; and the convening of a special session involves considerable expense. Yet, the Committee on the Judiciary has to date not scheduled hearings on reapportionment bills.

Many people in my congressional district have either visited with me or written to me about their concern regarding reapportionment. They are rightfully disturbed over last year's decision by the Supreme Court which, in interpreting the 14th amendment, requires the States to reapportion their legislatures so that every member of each house represents substantially the same number of people in his constituency. The public confusion following this decision is readily understandable, for a majority of the States have patterned their legislatures after the principle embodied in our Federal Constitution with regard to the Congress—that one body was to represent each geographic unit and the other the population distribution of the Nation. This is the basis for our traditional American concept of a fair and reasonable plan of bicameralism in a representative government, and the analogy of this Federal system to the present problem involving the States cannot be ignored.

Despite the fact that the Supreme Court has now struck down this system promulgated by the Constitution itself, I believe that the same reasoning which prompted our Founding Fathers to avoid apportioning both Houses of Congress on the basis of population is still applicable to legislative apportionment in the States today. In my opinion, the Supreme Court has exceeded its constitutional authority in this ruling. The power to amend the Constitution rests with the people, and I believe the Congress should give them the opportunity to decide this issue. Therefore, the Congress should consider this legislation without delay.

Mr. ICHORD. I might say to the gentlewoman from Illinois that I know there have been at least 80 constitutional amendments introduced thus far in the House of Representatives.

I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois for her observations and I believe she has made a very important point concerning the Court amending the Constitution. That is my position. I do not believe there is any doubt about that fact. Really, there has never been much of an argument about it. The Supreme Court has amended the Constitution by judicial decree. Amendments should be accomplished through the procedures established in the Constitution itself.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I thank the gentleman. I rise to commend the gentleman from Missouri for bringing this matter to the attention of the House today. I also wish to show my appreciation for his remarks and the remarks of others, who have pointed out the fact that this is not an urban versus rural controversy. It involves a basic, constitutional precept.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to come from and represent the most urbanized district in the State of North Carolina. It is about 70 percent urban and 30 percent rural. I view as one of the most important matters pending before this Congress the need to take some action to correct the most unfortunate decision which was handed down by the Supreme Court on June 15 of last year.

Again I commend the gentleman for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I believe his presentation has been most timely, most appropriate, and most urgent.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his contribution, particularly since he represents an urban district. He is one Member of the House who is not deciding this issue based upon his urban residence but is looking at the constitutional questions involved.

Mr. KORNEGAY. That is exactly correct. I appreciate very much the gentleman's making that statement.

I might add to the fact that I come from an urban district that my State of North Carolina is not "in the soup" so to speak at the moment. In my opinion, its legislative makeup is patently unconstitutional under the one-man, one-vote rule.

While my State, as many others, probably has not abided by the constitutional provision for periodic reapportionment as it should, this still is no way to get at that problem. The medicine is worse than the disease. From my observation, nothing but trouble and chaos have been created throughout much of this country subsequent to and as a result of the unfortunate decision which I just referred to.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join with the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] and my other colleagues this afternoon who have expressed their interest in this terrific problem of legislative reapportionment and their earnest desire to try to solve this matter by means of constitutional procedures. As my colleagues have pointed out, this is not a matter of country versus city. I believe the gentleman from Missouri will agree with me when I would add that it is not a matter of a liberal philosophy versus a conservative philosophy.

Mr. ICHORD. I would point out to the distinguished gentleman from Florida that the gentleman who wrote the dissenting opinion in Baker against Carr, the late Justice Frankfurter, was known as one of the greatest liberals of this century in the judiciary.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for that comment, and I certainly agree with him.

So the matter resolves itself down to this proposition; namely, whether or not we are going to try to solve through constitutional procedures this grave problem which to me is actually the biggest domestic problem confronting America today.

Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with permitting the people of a State, if they so decide by a vote, to say that they want one house of their legislature apportioned on a basis other than population? That is the issue and the question. It is a clear-cut question. I join with many of my colleagues in presenting a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to give our people of the 50 States that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Missouri once again and pledge to him my cooperation and pledge to my colleagues who have introduced several bills my efforts with them to correct this terrible problem in the very immediate future.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the learned gentleman from Florida for his valuable comments, and I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS].

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman for his remarks this afternoon and to associate myself with those remarks. I think the gentleman has made a powerful argument in favor of congressional action enacting these resolutions, one of which I happen to have introduced myself. I was interested in the gentleman's reading of the speech made by the present Chief Justice when he was Governor of California.

Mr. ICHORD. This was a speech made by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court when he was Governor of the State of California.

Mr. BETTS. I am aware of that speech. Therein I think lies one of the biggest arguments in favor of congressional action in that the Supreme Court, while it followed the principle of one-man, one-vote, actually abandoned another historical constitutional concept, namely, the concept of checks and balances, which has provided for and established the National Congress and which we thought was constitutionally established in all of the States and their legislatures. To me this is one of the big arguments in favor of this congressional action, that is, restoring this historic concept of checks and balances.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Missouri and associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. He made some very interesting and enlightening points.

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the gentleman for yielding and observe that I signed the discharge petition, and I feel very strongly, just as the gentleman expressed himself here today. It seems to me this would raise the question, if we do not overturn this Supreme Court decision by legislative act and by constitutional amendment I wonder if the gentleman would

agree with me that we might just as well have all of our State legislatures unicameral in nature rather than bicameral.

Mr. ICHORD. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from Illinois. You can even go further and say that you might as well be consistent and well reapportion the Senate of the United States and have their membership based upon population rather than geography. It may very well be that the Supreme Court will make a logical extension of its reasoning and say that since the equal protection clause is in the 14th amendment, which came after article I establishing the Senate of the United States, that article I has now been overruled by the equal protection clause, and that body should be reapportioned.

Mr. MICHEL. I think the gentleman makes a very good point.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the other descriptions I have given of the gentleman's remarks today I want to add that it is a most studious presentation which he has made and one that should be helpful as a bit of reference material for the House of Representatives as we approach this problem of State legislative reapportionment.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to add that I concur wholeheartedly, too, in the point that the States which have already established by constitutional amendment legislative reapportionment, as has been done in Missouri and in Illinois, have observed the one-man, one-vote principle. I think it is an important point which the gentleman has made and I want to add that that principle was observed in Illinois in the adoption of the constitutional amendment in 1954.

Mr. Speaker, may I add this further point, that as far as admonishing the House of Representatives and the Congress of the United States to act promptly on this matter, we constantly hear the argument that the legislative branch of the Federal Government is having its powers diminished and that the executive and judicial branches are growing in strength and power at the expense of the legislative branch. Here is a good opportunity, it seems to me, for the Congress of the United States to reassert its constitutional authority and at least to present to the people of the Nation the opportunity to vote on this important proposition.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has made a very important point. We are one of the vehicles through which the Constitution of the United States may be amended.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield again to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I have noted that the gentleman made reference to the fact that the next step could well be reapportionment of the U.S. Senate. I would like to ask the gentleman his views on this particular proposition. Would it not likewise be a part of this one-man one-vote principle that it should apply to local boards, such as boards of county commissioners, school boards, and other local boards that political subdivisions may have according to the various political setups in the States?

Mr. ICHORD. It is my information that a court in Wisconsin—I do not know whether it was a State court or a Federal district court—has held that the principle is applicable to school districts and other minor governmental subdivisions.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Does the gentleman have any feeling or any opinion about the kind of situation that would create locally? Many of the boards of county commissioners or school boards or other local boards may wake up one morning and find that they were unconstitutional.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman that if they were unconstitutional perhaps the bonds which they had submitted to the people of the various subdivisions would also be illegal and void and great repercussions could flow from such a holding.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding. The gentleman referred to the Wisconsin Supreme Court decision. We have already awakened one morning and found that our county commissioners and boards and school districts were as the gentleman has indicated.

Mr. ICHORD. That was a Wisconsin Supreme Court decision?

Mr. LAIRD. The Wisconsin Supreme Court, which is the highest court in Wisconsin, and it has already ruled on that particular question.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to make one additional statement: Then not only are we tampering with the political setup—and I use that expression in broad context—of our Federal Government, but also it could result in difficulty arising in the financial obligations that had heretofore been made by the local boards and local governing bodies.

Mr. ICHORD. I believe the gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. KORNEGAY. The point of the matter is and the point which I am trying to bring out, Mr. Speaker, is that there is just no end to this chain reaction and that it breeds chaos upon chaos. In other words, the farther down the line you go the worse it gets.

I thank again the gentleman for yielding to me and I compliment him most highly for his fine presentation.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the gentleman for his very learned contribution.

LEGISLATION DESIGNED TO EXPAND FISH AND WILDLIFE RESTORATION PROJECTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, today is a very appropriate day for me to speak on behalf of the bill I have introduced to expand fish and wildlife restoration projects by providing for a study of a comprehensive, long-range program to reclaim and rehabilitate surface mining areas in the United States.

Strip mining of coal has been going on in my home State of Illinois for many years. As a matter of fact, it began in 1866 in the Danville, Ill., area, a fine part of central Illinois. In Illinois we have had some experience with restoration efforts in the strip mining areas.

In 1963, the most recent year for which adequate statistics are available, Illinois was the leading State in the United States in the production of coal by strip mining.

Of 458,928,000 tons of coal mined in the United States from all types of mines in that year, about one-third or 144,141,000 tons were from strip mines. Of a total 51,736,000 tons mined in Illinois, strip mines accounted for 27,287,000 tons or nearly 53 percent of the total.

Strip-mining operations in Illinois are generally very modern, large-scale operations. Average production in 1963 per man per day was 33.7 tons. There were 64 such operations in the State as compared with 116 in Kentucky, 266 in Ohio, 521 in Pennsylvania, 130 in West Virginia, and 38 in Indiana. All of those States, as I reported earlier, produced less coal by strip mining than did Illinois; Indiana produced only 10,939,000 tons.

Such operations unavoidably disturbed the surface and overburden on large acreages. As one writer has put it, a completed strip mine operation leaves the earth as if furrowed by a large plow which has turned the earth upside down to a depth of 10 to 70 feet; and so it does. I have five such operations in my Peoria County. The landscape is indeed modified as the great behemoths plow their way across our Corn Belt fields.

It is estimated that more than 750,000 acres have been disturbed in the United States since the first coal strip mine was instituted in 1866. This is increasing at the rate of perhaps 25,000 acres per year.

As you might expect people did experiment to see what use could be made with such wasteland. The first recorded project of reclamation of surface-mined land occurred in Indiana in 1918. This experiment was followed closely by a venture in Illinois in 1920, when 6 acres of mined land was planted with 9,000 pine and hardwood trees.

Not unnaturally, legislation was sought at an early date to regulate strip-mining operations and to provide for assurance of performance which would, to a degree, restore or rehabilitate the usefulness of the disturbed surface.

Of major strip-mining States, West Virginia, in 1939, was the first to enact legislation regulating such operations. Indiana followed in 1941, Illinois in 1943. However, the original Illinois statute was declared unconstitutional by the Illinois Supreme Court on the basis that it did not appear to have a reasonable relation to public health, inasmuch as backfilling was not required for the final cut, and discriminated against coal strip-mine operators. The 1961 act is broader and includes all stripping operations, whatever the mineral, if the overburden exceeds a depth of 10 feet.

I am not today holding the Illinois statute up as a model—it has in fact been criticized with respect to several aspects of its reclamation features, the possibility of substituting other land previously mined but not reclaimed, and for the reason that a penalty can be imposed only for failure to secure a permit before engaging in operations.

But in enacting legislation which I favor, which among other things will provide for a study of a comprehensive, long-range program for the purpose of reclaiming and rehabilitating strip and surface mining areas of the United States, we ought to take account of the fact that a good amount of information is known to be available in Washington and in some of the important strip-mining States.

For example, Arnold E. Lamm reported to the Conference of Surface Mining, at Roanoke, Va., in April 1964:

In Indiana the total area affected by strip mining in the State since mining began until June 30, 1963, amounted to 80,066 acres. Of this, 67,193 acres have been reclaimed. A total of 44,809,700 trees have been planted, 5,434 acres of land have been seeded ungraded, and 1,343 acres have been graded and seeded. In addition to the above, 9,220 acres have been converted into lakes and 4,139 acres have been provided to the State for forest preserves. An additional 7,853 acres have been converted into other recreation areas, including sportsmens clubs, State parks, hunting and fishing areas and private clubs. In addition to this impressive development, 2,880 acres have been converted into private homesites and only 3,653 acres remain unreclaimed.

Illinois coal operators, with the exception of a few companies, began major land-use ventures in 1938 (some work was started 40 years ago), even before the industry in Illinois was of importance. Since that time, approximately 60 percent of the strip-mined area has been put into active uses—almost all on a voluntary basis, since the so-called strip mine law did not take effect until January 1, 1962. Significantly, the operators own only about 62 percent of the acreage mined, with the remainder in private (28 percent) and public (10 percent) holdings. Most of that in private ownership was mined on a royalty basis whereby the landowner sold coal only and retained the surface after mining. The strip-mining industry has done an excellent job in revegetating mined lands. Illinois operators can, without hesitation, point to their record of achievement on 115,000 acres as a model for others.

Unfortunately, too few persons are acquainted with what has been done in Illinois by the strip mine operators. How many realize that:

1. Some 17,000 acres of mined areas have been reforested with over 17 million trees.

2. Approximately 23,000 acres are being used for pasture to graze some 10,000 head of cattle, hogs, and sheep.

3. Almost 9,000 acres have been developed as recreational areas—including a State park, many private clubs, sportsmen's clubs, and the Southern Illinois University research area.

4. Lakes and ponds in excess of 2 acres each have been formed by mining operations on some 6,500 acres. These are generally heavily fished with many companies allowing use through a permit system.

5. Row crops (hay, corn, and so forth) are grown on approximately 3,000 acres.

6. Commercial orchards have been planted on some 135 acres of mined lands.

7. Over 8,000 acres are presently in some stage of development for one or more of the uses listed above.

It does appear to me that a lot of the necessary information is already available, and only requires collation. The Secretary of the Interior did testify on much the same study proposed in 1964 by S. 1013 that a difficult but important aspect of the study would be the determination of size, location, ownership, and effect of past operations at abandoned strip mines. Perhaps so. However, insofar as surveys are necessary, we should recognize that most, if not all, of these areas have been photographed from the air. These shots probably are available in county offices, if not in Washington. And most of the county offices now employ people who have had experience in checking acreages involved in agricultural program compliance by instrumental measurements made on such photos.

In view of these several facts and circumstances, there would seem to me no good reason why the final report, with recommendations, should not and could not be delivered to the Congress in 1 year—by July 1, 1966.

If private lands are to remain outside the official rehabilitation program pending the completion of the study, that is all the more reason for pursuing it diligently to conclusions and recommendations in 1 year.

I am not unaware that other acreage, amounting in total to perhaps 625,000 acres, has been surface mined for materials other than coal, notably gold, iron ore, and phosphate rock. This makes the problem somewhat larger, but not too large for completion in a year in my opinion.

REPUBLICAN OPPORTUNITY AND RESPONSIBILITY IN 89TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States exists to serve the citizens of the United States—not the executive branch of the U.S. Government. This body is a full partner in the process of government, not a poor relation.

And I speak today in solemn pledge that my party, minority though it may be, has not forgotten these things and will not permit the Nation to forget them.

Some who speak for the Executive may call this obstructionism, obstinancy, or negativism. I call it a positive and constructive contribution to a republic whose chief design is the liberty of its people and not the exaltation of its leaders.

I do not say that Congress should, or Republicans should automatically oppose every request of the Executive. I do say that Congress should, and I pledge you that every Republican will, carefully weigh every such request.

We have heard the Chief Executive speak to the Congress and tell us of his plans and programs for the Nation. We know that many of his party in the Congress will support all of these as a matter of course. We know that the sheer mathematics of political reality means that most will pass.

We also know, however, that there is danger that it will be only mathematics, and not political morality, that will guide many of these passages.

It is because of that danger and its high probability that the role of the minority party in the 89th Congress cannot be overstated.

THE ROLE OF THE MINORITY

We are not chained to the proposals of the executive. And, because we are free, we represent also the freedom of any Member of this body—on either side of the aisle—to speak out for his convictions, and the good of his constituents against the awesome power of the executive machine.

We are a minority, painfully so. But we are also one of the two major parties of this Nation and, numbers aside, those who forget this or minimize this do our entire political tradition and our future in freedom a grave disservice.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that there is no Member of this House who would rise to defend a one-party system in this Nation. And I trust that there is no Member who will listen to me and fail to see the implications, for our two-party system, of the minority party's role today.

That role has never been more important.

Nor has it ever been more important for the majority party to understand clearly that when the minority speaks—as I promise you, Mr. Speaker, it will speak—it does so to jog the conscience, not just the partisan calculations, of the majority.

The Republican Party and the men by whom it is represented in this House remains a party committed to principles which set it apart from the administration now in power in this country. I refer to our difference with the administration most deliberately, for I am as aware as any man that these very same principles are shared in full measure by some Members of the majority party in this House.

The Republican Party is not speaking just for Republicans who want to hear alternatives to this administration's proposals. It is speaking for all who reject the Federal extremism of the administration, for all who seek greater roles for

the individual, his town, his State, and his region. And it welcomes to the fight against Federal extremism every man of good will who shares with us the view of man as master of and never servant of government.

The Republican Party does not intend to spend this Congress or any other Congress doing nothing but copycatting administration programs but at bargain prices. We do not say that we must do the same things as the administration but do them better. We say there are better ways for Americans to do things.

We believe our party to be the enduring home of principles which mean real things to real people in this real world.

Republicans are not ashamed of being Republicans. They do not have to argue about what Republican means. They have spelled it out in the Republican platform of 1964. We stand on that platform and we know what it means.

It means that we have goals. It means that we have programs and promises for the America we want to build and the Americans who must do that building. It means that there is a great alternative to the great planned society.

It means that the numerical minority in this Congress still can speak with the voice of a moral majority.

It means that though we do not win rollcall votes, we can win for America the all-important second look that may save us from blindly accepting a Great Society that might be just another great mistake, just another great scheme, just another great debt—accepted without due consideration.

I will stop speaking of the Republican Party in summing up this point. I will speak of the Congress in its entirety. It is our role, our role from every seat in this House that is not sold lock, stock, and barrel to the executive, it is our role, fellow Members of Congress, our role—every one of us—to tell the men and women to whom we owe our election and our service just one urgent thing: what lies at the end of the road of the Great Society.

It is up to Republicans and to those Members of the other party who share our views to speak of what roads other than the Great Society are available to the American people if they turn an articulate minority into an effective majority in the 90th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans cannot succeed in enacting a program in this Congress—obviously. We do not have the votes. But we can succeed in developing new techniques of communication to inform the people of what we are doing and will do in the 89th Congress, and more importantly, of what we propose to do in the 90th Congress.

For it is in the 90th Congress that the present minority will have the votes. We will have the votes to enact into law the sound Republican alternatives we will continue to develop for those areas where there is a national need and a need for a national solution.

REVITALIZATION OF THE MINORITY

The task we face in this Congress is staggering. But the record we will write will be an impressive one for we shall set an example of unity and dedication for the entire party.

Where there is need for constructive alternatives, they will be devised. A legislative program to implement the Republican platform of 1964 is being developed right now. Some alternatives have already been introduced into the Congress. For example:

A more comprehensive and more equitable health care plan for the elderly was proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

A more realistic approach than the discriminatory Appalachia program which sets up the machinery for widespread Federal favoritism has been offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

A Republican task force on the implementation of the 1964 platform has been operating for weeks. Another task force on economic opportunity and one on agriculture has been established. There will be more in the days and weeks ahead.

A Republican coordinating committee with representatives from all elements of the party structure has been established and is operating.

In short, Mr. Speaker, our party is organizing its resources on a scale never before attempted. This stems from a determination to discharge a great responsibility: to the 43 percent of the American electorate who voted for Republican congressional candidates; to the growing number of millions who, in the weeks and months ahead, surely will wish they could recast their vote for the national ticket; and to the great numbers of other Americans who were so skillfully misled about the principles and policies of the Republican Party.

Republican opportunity to identify and then discharge these responsibilities is almost unbounded in this Congress and in its successor.

The issues we as a party defined and articulated in our 1962 statement of principle and our 1964 platform have not disappeared. If anything, they have taken on a new significance.

The shortcomings and misdeeds of the Johnson administration have not been corrected. They need a more imaginative exposure.

THE 1964 PLATFORM

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the comments and read the analyses of the 1964 Republican platform. As one who, in an apparent minority, has read the document and as one who was intimately involved in its evolution, I would be forced to conclude that the references were to some other document in some other period of history.

The fact is that this was one of the most widely misrepresented and least read documents in political party history.

The charge, for example, that its civil rights plank was weak and equivocal cannot stand the test of an objective reading of that plank. Even less can it stand the test of a line-by-line, word-by-word, or content-versus-content comparison with its Democratic counterpart.

It is clear to this observer that the Republican platform contained a comprehensive, well-thought-out, and realistic program for America that reflects the feelings of a majority of Americans. I cannot and will not concede that our platform was repudiated by the American people. I say, Mr. Speaker, that it simply was not fairly presented to them.

That it was not is attributable to two principal factors: that too few Republican candidates waged their campaigns primarily on the platform; and that the opposition deliberately misrepresented what the platform did contain.

This has been discussed so far as civil rights is concerned. It was equally true for social security and agriculture, to mention just two other areas.

The fiction was created that Republicans would abolish or make voluntary the social security system. The platform was quite clear in its call, not for abolition, but for strengthening the social security system. It called for increased benefits, liberalization of the earnings limitations imposed by the system on our elderly people, and other fiscally and compassionately sound proposals.

The fiction was also created that the platform called for the removal of farm price supports overnight. One simple quote from the document should dispel this false interpretation. The platform was clear in its call for "development of truly voluntary commodity programs for commercial agriculture, including price supports free of political manipulation in order to stimulate and attain fair market prices."

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, the minority party in the 89th Congress faces a staggering task. Not only must it dispel the false and mischievous misrepresentations of its policies but it must break through the overwhelming barriers any minority, by its very nature, must face.

ONE-PARTY GOVERNMENT

We should have no illusions about our ability to prevent an overwhelmingly Democratic Congress from enacting into law every piece of legislation the ADA tells the White House the Congress should enact, from medicare to repeal of section 14(b) of Taft-Hartley.

Under present circumstances, it cannot be lost on the American people that we have come to the dangerous brink of one-party government.

Talk of efficiency if you will; talk of parliamentary skill and persuasion if you will; talk of noble goals—the truth remains that the great consensus of the Great Society really boils down to a great conformity.

We cannot let it be lost on the American people that President Johnson has precisely this in mind when he calls for "national unity" and a "broad American consensus."

For behind these terms, we can already see emerging the clear outlines of an all-powerful central executive with one dominant voice, requesting not unity but demanding and dictating conformity.

The Congress has already experienced consensus government with the closing of veterans facilities and the overturned House vote on sales for local currency under Public Law 480 to Nasser's aggressive and collectivist Egypt.

We will continue to experience it as medicare, Appalachia, education, and a host of other Great Society proposals are rubber stamped through a no longer deliberative Congress.

This is not to say, Mr. Speaker, that all Great Society proposals are ill conceived. But in past Congresses, it was the practice to hold meaningful hearings, discuss the merits and shortcomings of a particular bill, and allow at least a token amount of time to offer and enact improving and perfecting amendments.

Under the Great Society, the 89th Congress promises to become a lost weekend in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, if one-party government is indeed the present administration's goal, and if it comes to pass, the checks and balances written into our Constitution will become all but meaningless.

The brake system of the American Republic which prevents concentrated power from running rampant over our liberties is the separation of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our Central Government.

But the system cannot work without the brake fluid of a strong two-party system. This is especially true when one party controls both the White House and the Congress with overwhelming majorities and cares little for the effective operation of our traditional principles and machinery.

THE RETREAT OF FREEDOM

In this country, Mr. Speaker, the beacon of liberty for some two centuries, individual liberty continues to beat a retreat under the mounting assault of an expanding centralized power.

We in the minority claim no monopoly of love of freedom.

But we cannot forget that the President of the United States, in the Detroit Labor Day speech which launched his campaign for the Presidency, outlined the essential ingredients of his Great Society, and that these ingredients were peace, prosperity, and justice—all eminently worthy goals, but all equally attainable in a Federal penitentiary.

In that speech, Mr. Speaker, the President neglected the fourth and by far, the most important element of any good or great society. That element is freedom.

Nor, apparently, was this oversight, an isolated lapse. A reading of the many messages sent to the Congress in the last 2 months indicates that this administration still has a blind spot so far as freedom is concerned—whether that freedom involves the freedom of the individual, or the freedom of the Congress, or the freedom of the States and localities, or the freedom of the marketplace.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we in the minority challenge as unwise the course charted by the Johnson administration; we challenge as dangerous the steps it plans along the way; and we deplore as self-defeating and harmful many of the moves already taken.

It is not my intention here to enumerate the hundreds of transgressions committed against liberty by this administration in its first term of office. Those transgressions are spelled out in section II of the 1964 Republican platform which was written under the direction of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL]. Nothing has yet happened to cause the minority to withdraw or modify any of the charges contained therein. On the contrary, much has happened to strengthen that conviction.

It is my intention to speak of what we in the minority will attempt to do in the 89th Congress on the domestic front and what we shall seek to influence in the area of foreign and defense policy.

THE GREAT SOCIETY

Up until now, Mr. Speaker, we have been relatively silent. This silence did not arise from a fear to speak or from fearful concern for our image or from concern that the American people have little interest in opinions contrary to those expressed by the planners of the Great Society.

Our silence has been dictated by a need of the American people. They needed time—uncomplicated by conflicting comment—to absorb the full initial impact of the Great Society proposals.

They have listened to a state of the Union message, an economic message, an inaugural address. They have seen the messages on health of the Nation, on education, on immigration—they have now had time to see most of the first year program of the Great Society.

It is difficult for most Americans fully to understand what it all means. Most of the programs will be enacted in the 89th Congress; but it will take at least 4 years for the administration itself fully to realize what has finally been enacted to launch the Great Society.

Mr. Speaker, this is not meant to be overly critical. But the programmatic details of the Great Society do raise certain fundamental questions. Permit me to illustrate with just one area—urban affairs.

Under the Great Society, Congress is urged to create a new Department of Housing and Urban Development to assist in the problems of the cities and their suburbs.

The President said:

> We must increasingly help our cities to develop unified metropolitan transportation systems; supply adequate water and sewage service; provide community facilities and neighborhood centers; build adequate housing for low- and middle-income families; promote more efficient land use; set aside open spaces and develop new suburbs; replace or rehabilitate slum areas; and improve housing codes and code enforcement.

Under another section of his program, crime prevention, the President proposes that local police be trained by the Federal Government.

The question which immediately comes to mind is: Where do the States and localities come into this picture? What is left as a responsibility for the States to discharge? Is the era of the Great Society also the era when our States and localities will finally become mere administrative arms of the Central Government?

It is at this point, Mr. Speaker, where we come to one of the greatest areas of Republican responsibility.

It is possible—it may even be probable—that this is indeed what the American people really want. It may be that we have passed through certain stages in the development of our country and that we are entering a new phase—a phase in which most governmental, political, economic, and social questions for the entire country are faced, diagnosed, and resolved in one manner or another at one level of government—the Federal level.

As I say, this may be what the American people want. But, I submit, if it is, it is by default Republican responsibility to apprise them of the fundamental changes that are taking place and that are being proposed in their form of government. I would hope that we all could agree that this is necessary so that the people may make an informed and intelligent decision as to whether this is the road they now wish to travel.

REPUBLICAN RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. Speaker, the minority remains true to its philosophy of government. This philosophy calls for a separation of powers, for a distribution of responsibility between the Central Government on the one hand and the States and localities on the other—and, perhaps, above all, for the continued existence of a strong, viable two-party system.

The so-called consensus government which is being proposed and vigorously promoted flies in the face of this traditional system. It looks rather to an overriding Central Government which concerns itself with all areas of our national life, which dislikes dissent and diversity, and which would, in a very narrow sense of the word, make us one people, based not on a unity of purpose but on a conformity with the purposes set for us by the Government in Washington.

I repeat, it is Republican responsibility to inform the American people of what is in store under the Great Society.

I also repeat, this may be what they want.

But I, for one, do not believe it for a minute.

Not believing it, I see as a second and equally important responsibility, that Republicans articulate and continue to espouse Republican principles and Republican policies so that the people may know what alternatives are available.

In some cases, under Republican principles, there are no alternatives, constructive or otherwise, to administration proposals.

Republicans view the Constitution as a living instrument. They see limitations imposed by that Constitution on areas in which the Central Government has neither the right nor the duty to tread.

The Appalachia regional development bill provides a good illustration. There are several regions of the country which include areas just as hard pressed as certain areas in Appalachia. As a matter of fact, Menominee County in my own congressional district is one of the most hard-pressed areas in the country. It will not qualify under Appalachia.

There are also pockets of prosperity in the Appalachian region which do not need the special aid that the Appalachia bill is designed to provide. But it will be available to these pockets of prosperity in Appalachia while it remains unavail-

able to the pockets of impoverishment in other areas of the country.

Thus, under Republican philosophy, there is no constructive alternative to the Appalachia bill so long as we continue to talk only of Appalachia. Nor would a Republican in the White House view the Appalachia approach as the best means to solve these problems. But numerical realities make it clear that some form of Appalachia will be enacted into law. Recognizing this, Republicans seek to improve the program that in all probability will be rubberstamped through Congress, anyway.

Thus, a Republican alternative, an infinitely more equitable one, which has already been offered as a Republican substitute for the Appalachia bill, will make these programs and funds available to any area in the United States that can qualify legitimately as an area in need.

Mr. Speaker, this is the Republican way. We do not cast around for a problem that needs solving so that we can offer a Federal program for that problem. We believe there are certain principles that have characterized the American Republic since its inception and we attempt to adhere to those principles.

REPUBLICAN PRINCIPLES

The broad principles which guide the programs and policies of the Republican Party are basically five in number. They were stated in our 1962 statement of principle. They were restated in our 1964 platform. They are:

First. That every person has the right to govern himself, to fix his own goals, and to make his own way with a minimum of governmental interference.

Second. That it is for Government to foster and maintain an environment of freedom, encouraging every individual to develop to the fullest his God-given powers of mind, heart, and body; and, beyond this, Government should undertake only needful things, rightly of public concern, which the citizen cannot himself accomplish.

Third. That within our Republic the Federal Government should act only in areas where it has constitutional authority to act, and then only in respect to proven needs where individuals and local or State governments will not or cannot adequately perform. Great power, whether governmental or private, political or economic, must be so checked, balanced, and restrained and, where necessary, so dispersed as to prevent it from becoming a threat to freedom any place in the land.

Fourth. That it is a high mission of Government to help assure equal opportunity for all, affording every citizen an equal chance at the starting line but never determining who is to win or lose. But Government must also reflect the Nation's compassionate concern for those who are unable, through no fault of their own, to provide adequately for themselves.

Fifth. That Government must be restrained in its demands upon and its use of the resources of the people, remembering that it is not the creator but the steward of the wealth it uses; that its goals must ever discipline its means; and that service to all the people, never to selfish or partisan ends, must be the abiding purpose of men entrusted with public power.

REPUBLICAN PROPOSALS AND ALTERNATIVES

Based on these principles, the Republican Party has developed a comprehensive, compassionate, and compelling program for America and its people. It is contained in the 1964 Republican platform.

Specifically, through the platform implementation committee of the Republican conference and the good offices of the entire Republican membership on the House side, legislation is being introduced now and will be in the days and weeks ahead to implement Republican commitments.

FOR THE INDIVIDUAL

This program will include legislation that recognizes that there is a need to assist individuals but which recognizes as well that government must first have faith in the individual's own capacity to determine for himself his economic, political, and social goals.

Such a program includes legislation designed to—

Enlarge employment opportunities for urban and rural citizens, with emphasis on training programs to equip them with needed skills, recognizing that for every job seeker in America today, there actually is a job available and that the overriding problem is to develop skills in the unemployed to match these available jobs.

Provide full coverage of all medical and hospital costs for needy elderly people, financed by general revenues rather than the compulsory Democratic scheme covering only a small percentage of such costs for everyone regardless of need.

Revision of the social security laws to allow higher earnings, without loss of benefits, by our elderly people.

Furnish tax credits for those burdened by the expenses of college education.

Stimulate employers to hire teenagers through such measures as a broadening of temporary exemptions under the minimum wage law.

Improve our vocational rehabilitation programs, through cooperation between government—Federal and State—and industry, for the mentally and physically handicapped, the chronically unemployed, and the poverty stricken.

Continue the advancement of education on all levels through such programs as selective aid to higher education, strengthened State and local tax resources, including tax credits for college education. In keeping with this, legislation has already been introduced, as in past years, to return a portion of federally collected taxes to the States to be earmarked for educational uses only.

Provide our farmers, who have contributed so much to the strength of our Nation, with the maximum opportunity to exercise their own management decisions on their own farms, while resisting all efforts to impose upon them further Federal controls.

Enact legislation, despite Democratic opposition, to curb the flow through the mail of obscene materials, which has flourished into a multimillion-dollar obscenity racket.

Espouse such additional administrative and legislative actions as may be required to end the denial, for whatever unlawful reason, of the right to vote.

In these and other legislative matters dealing with the individual, it is and will continue to be the Republican way to assure the individual of maximum freedom as government meets its proper responsibilities, while resisting the Democratic obsession to impose from above, uniform and rigid schemes for meeting varied and complex human problems.

FOR OUR COMPETITIVE SYSTEM

The Republican program sets legislative goals that are in keeping with traditional Republican understanding of and faith in the competitive system.

In keeping with this understanding, legislation has been or will be introduced which is designed to—

Remove those wartime Federal excise taxes which, until this Congress, were favored by the administration, on such items as pens, pencils, furs, jewelry, cosmetics, luggage, handbags, wallets, and toiletries.

Improve the antitrust statutes, coupled with a demand for long-overdue clarification of Federal policies and interpretations relating thereto in order to strengthen competition and protect the consumer and small business.

Provide meaningful safeguards against irreparable injuries to any domestic industries by disruptive surges of imports, such as in the case of beef and other meat imports.

Require that labels of imported items clearly disclose their foreign origin, even though such legislation was vetoed by the Democratic administration in the 88th Congress.

In these and other matters dealing with our competitive system, it is and will continue to be the Republican way vigorously to protect the dynamo of economic growth—free, competitive enterprise—that has made America the envy of the world.

FOR LIMITED GOVERNMENT

And finally, the Republican program in the 89th Congress will foster legislation designed to guarantee the Government effective but limited powers, designed to encourage frugal and efficient operations, and so framed as to insure that it fully meet its constitutional responsibilities to all the American people, and not just to a politically expedient few.

In keeping with this philosophy, legislation has been or will be introduced designed to—

Develop truly voluntary commodity programs for commercial agriculture, including payments in kind out of Government-owned surpluses, diversion of unneeded land to conservation uses, price supports free of political manipulation in order to stimulate and attain fair market prices, together with adequate credit facilities and continued support of farmer-owned and operated cooperatives including rural electric and telephone facilities, while resisting all efforts to

make the farmer dependent, for his economic survival, upon either compensatory payments by the Federal Government or upon the whim of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Provide credit against Federal taxes for specified State and local taxes paid, and a transfer to the States of excise and other Federal tax sources, to reinforce the fiscal strength of State and local governments so that they may better meet rising school costs and other pressing urban and suburban problems such as transportation, housing, water systems, and juvenile delinquency.

Amend the Constitution so as to enable States having bicameral legislatures to apportion one house on bases of their choosing, including factors other than population.

Completely reform the tax structure, to include simplification as well as lower rates to strengthen individual and business incentives.

Effect wide-ranging reforms in congressional procedures, including the provision of adequate professional staff assistance for the minority membership on congressional committees, to insure that the power and prestige of Congress remain adequate to the needs of our times.

In these and other matters dealing with our faith in limited government, it is and will continue to be the Republican way to foster genuine, not feigned savings, to allow a reduction of the public debt and additional tax reductions while meeting the proper responsibilities of government.

In all that we do or attempt to do on the domestic level, Republicans will be guided by our principles, our consciences, and our constituents' best interests.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. Speaker, Republicans do not view the domestic scene as their only, or even their primary responsibility. In this crisis-torn era of history, the conduct of our Nation's foreign policy takes on an importance hard to describe.

As we turn our attention outward, beyond our own shores, we see in the world both danger and opportunity.

The manifest nature of the American people shows an overwhelming desire for peace based upon the dignity of man.

Being an idealistic people, we frequently find our ideals beclouding reality. We are beguiled by words which, on the surface, reflect our desires, without scrupulously investigating motives and subsequent results.

Our goals too often seem to be to gain popularity rather than respect, to be based upon expediency rather than principle. In all fairness, I must hastily add, these do not seem to be the goals of the people but of some of their leaders.

NATO

In any event, an example of the consequences of this orientation can be seen in NATO.

This necessary alliance is collapsing. This is primarily due to a lack of respect for our word. Our official statements are certainly high sounding enough and appear to reflect reasoned judgment, but we are not believed, and our motives are constantly questioned.

We say we will defend Europe from nuclear attack. Yet we refuse to share control of the very weapons required to deter an attack.

At the same time, our actions indicate that we are seeking an accommodation with the Soviets, whom most of our allies recognize as the potential enemy.

The results?

France is building her own nuclear force; Turkey, one of our stanchest allies, has been negotiating agreements with Moscow for the first time in over 25 years; Greece, in an unprecedented move, has recently concluded agreements with Bulgaria; Cyprus continues to accept Soviet military aid.

THE SATELLITES

Mr. Speaker, the administration talks of building bridges to Eastern Europe to knock down the barriers of distrust. The bridges, however, have toll gates at both ends. Here in Washington, the gate is controlled by the Executive. At the other end, it is controlled by the Communist dictatorship. In either case, the people do not have an opportunity to judge results or to conduct free exchanges with one another. These exchanges are, in actuality, only government to government.

SOUTHEAST ASIA

In southeast Asia, we continue a policy that has caused thousands of South Vietnamese and American casualties, with no effective plan in sight to end this conflict. We continue the fiction that it is a South Vietnamese war, that we are only there as advisers, and that the recent retaliatory strikes are a direct result of attacks on American soldiers and possessions.

Mr. Speaker, we are presently in an impossible situation in Vietnam for one very simple reason: Laos. The fate of South Vietnam was all but sealed on the day our Government joined in the declaration and protocol on the neutrality of Laos in 1962. On that day, the United States, for the first time, accepted the troika principle in which a Communist government was given an absolute veto over taking any action on violations of that agreement.

As a result, there have been well over 2,700 separate and distinct violations and not a single citation to that effect by the International Control Commission, thanks to the veto possessed by Poland.

The situation in South Vietnam cannot be resolved effectively or satisfactorily for free world interests until the United States frankly asserts that it is no longer bound by the declaration and protocol on the neutrality of Laos because of the repeated violations on the part of the Communists.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, it is becoming more and more likely that some sort of negotiated settlement eventually may be sought by the present administration to extricate itself from that area of the world.

It is becoming clear that the Communists this time will not settle merely for a settlement affecting only Vietnam—they will demand, and believe they have some prospect of getting, a regional settlement in which it is more than conceivable that Formosa, the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu, and Korea will figure prominently.

Nor is it unreasonable to expect that the present stepped-up activities of the Vietcong augur flareups in other parts of the world. Let us not forget that when missiles were introduced in Cuba, India was attacked. Or, when the seemingly inexplicable Gulf of Tonkin incident took place, it occurred on the very day that Stanleyville in the Congo, a very strategic location, was taken over by Communist-backed rebels.

The present Vietcong activity could be prelude to a similar flareup in some strategic part of the world. And it would not be surprising if that flareup occurred in a heretofore long-dormant area such as South Korea.

There is, in my mind, little doubt that the conflict in Vietnam will end in the not-too-distant future in some form of compromised settlement that cannot help but lead to an eventual Communist takeover.

It has been shown repeatedly that the fall of South Vietnam will lead to the fall of all southeast Asia, thus putting our Western line of defense closer to Hawaii and the western coast of the United States.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Closer to home, Mr. Speaker, we appear to be living up to an understanding with the Soviets not to invade or allow a reinvasion of Cuba. More importantly, we have been ineffective in preventing communism from being exported to other countries in South America. We allow and even promote socialistic forms of government throughout Latin and South America, totally ignoring the fact that socialism is a vehicle for eventual Communist takeover.

AFRICA

Our policies in Africa, especially in the Congo, are reminiscent of our condemnation of Chiang in China prior to the Communist takeover there. In all of our actions concerning so-called colonialism, we have been very quick on the trigger of condemnation of what we feel are Western weaknesses but we have been unforgiveably slow to defend our strengths.

THE UNITED NATIONS

We loudly proclaim the necessity of the U.N., yet we inhibit its potential by abandoning courses that are objectively correct in order to take those which will be popularly received. What greater example of this can there be than our Ambassador's retreat 2 weeks ago from the rule of law as set forth by the World Court on the question of the Soviet Union's credentials to vote without paying past dues?

In short, Mr. Speaker, we have sought the love of the world and we have lost its respect.

We agree that the greatest threat to world peace is the advancement of communism, and its main deterrent is the United States. Yet this administration has not pursued research and development policies that will assure our coun-

try's strength for the next decade. We must be capable of continuing to act as the shield and the sword of free people everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, this administration has created a weapon of wind to promote its foreign policy. Since World War II, millions of hours of talk with the Soviet and Chinese Communists have resulted in our losing land, people, and trade—all in staggering amounts—to the Communist bloc.

Our leaders interpret these losses as victories because they say each setback prevented a nuclear attack. The fact that we have weakened ourselves and other free nations throughout the world, thereby heightening the danger of nuclear attack, seems not to have entered their thinking. They subscribe with a blind faith to the very debatable proposition that communism someday will lose its aggressiveness and, thus, make all the concessions worthwhile.

THE ALTERNATIVES

The immediate and superficial interpretation which will be placed on the foregoing remarks is that they are of the hard line school of thought, and politically partisan. They would fall into the category of old myths, that are no longer conversant with the new realities.

Well, they are old, as old as America's courage. And they do not square with the new realities of accommodation and retreat at the expense of respect and long-held principles.

What do they mean? They mean lasting peace—peace with honor, freedom, and justice—they mean that moral principles are applicable to nations as well as men, and that the freedom of all men is threatened when there are enslaved peoples anywhere.

Communist and Fascist dictators alike recognize that the greatest threat to their continued existence is their peoples' hope for freedom and their knowledge that freedom does exist somewhere in the world.

Our policies, therefore, must preserve freedom where it does exist and promote conditions that would serve to extend it.

It cannot be denied that such policies would not be looked upon with favor by the Communists and would incur certain risks.

But policies which seek accommodations with dictators, that strengthen rather than weaken their positions, are a greater threat.

Weakness, real or apparent, has always led to war.

The first objective of our policies must be to maintain the strength of the United States, morally, politically, economically, and militarily. We must regain the respect we once had from all nations of the world. We must do this by showing in word and deed that freedom, honor, and principle are still the touchstones of the American dream, and that others may share in it by following our example.

All of this must begin with a proper understanding of the world as it is and of the true nature of the conflict we face.

Our leaders must base their decisions on integrity and courage, recognizing that the times in which we live are neither safe nor simple and probably will not be in our lifetime.

There is an easier road to follow—but that road leads to defeat and slavery if the past is indeed prologue.

It has been intimated that the American people lack the courage of their forefathers but I cannot believe this for a minute.

Given a clear understanding of events both at home and abroad, there would be on the part of the American people an overwhelming determination to sacrifice whatever is necessary and to face whatever problems may arise with courage and dignity.

Such a posture, on the part of the American people, would be sufficient to deter war and insure a peace that would last for generations.

Given the posture of such a foundation, fostered by our leaders, and fully backed by our people, we could expect the following types of decisions and actions by our Government. They represent excerpts of what was contained in the 1964 Republican platform, drafted and adopted some 7 months ago.

REPUBLICAN PROPOSALS

America must advance freedom throughout the world as a vital condition of orderly human progress, universal justice, and the security of the American people.

The supreme challenge to this policy is an atheistic imperialism-communism.

In our foreign policy, the overriding national goal must be victory over communism through the establishment of a world in which men can live in freedom, security, and national independence. There can be no real peace short of it.

So long as Communist leaders remain ideologically fixed upon ruling the world, there can be no lesser goal.

Therefore, our first duty is to regain a trust both in ourselves and our allies. Secrecy in foreign policy must be at a minimum, public understanding at a maximum. Consultation with our allies should take precedence over direct negotiations with Communist powers.

In the United Nations, our Government should press for a change in the method of voting in the General Assembly and in the specialized agencies that will reflect population disparities among the member States and recognize differing abilities and willingness to meet the obligations of the charter.

An amending convention, which is provided for in the charter itself and which is not subject to a single veto by one nation on the Security Council, should be sought immediately by our delegation at the U.N.

We should insist upon General Assembly acceptance of the International Court of Justice Advisory opinion, upholding denial of the votes of member nations which refuse to meet properly levied assessments, so that the United Nations will more accurately reflect the power realities of the world. This is the first and perhaps most important step in recognizing in this world the rule of law.

We should never surrender to any international group, however, the responsibility of the United States for its sovereignty, its own security, and the leadership of the free world.

Regarding NATO, our Government should move immediately to establish an international commission, comprised of individuals of high competence in NATO affairs, whether in or out of government to explore and recommend effective new ways to strengthen alliance participation and fulfillment.

To our Nation's associates in SEATO and CENTO, our Government should pledge reciprocal dedication of purpose and revitalized interest.

THE GEOGRAPHY OF FREEDOM

In diverse regions of the world, our Government should make clear to any hostile nation that the United States will increase the costs and risks of aggression to make them outweigh hopes for gain.

Our German friends should be reassured that the United States will not accept any plan for the future of Germany which lacks firm assurance of a free election on reunification.

Our Government should vigorously press our OAS partners to join the United States in restoring a free and independent government in Cuba, stopping the spread of Sino-Soviet subversion, forcing the withdrawal of the foreign military presence now in Latin America, and preventing future intrusions.

It should be made clear to all Communists now supporting or planning to support guerrilla and subversive activities, that henceforth there will be no privileged sanctuaries to protect those who disrupt the peace of the world.

Our foreign aid programs should be recast in such a way that all will serve the cause of freedom, permitting none to bolster and sustain anti-American regimes and that the use of private capital is increased on a partnership basis with foreign nationals as a means of fostering independence and mutual respect.

In short, our Government should adhere to the principle that freedom's wealth should never support freedom's decline, always its growth. Aid and assistance should always be conditional upon self-help and progress toward the development of free institutions. Our Government should favor and foster the establishment in underdeveloped nations of an economic and political climate that will encourage the investment of local capital and attract the investment of foreign capital.

FREEDOM'S SHIELD AND SWORD

Finally, the condition of the world today and in the foreseeable future requires that our Nation be strong militarily.

This is necessary to maintain peace in our time.

Strength, however, is not merely the quantitative and qualitative superiority of weapons. It is equally and more importantly the will and determination of the people and their leaders.

By themselves, nuclear bombs cannot start wars.

By themselves, nuclear bombs cannot deter wars.

With the awesome power of today's weapons, it is not enough to be militarily equipped to win a war. There must

be a superiority in a balance of weapons to prevent an aggressor from exploiting a weakness, as well as a credible posture which convinces any would-be aggressor that the power will be used should the occasion demand.

This has not been evident in our past policies.

Under present American leadership, an inflexible and unconvincing posture has been created. At one end of the spectrum, they have relied almost solely upon missiles to act as deterrents to or as the actual weapons of a nuclear war.

At the other end, they have built up guerrilla forces but have made it clear to our potential enemy that we will not use them without the express consent of the country involved, that in some cases we may not even participate directly and that we will not pursue the enemy guerrilla activity to its source of power and support.

The recent strikes authorized by the administration on North Vietnamese territory are encouraging signs. It is to be hoped—although candor dictates that it is a weak hope—that in the future the administration will deny the Communists the immunity of a privileged sanctuary by applying the same ground rules to the South Vietnamese that the North Vietnamese guerrillas have been enjoying with impunity.

In short, knowing the nature of guerrilla warfare, unless the source of supply is cut off or destroyed, time is on the side of the aggressor, providing him with the probable margin of victory.

This administration has taken the position that the quantity and quality of arms starts or invites war. They are taking steps to cut back in this decade both quantitatively and qualitatively our defense program. The fact that the Communist bloc, an admitted aggressor, has made no concrete provable steps in the same direction seems to be of minor secondary importance to our idealistic decisionmakers.

This administration has stated, and we agree, that today we have a distinct superiority. They have not made similar statements about what our position will be in the late sixties and; more importantly, in the decade of the seventies, without a number of qualifying conditions.

The weapons we have today, and in most cases their programed quantity, were inherited from the Eisenhower administration either as actual hardware or in the form of well-developed plans.

Today, we do not have either the new generation of weapons prudence requires, or the specific plans to develop them in time.

It has been assumed that such criticisms imply the need for significant increases in the defense budget. Actually, the opposite is more probably true. The reorientation being proposed here would use funds properly, both in recognition of the needs of the political-military requirements and in their timely application.

Republicans have proposed in the past, and still propose today, a positive program designed to keep our Nation's sword sharp, ready, and dependable.

Specific Republican proposals to accomplish this end were contained in the 1964 Republican platform.

At the conclusion of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that the section of the Republican platform of 1964, entitled "Freedom's Shield and Sword," be inserted in the RECORD. This section was drafted under the leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB].

Mr. Speaker, in the field both of defense and foreign affairs, events of recent months have clearly indicated the correctness of the positions proposed in the Republican platform of 1964.

Conditions on the world scene, such as developments in NATO and southeast Asia prove the ineptness of our present policies, and the inconsistencies of those being proposed.

In defense, the various program cancellations and indications of what the new budget will contain show that the basic thinking of this administration is leading us dangerously close to unilateral disarmament and placing serious risks upon the country and the free world as a whole.

It is to be devoutly hoped that the Johnson administration will undertake a serious and penetrating reevaluation of our basic policies in the interest of freedom and security for this Nation and the whole free world.

Mr. Speaker, whether the Executive will, or will not, we Republicans stand ready to work with all of our colleagues in the Congress to assure that the voice of the American people still may be heard at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue.

And we warn all of our colleagues that, unless the legislative branch stands for something more than a rubber stamp, it is not Republicans who will be a minority—it will be the entire Congress, dwarfed and dragooned by a great and overbearing executive branch.

The section of the Republican platform referred to above follows:

FREEDOM'S SHIELD—AND SWORD

Finally, Republicans pledge to keep the Nation's sword sharp, ready, and dependable.

We will maintain a superior, not merely equal, military capability as long as the Communist drive for world domination continues. It will be a capability of balanced force, superior in all its arms, maintaining flexibility for effective performance in the rapidly changing science of war.

Republicans will never unilaterally disarm America.

We will demand that any arms reduction plan worthy of consideration guarantee reliable inspection. We will demand that any such plan assure this Nation of sufficient strength, step by step, to forestall and defend against possible violations.

We will take every step necessary to carry forward the vital military research and development programs. We will pursue these programs as absolutely necessary to assure our Nation of superior strength in the 1970's.

We will revitalize research and development programs needed to enable the Nation to develop advanced new weapons systems, strategic as well as tactical.

We will include the fields of antisubmarine warfare, astronautics and aeronautics, special guerrilla forces, and such other defense systems required to keep America ready for any threat.

We will fully implement such safeguards as our security requires under the limited nuclear test ban treaty. We will conduct advanced tests in permissible areas, maintain facilities to test elsewhere in case of violations and develop to the fullest our ability to detect Communist transgressions. Additionally, we will regularly review the status of nuclear weaponry under the limited nuclear test ban to assure this Nation's protection. We shall also provide sensible, continuing reviews of the treaty itself.

We will end second-best weapons policies. We will end the false economies which place price ahead of the performance upon which American lives may depend. Republicans will bring an end once again to the "peak and valley" defense planning, so costly in morale and strength as well as in dollars. We will prepare a practical civil defense program.

We will restore the morale of our Armed Forces by upgrading military professionalism, and we will allow professional dissent while insuring that strong and sound civilian authority controls objective decisionmaking.

We will return the Joint Chiefs of Staff to their lawful status as the President's principal military advisers. We will insure that an effective planning and operations staff is restored to the National Security Council.

We will reconsecrate this Nation to human liberty, assuring the freedom of our people, and rallying mankind to a new crusade for freedom all around the world.

We Republicans, with the help of Almighty God, will keep those who would bury America aware that this Nation has the strength and also the will to defend its every interest. Those interests, we shall make clear, include the preservation and expansion of freedom—and ultimately its victory—every place on earth.

We do not offer the easy way. We offer dedication and perseverance, leading to victory. This is our platform. This is the Republican way.

MIDDLE EAST ARMS RACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it was most disturbing to read in Sunday's New York Times:

> The administration is being drawn deeper into the accelerating arms race in the Middle East by requests for arms from Jordan and Saudi Arabia. (New York Times, Feb. 28, 1965.)

According to the Times, Saudi Arabia is interested in buying modern jet fighters and bombers. The United States has supplied Saudi Arabia with F–86 jet fighters, jet trainers, and B–26 bombers as well as transports.

Jordan is interested in receiving modern tanks and other modern military equipment. Since 1957, the United States has been supplying Jordan with approximately $4 million of military assistance every year with the exception of 1959 when there were no arms shipments.

It is clear from these recent requests and from the military buildup over the last several years that there is an arms race in the Middle East. This arms race presents a grave threat not only to the democracy of Israel but also to world peace. It is inconceivable that a major war in this sensitive area would not involve the great powers. The possibility that the arms race in the Middle East will inevitably result in the introduction of nuclear weapons in that area makes

the situation critical. This is no idle concern. Nasser has already employed German scientists to work on a missile program.

In view of the situation in the Middle East, it would be supreme folly for the United States to sanction further military aid to Jordan and Saudi Arabia. The power, prestige, and influence of the United States should be used to bring about peace in the area, not to accelerate the arms race. On February 19, 1965, the Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara stated in regard to the Middle East:

A principal U.S. objective has long been to keep the feud from escalating into overt hosilities.

I can think of no act more calculated to escalate the feud than for the United States to increase military aid to Arab States.

Mr. Speaker, because of the grave situation in the Middle East, I have written to the Secretary of State urging that the proposed sale of military equipment to Jordan and Saudi Arabia be disapproved. Tomorrow I will introduce again the concurrent resolution concerning the situation in the Middle East, which I sponsored in the 88th Congress. This resolution would make clear that the policy of the United States is to discourage an arms race in the Near East. The resolution also reaffirms the tripartite declaration of May 1950, in which the United States, Britain, and France are committed to take action both within and outside the United Nations if any state in the area should use force or threaten to use force in violation of the Arab-Israel armistice agreement. The resolution also urges that the United States use its good offices to negotiate with the Middle Eastern States an agreement banning nuclear weapons in that area under an international policing system.

The United States must do everything it can to insure peace in the Middle East. Increased armaments for the Arab world are not conducive to stability in that troubled area.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the text of my resolution:

H. CON. RES. —

Whereas tensions in the Near East are steadily mounting; and

Whereas the stability and peace of the Near East are vital to the well-being of the peoples of the Near East and to the world at large; and

Whereas the continuing arms race in the Near East threatens to enter a new stage of development of nuclear weapons and offensive missiles; and

Whereas the policy of the United States is to discourage an arms race in the Near East; and

Whereas the United States has contributed generously and impartially to promote the economic development of the states of the Near East and to raise the standard of living of their peoples; and

Whereas several of the states are wasting precious resources in order to acquire ever greater quantities and even more sophisticated types of weapons, thus partially offsetting the effects and aims of United States foreign economic and technical assistance programs; and

Whereas the acquisition of such arms serves further to heighten the tensions in the Near East and to enhance the risk of hostilities; and

Whereas the interests of the states and peoples of the area, of the United States, and of the world in general would be served by a reduction of tensions, by an end to belligerency, and by a termination of the arms race: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States use his good offices with the states of the area to negotiate with them either through the United Nations, or directly, an agreement that nuclear weapons will neither be produced in the area nor be introduced into the area; that missiles of a mass-destruction nature will neither be produced nor be introduced into the area; that an international policing system will be adopted to enforce such agreement; and that the United States continue, in accordance with the tripartite declaration of May 1950, to take all necessary and appropriate actions both within and outside the United Nations to prevent any violation of existing frontiers or armistice lines in the Near East; and that the United States, either through the United Nations, or directly with other nations in the area, devise means to bring to an end the recriminations and incitements to violence which are contributing to tension and instability in the Near East.

ILLICIT SALE AND USE OF STIMULANT AND DEPRESSANT DRUGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. MCDOWELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MCDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, Congress and the U.S. Public Health Service, among others, have been aware of the mounting evidence of illegal traffic in the sale of barbiturates and amphetamines and the foolish and dangerous unprescribed misuse of these stimulant and depressant drugs by various elements of our population for other than medical purposes.

These stimulant-depressant drugs find their way into the illicit pathways by various names; barbiturates are called "goof balls" and the amphetamines are variously known as pep pills and bennies.

A new contemporary fad uncovered by law enforcement officers is making considerable inroads among adolescents who seek new thrills by getting "high," or "sinking low," in a fuzzy haze from experimenting with these complex drugs. The barbiturates and amphetamines resemble the characteristics of narcotics; many are addictive; all distort the senses when used wantonly; all, when abused, harm body and mind. Many produce hallucinations and some have resulted in the death of the indiscriminate users.

The problem is further compounded when users try bizarre offshoots to "kick up" the effects of the drug. Mixing them with alcoholic beverages is one practice. Another, discovered by health officers, is that whereby the experimenter takes an amphetamine to shoot sky high and then takes a barbiturate to roller coaster into the depths.

The illicit sales of these drugs and their use in seeking euphoria on the part of juveniles and adults are causing considerable concern, and problems, among the medical profession, drug manufacturers, law enforcement officials, and public health officers throughout the United States. This concern is further reflected by the introduction of H.R. 2 on January 4, 1965, by the gentleman from Arkansas, Congressman OREN HARRIS, a measure which relates to the production and distribution of stimulant and depressant drugs. Smith, Kline, & French, along with several other major drug manufacturers, is also worried about the problem. The firm knows that publicity about abuse deters some sick people, who need such drugs, from taking them, even under a doctor's guidance. They know, too, that abuse tends to give the entire drug field a bad name and they are anxious to seek remedies to the problem.

Moreover, users who become addicted to these drugs resort to stealing and other crimes for money to purchase drugs from shady sources.

It is paradoxical that, on the one hand, the Government and hundreds of philanthropic organizations and health clinics are spending millions of dollars in research and treatment to control disabling diseases and to upgrade our national health, some of which are treated by the use of these drugs, while on the other hand, illicit drug peddlers are menacing the public health and public safety by bootlegging dangerous drugs for the indiscriminate use of thrill seekers and the emotionally disturbed adolescent or adult.

While I commend the action taken by the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration to restrict inhalers containing methamphetamine or its salts, as well as amphetamine inhalers, to prescription sale only, I am hopeful that Congressman HARRIS' bill will be seriously and promptly considered by the Congress, now that it has been favorably reported by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

As a Roman philosopher once said: "We should pray for a sane mind in a sound body." It is inconceivable that the benefits of our highly developed society, which do sustain good health and prolong life, are used capriciously and indiscriminately for ill gain and for seeking an unrealistic euphoria.

TIME MAGAZINE TAKES NOTES OF COTTON MESS

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, at long last a national periodical has taken note of the cotton program mess. Last year the Congress, at President Johnson's behest, piled a multimillion mill subsidy on top of a jerry-built contraption of other subsidies.

The new subsidy was supposed to result in lower program costs, and lower consumer prices. Neither has resulted, of course. In fact, about everything has

gone up—program costs, consumer prices, and mill profits.

U.S. Department of Agriculture statistics show that mills simply transferred the subsidies to their profit column, and let product prices continue their upward trend.

The current issue of Time magazine contains a brief review of the sorry situation, and I hope other periodicals will dig even deeper.

Text of the Time article follows:

KING COTTON

When it comes to subsidies, cotton is king. The Federal Government has long subsidized cottongrowers. Then, when exporters complained that the farmers' subsidy priced American cotton out of oversea markets, the United States started subsidizing exporters. And last year, after textile mill owners protested that the exporters' subsidy permitted foreign mills to buy U.S. cotton cheaper than American mills could, the Johnson administration pushed through Congress a subsidy for the mills.

The argument was that with the Government shelling out 6½ cents of the 30 cents per pound paid by the mills, textile prices would fall and the consumer would benefit. This entirely ignored the fact that the consumer is also a taxpayer—and anyway, it hasn't worked out. So far, the textile industry has received a mouth-watering $329 million in subsidies; payments have even gone to prisons whose convicts work at weaving. Textile industry profits have soared to their highest level since Korea. But there has been no dramatic drop in wholesale or retail textile prices. For example, the Agriculture Department recently reported that the price of a heavy cotton union suit has risen from $3.07 a year earlier to $3.14, a long-sleeved sport shirt from $3.38 to $3.41.

The overall cotton program was advertised as costing $448 million during its first year. Instead, it is now expected to amount to nearly $800 million. Reason: despite all the subsidies, exports have kept falling and production has kept rising, meaning that the Government has had to buy up still more cotton for its already bulging inventories. By last week the Commodity Credit Corporation owned a record 7,372,000 bales at a cost of $1.2 billion, on which storage charges alone run another annual $30 million.

In his 1965 farm message, President Johnson promised to reduce the cost of this program and the level of [cotton] stocks. But nobody expects the administration to propose more than minor alterations in the current program—and cotton is likely to remain the only U.S. crop that is subsidized from stem to steam whistle.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the first polls on the question of reapportionment which has been taken is by the Farm Journal and the results are most interesting. In the East, 4 percent voted to let the Supreme Court's decision stand and 96 percent voted for a constitutional amendment permitting the States to decide their own apportionment; in the Southeast 3 percent voted for the Court's decision and 97 percent voted to let the States decide. The Central States voted 5 percent for the Court's decision and 95 percent voted in favor of the constitutional amendment. The West voted 3 percent for the Court's decision and 97 percent for the constitutional amendment; and in the Southwest, 2 percent voted to let the Court's decision stand and 98 percent voted for the constitutional amendment permitting the States to decide.

I sincerely hope that the discharge petition will be promptly signed by a majority of the Members of the House so that we can get the constitutional amendment to the floor for a vote.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1965.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: On Monday, March 1, I have obtained a special order for the purpose of discussing the Supreme Court decisions on State legislative apportionment and the aims and objectives of the Members who have introduced constitutional amendments similar to the one that I have introduced.

I personally feel that we may be a little short of the two-thirds vote required although we do have a comfortable majority; and in order to clear such a measure in the House, we must make clear the very reasonable and mild nature of the proposals we are sponsoring. Today, Thursday, only 66 Members have signed the discharge petition filed by Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN so we need to focus attention on our efforts.

I thought you would want to participate in the discussion and would suggest that you obtain special orders on succeeding days in order that we can keep attention directed on our efforts.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD H. ICHORD,
Member of Congress.

REALISM OR COMMUNISM

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a report from Mr. Robert Stanton, chairman of the board of Aris Gloves, Inc., relative to his trip around the world. This report was written from France.

In view of Mr. Stanton's long experience in worldwide trade and commerce, his views are very much worthwhile. His report from Paris follows:

REALISM OR COMMUNISM

No one can appreciate the problems of a troubled world without experiencing those troubles firsthand. It is a study in foreign relations and our inexperience. I shall try to give my impressions, not to criticize but perhaps to help one analyze what we are up against. The route by ship covered Yokohama, Hong Kong, Manila, Saigon, Singapore, Colombo, Bombay, Karachi, Djibouti, Suez, Port Said, Marseille. For a long time now it has been obvious that the removal of British, Dutch, Belgian, and French tutelage from African and Asian territories has not brought greater freedom to the individual but a loss of order and stability.

What made England the greatest colonial power of all times and how did they lose that power? Was it America's fault? Was the Suez crisis the beginning of the end? Did England rule solely by force? Even where the English have relinquished their authority in the places we visited, they still have the respect of the people. They recognize their authority, and, in fact, still maintain a control over external issues like trade. Malaysia and Ceylon remain British protectorates.

We must recognize man's ambitions which are stimulated by American achievements but we must also recognize the inability of the backward races to appreciate a holier-than-thou attitude. This we have learned from Suez and the possible loss of the entire Middle East. Power and patience were great British attributes and with America's ascendancy as the great world power, it behooves us to learn from our British brothers how they functioned.

A great deal of misinformation is today broadcast by the Communists about our aims and our economic system. Nationalists in these former colonial regions have exploited these communistic claims. The United Nations has given them status. The colonies are entitled to their own aspirations but they should not deprive their people of the assistance and help of a friendly power or powers. They must know communism and nationalism cannot exist together.

Even France, who should understand our motives takes the position that she need not support our foreign policies because she knows that we are so irrevocably committed to peace that she can safely pursue an independent—indeed an isolationist French policy regardless of what we think of it. De Gaulle fails to recognize that a divided free world is no match for future Communist aggressions. Let him beware.

If we did not have the United Nations we would have to invent one. I do not expect that we will always be in agreement on the best means for resolving various issues even between our free nations or best friends; that is the privilege of free nations. However, I sincerely believe that on matters of vital importance to the freedom, well-being and dignity of man, we must find common ground on which we must agree.

Most of these newly developed nations are not capable of sound judgments through lack of education, and inexperienced leaders. It is the tendency of the backward nations to be moderate in their criticism of those whom they fear, and direct their blasts against those whom they can trust. Being too sensitive of world opinion, however, weakens our position, and being ultra-sensitive only impairs our prestige. Maybe the United States, in its foreign policy is too much influenced because decisions are made with an eye to the United Nations. It relies too much on the United Nations instead of implementing programs by building a cohesive community of free nations, specifically the North Atlantic nations that make up the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and not use it solely as an organization for defense, as the United States must rely on its own military strength.

Whatever it is called, its motto should be moral suasion and the rule of law. Such an alliance might one day help bring peace to this earth.

Britain's importance in the world was not just a product of gunboats and regiments, and the Royal Navy maintaining the freedom of the seas. It was a response at home and abroad to the bearing of the Britons, their dispassionate intelligence, their moral rectitude, their sense of justice and selflessness which British officials everywhere left in the mind of those over whom they ruled.

The word which best describes the strength of British power over its former colonies is the simple word "integrity." It is much more effective than our image of liberality as far as the populace is concerned. Most of our liberality goes to the

governments and the people know little about it. Our State Department needs an agency to promote our forces of courage, conviction, dignity, and decision.

England saved herself by her exertions and will and the confident conviction of the power of freemen. This feeling of freemen posted across the world should be our force to fight communism, instead of favors and fortunes.

And finally, perhaps the passing of Winston Churchill will bring back the symbol of unity by which our English-speaking world saved the cause of freemen through his voice, his ideas, and his philosophy. Maybe it will awaken us to the values of the past and strike a forgotten chord in the English-speaking world by keeping something from the older world which is essential to our future. We need an effort in the United States which is human and alive—not just doles. It is that force of character which makes a nation enduring. It is that power of freemen and confident conviction of our place in the world that will win the prestige to which we are entitled.

With the end of an era and the end of our steamer voyage, I feel very strongly that President Johnson should include our foreign relations in his Great Society, if possible through a united peoples as a forum for freemen. In addition, let us show our might when we have a right to fight.

ROBERT STANTON,
Chairman of the Board,
Aris Gloves, Inc.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

FRANCES P. BOLTON: SILVER ANNIVERSARY OF SERVICE TO THE CONGRESS

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, my neighbor in the 22d District of Ohio, my good friend and wonderful counselor, FRANCES PAINE BOLTON, is observing her silver anniversary as a U.S. Representative. We are the richer for her 25 years of unselfish public service.

To the pride of her devoted constituents, this great lady has achieved the stature of a stateswoman during her quarter century in the House. Without sacrifice of dignity or feminine charm, she has successfully sailed the sometimes rocky seas of political life. She commands the respect of the Nation for her clear-sighted leadership as ranking minority member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Her private endeavors in behalf of nursing have won nationwide recognition and applause.

For myself, I shall always regard her with the deepest affection for the guidance she gave me as a young Member from the 23d District when I came to the House 10 years ago and for the constancy of her friendship ever since.

As legislator, leader, friend, Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON is a remarkable lady. To a magnificent heritage of public service she brings the crown of laurels.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished and delightful colleague from the 22d District of Ohio, the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, marked the 25th anniversary of her service in the Congress on the 27th of February. This attainment is unique for a woman in the annals of Ohio politics, and remarkable by any measure. However, Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON is a remarkable person, and we salute her with cordial congratulations on this happy occasion. All Ohio is very proud of her.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] in his fine tribute to my longtime friend, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON]. Her friendship has been one of the rewarding compensations of my service in Congress. An eloquent and talented lady, she has dignified the House of Representatives by her membership in this body for 25 years. During that time she has achieved national recognition for her untiring efforts in the complicated and critical area of our country's foreign affairs. This anniversary of her 25 years of dedicated service in Congress is an event which brings pride and happiness to those of us who have been privileged to work with her.

I desire to extend my personal congratulations to her for this magnificent record of accomplishment. And I hope the Nation may have the benefit of many more years of her unselfish and devoted service.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, this day is a very meaningful one to me. I can well remember the special election which was held on February 27, 1940. There were two special elections in the State of Ohio to fill two vacancies. One seat was that of my father, William A. Ashbrook, and the other was that of the late husband of our distinguished Representative of the 22d Ohio District, Chester Castle Bolton. Hon. J. Harry McGregor was elected to fill the vacancy in the 17th District and served until he died in October 1958, while serving his constitutents. The charming lady we honor today, Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON, was elected to succeed her husband.

No one has served more honorably during the two troubled decades of the forties and the fifties than our esteemed colleague from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON]. She is one of the most learned Members of this body, she has traveled throughout the world and she combines a gracious manner with a dedicated interest in every problem from the smallest matter to matters of state. I delight in joining with my colleagues in paying respect to the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, a great American and, thankfully, an Ohioan with whom I have had the rare opportunity of associating during these few years in Congress. We salute you, FRANCES, and wish you another 25 years of dedicated public service.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with my colleagues in paying a special tribute to FRANCES P. BOLTON. Today marks her silver anniversary in the House of Representatives, culminating 25 years of dedicated and unselfish service to her country. This gracious and lovely lady from Ohio not only gives her time to serving her own constituents and her country, but makes a great contribution to the Republican Party as well.

It is indeed a privilege to work with the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] in the Congress and a great honor to know her as my friend. I hope we may have the benefit of her service for many more years to come.

SUPPORT PASSAGE TO APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support passage of the Appalachian Regional Development Act. This legislation is vital to the people of Pennsylvania. As it helps them so it will also help the Nation. Because of my intense interest in helping to solve the burdensome problems of our citizens in Appalachia, I have sponsored legislation similar to that now being considered by this House.

The Schweiker bill contains better strip mining benefits than the bill which has passed the Senate and is now before us. I urge that this House improve the proposed legislation by adopting the provisions of the Schweiker Appalachia bill which would enlarge and strengthen the strip mining section and would permit meaningful action in this area in the immediate future rather than delaying this program for 2 more years.

PASSAGE OF THE IMMIGRATION REFORM BILL

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, this great deliberative body, the U.S. Congress, can be keyed to change the course of history in a matter of hours or, on the other hand, it may take such a course that will seem to be a never-ending diet of inaction.

This is as it should be. The Members of this House of Representatives and our friends on the other side of the Capitol must respond to the dictates of the people that we represent. The Congress must reflect what the people want and need, always alert to the best interests of the United States.

The committees of this Congress are busy, today, conducting hearings and actively considering priority or must legislation. When these priority measures are reported by the respective committees they are scheduled for floor action.

However, Mr. Speaker, one very important proposal in President Johnson's program—legislation to reform our immigration policy—appears to be lagging behind all other priority legislation. I urge my colleagues on the House Judiciary Committee to speed up the time schedule so that this very important legislation—a proposal for immigration reform conceived by the late President Kennedy, and submitted to this Congress by President Johnson and designated by him as one of the most important programs before the Congress this session—may be enacted into law.

Let us whet the legislative process to a finely honed instrument and cut through the delay in the enactment of that important program.

For a period of over 3 months, Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Judiciary Committee heard witnesses from all interested governmental agencies, private organizations, and private citizens express their views on our immigration policies. The record has been made and the foundation firmly established for action and for action now.

Repeal of an immigration law based on an undemocratic national origins quota system was a major goal of President Kennedy who understood the problems and appreciated the contributions of those millions who came from foreign lands to make their home in our United States.

Our late President took a special interest in immigration matters throughout his public life. He stated many times that the basic problem for our immigration policy is to choose fairly among the applicants for admission to this country. Only a few weeks ago President Kennedy's last book, "A Nation of Immigrants" pointed with pride to the great contributions made by the foreign born to our great country—undoubted contributions of people from all over the world who have given this Nation its great strength. This Nation was formed by immigrants of courage and ability. This Nation has benefited from their genius and a rich and enduring culture has been our reward.

President Johnson in his January 13, 1965, immigration message to the Congress noted that four Presidents have called attention to the serious defects in our immigration legislation. With conviction he said:

> I urge the Congress to return the United States to an immigration policy which both serves the national interest and continues our traditional ideals. No move could more effectively reaffirm our immigration policy which both serves the national interest and continues our fundamental belief that a man is to be judged—and judged exclusively—on his worth as a human being.

The discrimination which has existed in our immigration policy for several decades can no longer go unchallenged and unheeded. The legislation to remedy our outdated and immature attitude toward immigrants is pending before this body. I repeat, we must speed up the schedule for passage of the immigration reform bill.

The House Judiciary Committee in this Congress is in a position to initiate the building of a great monument to a great President. It would be a fitting tribute, indeed, if Congress would consider the present immigration bill so that it could be passed in time for President Johnson to sign it into law on May 29—the birth date of the late President John F. Kennedy.

COPYRIGHT LAW REVISION HEARINGS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the Copyright Subcommittee of which I am chairman has scheduled hearings on the copyright law revision bill, H.R. 4347, introduced by the gentleman from New York, Judiciary Committee Chairman CELLER. The hearings will begin on Wednesday, April 28, at 10 a.m.

There has been no general revision of the copyright law since 1909. Meanwhile entirely new industries involving entirely new methods of reproducing and disseminating literary and artistic works have come into existence. At the time of the enactment of the present law, the motion pictures were in their infancy, radio virtually unknown, and commercial television still far in the future. The 1909 act is no longer adequate.

For the past 10 years, the Copyright Office has been engaged in a program for the general revision of the copyright law. In 1955, pursuant to authority from Congress, it sponsored 35 studies analyzing the major problem areas under the present statute. In 1961, on the basis of these studies and comments based on them, the Register of Copyrights issued his report on the general revision of the copyright law. This report was discussed intensely at a series of meeting with a panel of consultants on general revision of the copyright law conducted by the Register in 1961 and 1962.

In July 1964, Chairman CELLER, acting at the request of the Register of Copyrights, and for the purpose of enabling study, introduced H.R. 11947, a bill for the complete revision of the copyright law. Thereafter, the Register again met with the panel of consultants and also received a large number of statements of positions on questions of substance and suggestions for improvements in language.

The present bill, H.R. 4347, reflects the Register's revision in light of further comments received and further study.

The subcommittee wishes to afford all interested persons the opportunity of submitting their views on this vital legislation. For this purpose it has set aside Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, April 28, 29, and 30, and Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, May 5, 6, and 7, 1965. The Register of Copyrights will be heard on April 28.

Persons wishing to testify or to submit written statements relating to this measure should address Mr. Herbert Fuchs, subcommittee counsel, in room 345, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

OPERATION MUST

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, San Antonio, Tex., which I have the honor to represent in this hallowed Chamber of democracy, is one of the fastest growing centers for scientific research in America. Long renowned as one of the truly unique cities of the Nation, containing a picturesque blend of the Anglo and Latin American cultures, it has emerged in recent years as a city of science. Among the major scientific facilities in the Alamo City are Wilford Hall U.S. Air Force Hospital, the largest Air Force hospital and the largest single structure unit in the Department of Defense; Brooke Army Medical Center, world famous for its clinical treatment in the management of severe burns; Lackland Air Force Base Military Training Center; the school of aerospace medicine at Brooks Air Force Base; the Southwest Research Center; the Southwest Research Institute; and the Southwest Foundation for Research and Education.

San Antonio, the home of Kelly Air Force Base, has been called the mother of the Air Force. But also located in this great city is the Brooke Army Medical Center, and it was therefore particularly fitting for the Department of Defense and the U.S. Army to have demonstrated its newest answer to the problem of rapidly setting up military field hospitals for the care of battlefield casualties. This occurred last Wednesday, February 24, 1965, when the Army unveiled its medical unit self-contained transportable, called MUST, before members of the House Armed Services Committee and numerous other distinguished visitors to San Antonio representing the Government, industry, and medicine.

This remarkable demonstration proved beyond any doubt that we have made a spectacular breakthrough in this area of military medicine.

Among the many news services covering this important event were Time magazine, the San Antonio Express, and the San Antonio Light. With unanimous consent I am inserting in the RECORD articles from each of these publications giving eyewitness accounts of what took place.

The tremendous success of this demonstration is a real tribute to every man and woman who participated in it, and I think special recognition ought to be given to the Secretary of the Army, Stephen Ailes, to the Surgeon General of the Army, Lt. Gen. L. D. Heaton, and to the commander of Brooke Army Medical Center, Maj. Gen. James Snyder, for their foresight, imagination, and hard work.

[From Time magazine, Mar. 5, 1965]

BATTLEFIELD READINESS

The wounds of the battlefield casualty often cry out for the most advanced skills of modern medicine. But the battlefield surgeon has always worked against forbidding odds. Aseptic surgery is practically impossible in a tent operating room of the sort that has gone almost unchanged for 100 years. The canvas is far from airtight, and temperature control is so bad that an infusion bottle might freeze and shatter in mid-operation. The lab work that is essential in today's medicine and surgery is usually out of the question.

Now all such problems can be relegated to the past. Last week at the Army's Camp Bullis, near San Antonio, medics demonstrated a portable, air-conditioned hospital—aseptic operating room and all. Under a miniature mushroom cloud that signified a theoretical A-bomb attack, while scores of "casualties" splashed with blood-red paint waited for treatment, the 20-bed unit was made ready within half an hour.

ZIPPERED JOINTS

The hospital arrived on trucks and trailers—a load of bulky packages, some as big as 7 feet by 8 feet by 12 feet, weighing up to 3 tons. From one, corpsmen took four bundles that looked like oversized parachutes and laid them out neatly, edge to edge, on clear ground, then hooked them to an air-hose. Solemnly, the big bags shook out their wrinkles as they were inflated and rose into the familiar, half-round shape of a quonset hut. The four sections were joined together and the joints zippered airtight. Out of the other packages came 20 beds and all the gear needed for as many patients. Only eight men were needed for the job.

In an equally impressive performance, another crew set up the operating room, which had come in a slightly smaller package. In the center was a versatile operating table adjustable to all nine standard surgical positions. Overhead, from ceiling mounts, hung three groups of lights, of 1,500 foot-candles each, which can be aimed at different parts of the body if a man has scattered wounds and needs surgery on his head, trunk and legs at the same time. The table weighs only 200 pounds as shipped, but need not wobble because there is a base tank that holds 100 pounds of water.

ADDED PRESSURE

The Army calls its new hospital MUST, from medical unit self-contained transportable. Impressed observers could suggest only one potential drawback. What would happen under a strafing attack? Would a few bullet holes cause leaks in the walls and let the whole pneumatic construction collapse? The Army had not overlooked the obvious: added air pressure can compensate for most holes.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Light, Feb. 24, 1965]

ARMY TO DEMONSTRATE NEW HOSPITAL IN SOUTH AMERICA

(By John Barbour)

A mushroom cloud erupted over Herr Hill, and the casualty count was devastating. It was only a mock attack, but it set the scene for the U.S. Army's new hospital in a box.

The hospital, flown to San Antonio by helicopter or toted by truck, can be set up and ready for surgery in less than half an hour. In the primitive, hurt world that must follow atomic attack, it is an impressive bit of civilization.

The units would replace the old canvas field tents in which Army doctors say some men died in war because the stresses of cold and heat added to the shock of their wounds.

"In some of those tents, you'd be operating on a man over here, and in the corner plasma bottles would be freezing and cracking open," one doctor remembered.

SOLONS COMING

Today the Army plays host to the House Armed Services Committee and representatives of industry and medicine to show off this new hospital concept that the Army wants for its strike units and thinks is a prime development for civil defense.

"It's the first integrated advance in field hospitals since the Civil War," said Col. John Trenholm, of the Army Surgeon General's Office.

The hospital comes in three boxed units—a gas turbine that supplies heat, air conditioning, electricity, hot and cold water; an inflatable ward that looks like a rubber quonset hut; and a box that unfolds into a fully equipped surgical room.

Any number and any variety of the units can be joined together into a single building with the use of fabric air locks that provide hallways where needed.

VIETNAM TEST

The Army would like to have at least 15 or 20 400-bed hospitals of this type, and probably more. It may test one of the prototypes within the next 6 months in South Vietnam.

The cost, fully equipped with modern medical devices from new operating tables to anesthesia units, might run up to $2 million for a 400-bed hospital.

Army doctors say the cost, while twice that of current field hospitals, would be worth its weight in human lives.

The inflatable ward—though it seems vulnerable to a pinprick—is sturdy even under fire from an automatic weapons. Army doctors say the structures provide excellent insulation.

The hospital units are manufactured by Garrett Corp. of Los Angeles, a firm which produces gas turbines and pressurized aircraft cabins.

The Army's demonstration takes place on the hills of Camp Bullis outside San Antonio. GI's are made up to demonstrate the wounds that can occur when enemy aircraft deliver a small nuclear device on a target behind the lines.

Representative GONZALEZ Wednesday described the mobile field hospital being demonstrated at Camp Bullis as a "remarkable and magnificent achievement."

The Congressman said the military facility will result in the savings of "untold numbers of lives" if it is ever needed in a combat area.

"I am going to push for this type of hospital," the lawmaker pledged. "I wish to commend the Surgeon General and the staff of Brooke Army Medical Center for their work and the ingenuity they have shown in the development of it," GONZALEZ continued.

GONZALEZ said the new type transportable hospital is a "major breakthrough" in the field of technology and hospitals.

"I have of course been aware of the great prestige of the installation known as Brooke Army Medical Center and I have seen technicians trained there work throughout the world," he continued.

GONZALEZ was one of a dozen Congressmen who attended the demonstration of the mobile field hospital at Camp Bullis. Included in the congressional delegation were 10 members of the House Armed Services Committee.

There were 600 civilian and military dignitaries in attendance at the demonstration.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Express, Feb. 25, 1965]

"MUST" HOSPITAL SHOWN

Ranking Army officers, Congressmen, and other VIP's shrouded in heavy blankets and coats, braved icy weather Wednesday to view the first official demonstration of Operation MUST at Camp Bullis.

The unique concept in field hospitalization has been in development only 19 months and incurred favorable comments from the Army Surgeon General, Lt. Gen. Leonard T. Heaton.

"MUST is a high level of hospital care never before attained," General Heaton said.

MUST (for medical unit self-contained transportable) is a three-part field hospital unit, the most revolutionary part being an inflatable patient ward. The 20-patient unit looks like a rubberized quonset hut.

The other two units consist of an expandable operating room made of wood and a power unit to supply air conditioning and air pressure as well as hot and cold water.

General Heaton said it would be 18 months before MUST will be integrated into the Army medical services program if the idea is accepted.

"First we have to sell it to Congress and the Defense Department," the general explained.

The day-long tour of the unit included a simulated nuclear explosion with realistic wounded soldiers adding to the drama.

The demonstration then included treatment in the MUST facility.

Army officials estimated cost of a fully equipped 400-bed MUST hospital unit at $2 million. Even though twice the cost of present-day tent hospitals, General Heaton justified the added expense.

"Any medium that works better is well worth the millions. The surgery advantages alone are worth the effort and expense," he said. "I can see its use in Vietnam certainly."

The MUST concept can be applied equally as well to civilian disaster relief agencies. The highly mobile unit can be airlifted to the most remote area and be erected, ready for delicate surgery, on a moment's notice.

MUST was developed by the Garrett Corp. of Los Angeles and the American Hospital Supply Co.

General Heaton would not comment on how many MUST units might be ordered for Army use should the facility be approved. An Army spokesman said, however, that normally there are three field hospital units per division and there are now 15 divisions.

"We would hope to supply all of them with the required number of field units first," said Col. John Trenholm of the Army Surgeon General's Office.

Viewing the demonstration Wednesday were nine members of the House Armed Services Committee. They were Representatives FRANK E. EVANS, Democrat, of Tennessee; CHARLES S. GUBSER, Republican, of California; DURWARD G. HALL, Republican, of Missouri;

PORTER HARDY, JR., Democrat, of Virginia; RODNEY M. LOVE, Democrat, of Ohio; LUCIEN N. NEDZI, Democrat, of Michigan; OTIS G. PIKE, Democrat, of New York; WILLIAM RANDALL, Democrat, of Missouri; and ROBERT WILSON, Democrat, of California.

Also on hand were representatives of industry and medicine, San Antonio's U.S. Representative HENRY B. GONZALEZ, and Mayor W. W. McAllister.

PEACE CORPS DESERVES SUPPORT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, this country has demonstrated for many, many years that it is searching for ways to contribute to mankind, and the means to seek a peaceful relationship with governments on all continents. Under the administration of the beloved John F. Kennedy, the concept of the Peace Corps was born and put into a tangible program which has brought a new light to scores of people in almost 50 countries. The Peace Corps is a living tribute to that great President.

President Lydon B. Johnson has shown that he plans to expand this worthy program and that he desires to provide through the Peace Corps volunteers the unique technical assistance and the vibrant enthusiasm which can be made available through the Peace Corps. Such actions are deserving of our praise and of our help at this time.

The Peace Corps represents a partial answer to the complex and nagging problems of our time. Problems which will not disappear in this or the next generation. The Peace Corps is a part of the assertion of leadership that America must exercise in a troubled world. It is a demonstration of the worthwhile and single desire we have for an existence with all nations without conflict, for a prosperous world.

A great President has shown us the way; a second one has demonstrated the wisdom to continue the Peace Corps in even larger proportion. Ours is the obligation to follow their lead and give support to this program which is at work for the cause of peace throughout the world.

BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE STUDY OF THE FEASIBILITY OF DEVELOPING A DEICING SYSTEM FOR THE GREAT LAKES AND THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing my bill to authorize the study of the feasibility of developing a deicing system for the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway so they will be available for navigation during the entire year.

The possibility of providing ice-free navigation channels through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway 12 months a year instead of only 8 has, I am happy to say, aroused considerable interest. In September 1963, the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the Public Works Committee held hearings on this legislation and at that time Mr. Franklin Snyder, Civil Works Division, Office of the Chief of Engineers, testified as to the techniques and methods which have been developed for the practical utilization of such a proposal.

The most common deicing procedure is called air-bubbling in which air tubes in the water are used to raise the warmer water from the bottom to the surface to melt ice. New machinery and equipment has been developed and is in use. There is some work in this area which has been done in the Arctic by the military and at Port Radium in Canada, Northwest Territory on the Great Bear Lake, they keep ice which is normally 5 feet thick there open during the winter months by air-bubbling in order to permit a dredge to operate year around in recovering ore tailings which they are now processing.

While it is true, of course, that most of this work has been done in small areas, narrow channels and short distances, according to the Corps of Engineers there is plenty of warm water at the bottom of the Great Lakes which could provide energy to keep a channel open. I would hope, therefore, that this legislation which only asks $50,000 for a feasibility study to investigate the possibilities of such a venture would receive prompt and favorable consideration. Considering the vital role which navigation on the Great Lakes plays on the total economy of our Nation, any new information which ultimately leads to a further understanding of the control of our water resources would be of national benefit and the matter should be fully explored because of its economic and national defense aspects.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include a recent newspaper account of the International Association of Great Lakes Ports meeting at which a Canadian port official urged the executives and directors of more than 20 United States and Canadian ports to get behind this proposal and I urge the same of my colleagues:

LAKES PORTS HOPE TO MELT BARRIERS TO LONGER SEASON—METHOD OF CLEARING ICE OUTLINED BY TORONTO ENGINEER AT CHICAGO SESSION

CHICAGO, February 4.—"You have to melt men's minds before you can melt the ice," the Canadian said.

The ice is the reason why the St. Lawrence Seaway has been closed 4 months a year since the seaway opened in 1959.

The mental barrier reflects the opposition—political and traditional—to finding ways to open the seaway in the winter, a feat that would greatly increase traffic.

The speaker was a Canadian port official in Chicago for the winter meeting of the International Association of Great Lakes Ports, a group made up of the directors and other executives of more than 20 United States and Canadian ports.

The political opposition stems largely from eastern ports, leading foes of the seaway because they attract tonnage that normally would flow to inland ports. This is especially true of some eastern Canadian ports that do practically all of their business in the winter, he noted.

The port directors have two goals. They want the seaway closing date extended from November 30 to a firm December 15 to coincide with the closing of the Welland Canal that links Lake Ontario and Lake Erie west of the seaway.

They also want, in the long run, to keep the seaway open all year. Not only would this boost tonnage for their ports but it would increase seaway revenues.

The early closing date, even if extended several days when weather allowed in the past, costs seaway ports valuable tonnage. The officials point to the four ships that failed to enter the seaway last December 5, the closing date set by the Canadian authority. The eastbound ships were trapped at Great Lakes ports for the winter, costing the owners an estimated $1 million or more.

Shippers have flirted with the closing date in the past and, until last year, never got caught; many believe the four ships could have cleared the Canadian stretch of seaway, even it it meant calling in icebreakers.

The effect, it is feared, is that some foreign shipping lines will play it safe and schedule one less sailing at the end of the 1965 season.

A port official taking a positive view is Jack Jones, chief engineer of the port of Toronto, who heads an IAGLP committee studying the problem.

"The season could be extended 2 weeks and possibly longer," Mr. Jones said, "by using icebreakers and some comparatively inexpensive techniques, such as wire to hold ice back from shipping lanes and bubbling devices to keep ice from forming."

For bottlenecks, such as the two narrow locks near Montreal, the eastern end of the seaway, Mr. Jones proposes increasing water flow and cutting slots in the dike that protects the shipping lanes from the St. Lawrence River.

RESOLUTION BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF RHODE ISLAND TO THE PRESIDENT TO OBTAIN INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT LIMITING IMPORTS OF WOOLEN-WORSTEDS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island entitled "Resolution of the general assembly memorializing the President of the United States in view of economic conditions in communities dependent upon the woolen-worsted industry, to obtain at the earliest possible

moment an international agreement limiting imports of woolen-worsteds":

RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY MEMORIALIZING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, IN VIEW OF ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN COMMUNITIES DEPENDENT UPON THE WOOLEN-WORSTED INDUSTRY, TO OBTAIN AT THE EARLIEST POSSIBLE MOMENT AN INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT LIMITING IMPORTS OF WOOLEN-WORSTEDS

Whereas the woolen-worsted industry in the city of Woonsocket and the State of Rhode Island has suffered severe losses in woolen-worsted plants and employment due to the large woolen-worsted imports; and

Whereas increasing imports of woolen-worsteds produced by low wage foreign nations prohibit a reasonable competition with said imports, resulting in the total liquidation of 24 woolen-worsted or related plants in the Woonsocket area with an aggregate peak employment in excess of 5,000 workers, from 1950 through 1965; and

Whereas the loss of the above woolen-worsted plants has reduced sources of tax revenue to the city of Woonsocket and has prevented the overall community payroll from enjoying a steady growth consistent with the national economy and the rising cost of living; and

Whereas the threat of continuing imports has discouraged existing woolen-worsted plants from further investments in plants and equipment; and

Whereas unemployed woolen-worsted workers find it practically impossible to find other employment; and

Whereas the continuing depletion of small woolen-worsted plants has reduced the overall number of competitors in that industry, permitting a handful of larger plants to grow and thus reduce the intensity of competition so essential to our economy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the general assembly hereby memorializes the Honorable Lyndon Baines Johnson, President of the United States, to consider the above factors for all communities strongly dependent on the woolen-worsted industry, and that he increase his efforts to obtain at the earliest possible time a comprehensive international agreement, limiting the imports of woolen-worsteds in order to restore to the domestic woolen-worsted industry an equitable competitive position; and be it further

Resolved, That the general assembly directs the secretary of state to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Honorable Lyndon Baines Johnson, President of the United States, to the Honorable JOHN O. PASTORE and the Honorable CLAIBORNE PELL, Senators from Rhode Island, and to the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY and the Honorable FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN, Congressmen from Rhode Island.

Attest:

AUGUST V. LAFRANCE,
Secretary of State.

BILL TO ALLEVIATE FINANCIAL HARDSHIP TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WITH THE CLOSING OF VARIOUS FEDERAL BASES AND OTHER INSTALLATIONS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill designed to alleviate the financial hardship which will be experienced by Federal employees and their families with the closing of various Federal bases and other installations.

As a result of the termination of these facilities, the jobs of many of these workers will be abolished. Others will be able to retain positions if they are able to relocate to another area. The bill I offer allows these career civil service employees to retire if they have acquired 20 years of service, without incurring the penalties now in effect.

Under the existing Civil Service Retirement Act workers who lose their jobs not for cause may retire if they have completed 20 years of service and are 50 years of age or if they have civil service credit of 25 years, regardless of age. In each instance, the individual incurs a sharp reduction in the pension which would be available if he retired under the normal conditions—30 years' service at 60 years of age. The annuity is reduced by 1 percent per year if he retires between 59 and 55 years of age. Below age 55 the pension declines an additional 2 percent each year. Thus, an individual separated under these circumstances may receive a pension totally inadequate to supply even the necessities for himself and his family, much less any of the amenities normally available to citizens generally.

The bill I have proposed will remove the 50-year minimum age requirement and will eliminate the reduction in pension now applicable. This does not mean that the employee retiring under the measure will receive the same pension as if he had remained in Federal service for 30 years and until attaining age 60. It will permit computation of his annuity based upon his years of service, without reduction for age.

My colleagues are fully aware of the effects of closing military bases, veterans facilities, public health service hospitals and other Government activities on individuals who have devoted a career to public service. The legislation I suggest would ease the impact of this action on thousands of employees, who will be compelled to either move from long-established homes, accept reduced pay in other jobs or leave the Federal service. Understandably, many employees are reluctant to uproot their families from homes they have purchased in neighborhoods where they have established ties, to move into other localities with no guarantee of a permanent job. Similarly, they do not relish the prospect of accepting positions at greatly reduced pay below their capacities. Faced with the alternative of job loss, the measure I offer would permit them to turn to retirement as an alternative.

Many of the workers affected have reached an age where it will be extremely difficult to secure comparable jobs. They should not be required to lose their Federal positions and a large part of their civil service retirement benefits as well.

The Federal Government as a responsible, humane employer has an obligation to assist employees facing these conditions so that their lives will not be seriously disrupted or that they will have to rely on completely substandard retirement benefits.

I commend this proposal to the serious consideration of my colleagues.

WORLD DAY OF PRAYER

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like very much for my colleagues to be aware of the fact that Capitol Hill will observe the World Day of Prayer, March 5, with a quiet meditation service in room S–120 in the Capitol from 11 a.m. to 2 p.m.

There will be no organized worship but Members of Congress and Hill staff members are invited to drop by the interdenominational service at any time for a few moments of prayer and meditation.

The service is sponsored by the United Church Women of the Capital area, and Mrs. George R. Davis, chairman of planning for the Hill service, said this will be one of a number of prayer services in the Washington area and around the world.

The chaplains of both the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris and the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, respectively, are cooperating with the UCW on the service.

Mrs. Davis is the wife of the Reverend Dr. George R. Davis, pastor of the National City Christian Church. She is assisted in planning the Hill service by Mrs. William B. Hynds, who worked on the Hill as secretary to Senator Alben Barkley, Democrat, of Kentucky.

The theme of the service observance will be "What Doth the Lord Require of Thee?" and Dr. Harris and Dr. Braskamp will give brief meditations on this at 12:15 and 1:15 p.m., respectively.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. HUOT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. This year over 250,000 high school students participated in the contest competing for the four scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes.

The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington for the final judging as guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The following is the winning speech of Mr. Durwood Littlefield of Manchester, N.H., who will be in Washington the evening of March 9, 1965, at the Veterans of Foreign Wars annual congressional dinner at the Sheraton Park Hotel.

Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, the people of the State of New Hampshire are justly proud of Mr. Littlefield. His address "The Challenge of Citizenship," exemplifies the patriotic and moral fortitude of the youth of today who are preparing themselves to be leaders of tomorrow.

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Durwood Littlefield, Manchester, N.H.)

It seems that in this era we have undertaken a radically new approach to our philosophy of citizenship. The feeling that each individual citizen should assert himself in the affairs of his State and Nation has rapidly declined. Instead, people are assuming a complacent attitude.

What then is the challenge of citizenship in this present day and age? Perhaps the most pressing challenge is the attempt by each citizen to stem the tide of this declination and to stir the people from their state of lethargy. To do so is no mean task. In a society where the word "chauvinism" has become an object of sneers and jests it requires a citizen of strong character indeed to assert openly his beliefs.

The framers of the Constitution desired that each of us take an active interest in all areas of society and government, and that we wholeheartedly strive to preserve the now inherent freedoms that they fought so diligently to obtain. The Founding Fathers believed that only when each citizen assumed his share of the responsibility could the Nation they founded reach the lofty goals which had been set. Therefore, taking an active part in the affairs of the community and Nation is not just a privilege afforded us, but rather a duty, and a moral obligation.

It is apparent that too many of us are satisfied to live within ourselves or within an equally self-centered group of individuals, leaving the rest of mankind to fend for itself. These people merely take for granted the social community of which they are a part, and are content in allowing others to manage their civic affairs, and accept apathetically any legislation imposed upon them. This is done not realizing that they are fulfilling neither their personal requirements nor their capacity for helping others. They continually fail to recognize the tremendous satisfaction that can be obtained by being a true asset to the community. They do so without realizing that such a status is not difficult to attain, but simply requires a determined perseverance, a true understanding of ethical values, and a genuine desire to help mankind. Of course, everyone cannot be a leader in all endeavors, but being a willing worker in the areas with which one is connected, is the essence of a good citizen.

There are no limits to the challenges in the different realms of society of which a true citizen is a part, and each of these regions is vital to the continuance of the ideals of our Nation. Men of integrity, with an appreciation for the feelings and desires of others, accept these challenges by taking an active part in such activities as the Community Chest, Red Cross, and educational organizations. They take part in all forms of government, keeping well informed on both national and local affairs, and never fail to exercise their privilege of voting on all issues.

A citizen must never be afraid to voice his opinion on issues he deems vital to the good of society. Without the voice of approval or discontent from well-informed citizens, the leaders of the community cannot make the proper decisions which are necessary for its betterment.

Only by the help of the citizen who has accepted his great challenge and has the moral courage to assert his beliefs and voice his opinions, can our Government operate at its greatest capabilities. Those people, having taken up their challenge, daily receive the bountiful rewards from the realization that people have been helped and their community strengthened through their efforts in accepting a challenge put before them.

These are the ingredients needed by a man who desires to accept the challenge of citizenship. Our Constitution is emphatic in the points that we all have the God-given rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Therefore, it follows that we have the right to enjoy the fruits of our labor. No man who has these ingredients could enjoy the fruits of his labor if he did not know within his heart that he had contributed his share of spiritual and material help to his community, his country, and his fellow man.

The challenge is there. One has only to meet it head on and accept its responsibilities and the unbounded rewards of being a true citizen will be bestowed upon him.

FOURTH BIRTHDAY OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the Peace Corps which was looked upon by some at the time of its origin as a fragile venture of questionable merit, is now established as one of the greatest humanitarian and effective programs in our history.

No small measure of the success of the Corps is due to the devotion, skill, and management of its Director, R. Sargent Shriver. Although he would never concede, unselfish as he is, that the Peace Corps would not have succeeded without him, let me be one to say that it could never have done as well, since the quality of its program is a direct result of his vision and enterprise.

One of the most valuable dividends from the Peace Corps will be the experience gained by its voluntary workers—experience which they will bring back to the communities of America as part of the two-way interaction of world understanding. I am delighted to know that later this month hundreds of Peace Corps graduates will be coming to Washington to discuss their experiences and lend further support to the future activity and growth of the Corps.

One of the most noteworthy marks of the Corps' effectiveness is that where its success has been greatest it has been the target for the fullness of the diatribe of the enemies of America and the enemies of freedom. On the other hand, among those who need help most in lands where hope for survival was least, among people where hunger and disease were the best prospects, the Peace Corps is truly known and appreciated.

If the children of South and Latin America, the Philippines, and southeast Asia, the aged and infirm to whom all the world was a dark continent could be brought here on this fourth birthday, they would hardly understand our curious custom of extinguishing candles on the Peace Corps birthday cake. Rather, they would cry out, and hopefully, be heard by us, that we must support the work of the Peace Corps and continue to light candles bringing warmth, illuminating corners of the earth, saving lives and giving new breadth and hope to freedom and justice and love among mankind, so that "Pacem in Terris" will have more meaning for more men.

A TRIBUTE TO THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the others in paying tribute to Mr. Sargent Shriver and the Peace Corps.

Without a doubt, the Peace Corps has proven itself to be the most effective instrument for bringing about understanding between the United States and other nations of the world. It has been the wisest investment in our search for peace. Through its intelligent, dedicated, and hard-working Corpsmen it has helped to create a new image of our country abroad—a change from one of acquisitive, materialistic society of fortune-seeking individualists, to a nation of men of good will seeking to help those in need. This has been the impression expressed to me by countless numbers of Asians I have met, including the Crown Prince of Japan.

Coming as I do from a State which has played a major role in the training of Peace Corpsmen sent to the Asian nations, I take especial pride in saluting the Peace Corps on this anniversary date. The Peace Corps Training Center on the island of Hawaii, under the competent direction of Dr. John Stalker of the University of Hawaii, has won high praises from all who have visited it and inspected its operations. In addition, many of Hawaii have volunteered to join this great service organization and are serving in many sensitive areas around the world. For example, there is Richard Clancy, a physical education instructor in Ecuador; Michael Wilson, a history teacher in Malawi; Clarence Nagao, a communications development worker in Thailand with Timothy Wong, a language teacher, and Joyce Nakahara, an English teacher: Then there are Gerald Taniguchi and Benjamin Chang in Sabah, Malaysia; Erwin and Taeko Wong who served in British Honduras with great distinction; Mataichi D. Osora in Guatemala; Gertrude Okinaga and Albert Peterson in the Philippines; and James Veech in Tanganyika.

Hawaii, of course, can do much more to contribute to the Peace Corps, and

we ask its responsible authorities to use our complex of natural tropical and semitropical settings and multiracial community to full advantage. We believe we can add to the continuing effectiveness of the Peace Corps in its mission of bringing better understanding between the United States and the developing nations of the world.

REPRESENTATIVE MOELLER FIGHTING TO PREVENT CLOSING OF SOME VA HOSPITALS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege. It has just come to my attention that the usually reliable United Press International news service was guilty of a serious error of fact and interpretation in its coverage of consideration of House Joint Resolution 234 by the House of Representatives.

United Press International used the following grossly misleading language in its lead paragraph of that story:

Ohio's delegation Thursday voted 12 to 10 in favor of a Republican motion to trim foreign aid bill by enough to keep all Veterans' Administration hospitals in this country open.

The article went on to report, inaccurately, that I voted against keeping the Veterans' Administration hospitals open.

The fact is, of course, that the motion in question would not have, by any stretch of the imagination, prevented the closure of a single VA hospital or facility. This motion was a hoax; it represented no more and no less than a desperate, frantic attempt to embarrass the President of the United States and tie his hands in the conduct of foreign policy. Fortunately, the true nature of the motion was easily recognized by the majority of the Members of this House. It was defeated and done with.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I and the overwhelming majority of the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives voted on February 10, 1965, for an amendment preventing the closure of any VA installation before May 1, 1965. The amendment was adopted, and the President accepted it. This gave us 75 days to persuade the Administration of the urgent necessity of maintaining the great network of VA hospitals which serve the men and women who defended their country in time of danger and peril.

At this point, I insert that portion of my January 25 news report to the people of the 10th Congressional District of Ohio, which puts me firmly on record as opposing any effort to close any VA hospitals so long as they are required for the treatment and care of our veterans:

VA HOSPITALS SHOULD NOT BE CLOSED

I was shocked by the decision to shut down certain hospitals and other facilities operated by the Veterans' Administration. Such a step will, in my judgment, create unnecessary hardships and inconveniences for our veterans and their families. The loss of jobs that will result from these proposed closures is also a matter of grave concern to me. While I support reasonable efforts to reduce Federal spending, I think this move comes under the heading of false economy. I am glad to report that Congress appears to be overwhelmingly opposed to the so-called reorganization plan. A congressional investigation already is underway in the U.S. Senate, and the House Committee on Veterans Affairs will open hearings as soon as possible. You may be assured that I am doing everything I can to prevent the abandonment of VA hospitals and facilities.

I am not prepared to play budget roulette with the great and essential network of VA hospitals authorized by Congress for the care and treatment of those Americans who served their country in time of peril. The reorganization order should be canceled without further ado.

Mr. Speaker, in fairness, I hope that United Press International will correct the misleading and inaccurate information it has published about this matter.

ROA MINUTEMAN AWARD—ADDRESS OF HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. STEPHENS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday night, a most coveted award was conferred by the National Reserve Officers Association on the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. This recognition, the Minuteman Award, has been conferred upon a number of distinguished Americans, none of whom are more deserving of this recognition than the recipient of the award for 1965. Chairman RIVERS, in response to the citation, made an outstanding address on the paramount role of Congress in forming the policies for the defense of America.

This address, in my opinion, is one of the outstanding reports on this subject and on the general relationship of one branch of Government to another which I have ever heard. For those who did not hear the delivery of this speech, I insert the text in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE L. MENDEL RIVERS, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BEFORE THE RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION, ANNUAL NATIONAL COUNCIL BANQUET, FEBRUARY 26, 1965

Admiral Reeder, distinguished colleagues of the Congress, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am quite aware of the names of those outstanding Americans to whom you have given this, the Minuteman Award: and I am humbled as my name joins this most distinguished group.

No human being, regardless of his assigned station in life, could fail to be deeply moved by such a tribute as this—coming from an organization such as yours.

This is an organization which accurately represents, with distinction, those of your fellow dedicated Americans who not only helped to win the greatest victory in the life of this Republic, but who also ask for the privilege to serve again, if necessary, and to die if need be.

I consider this award tonight not primarily for me, but to one whom you hope reflects the independence of the Congress—a Congress which will carry out the mandate of the Constitution to provide this Nation with the best security in the world; and a Congress which will assure a contented, motivated, and dedicated military, both Regular and Reserve alike; and also a Congress to whom you can turn for recourse in time of honest disagreement with those representing the executive branch of government.

Knowing so many of those you have chosen before, not the least of whom was my beloved teacher and friend, the immortal Carl Vinson, I accept with deep humility this invitation to join these select few.

Now, you realize, I know, that it would not be appropriate, or proper, for me to discuss here this evening the burning issue that so vitally affects the Reserve Officers Association and so many other veterans.

As you know, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services, under the very distinguished chairmanship of the Honorable F. EDWARD HÉBERT, will conduct hearings on the proposed merger of the Army Reserve with the National Guard; therefore, it would be improper for me to comment on that proposal tonight.

Many distinguished Members of Congress have raised interesting questions concerning the manner in which the merger proposal will be implemented.

Other Members have expressed their disappointment with respect to the procedures followed in announcing this merger—its timing as well as its genesis.

Some Members have queried me as to how the decision was reached, who recommended it, and whether it is militarily sound.

My reply has been that those answers must await the hearings. And hearings there will be.

You and others will have your day in court.

The imponderables raised by the decision of the Secretary of Defense to change the status of a segment of our Reserves are manifold. We will explore these and the long-range effect on our security.

But questions of this nature impel me to discuss a somewhat delicate subject with you tonight, although I do not mean to imply any correlation between the subject matter of my remarks and the dispute which raised the questions.

It is not my intention, or my desire, to offend any individual who is present here tonight. I strive to make this plain—I neither impugn nor deprecate the intentions of those who have made the decision.

Instead, I would like to ask you to join me as I take a short walk down the path of history.

One hundred and seventy-six years ago, almost to the day, on March 4, 1789, the first Congress of the United States, under the new Constitution, met in Federal Hall in New York City. The new Congress consisted of 20 Senators and 59 Representatives, since not all the States had ratified the Constitution.

The Constitution under which they met vested all legislative powers in the Congress of the United States, executive power in the President, and judicial power in a Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as the Congress might establish.

The Constitution was clear with respect to the powers vested in each of the separate branches of Government.

At that time, Members of the Senate were appointed by State legislatures, but Members of the House were elected, every 2 years, by the people.

Thus, every 2 years, the entire membership of the House of Representatives had to stand for reelection.

That has never changed insofar as the House is concerned and, today, of course, Members of the Senate are also elected by the people.

Since that date in history, each branch of the Government has been the subject of criticism by political scientists, cartoonists, editors, sensation seekers, ordinary citizens, Members of Congress, members of the judicial branch, and even Chief Executives. This is as it should be. This is one of the great freedoms we all enjoy.

But one fact of life remains unchanged—the Congress of the United States is elected by the people directly, and the House of Representatives must be reelected every 2 years.

I conclude, therefore, that the House of Representatives more nearly reflects the people's views than the other House or any other branch of Government.

Certainly, the judicial branch of Government, which is appointed for life, not only does not, by design, represent the views of the people, but, in a strict constitutional sense, should not, since its function is to interpret the laws, not make them.

The fact that our Federal judiciary has been making laws with increasing frequency represents one of the most violent assaults your Constitution has sustained since this Republic was born. This Supreme Court is even arrogating unto itself the authority to reorganize State governments and apportion State legislatures.

The Chief Executive of the Nation has become a more vital office with each passing decade.

As the complexities of Government grow, as the population increases, the responsibilities imposed upon the President of the United States grow accordingly.

The Constitution of the United States, perhaps prophetically, recognized that this office would become more important as the years went by and vested in the President rather broad, and in some cases, undefined powers.

One of the undefined powers is that of the President's position as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and, of course, the Air Force, and of the militia of the States when called into the actual service of the Federal Government.

Certainly the President, under our political system, represents the views of the people who have elected him to office. But again, I say, I do not believe that any branch of Government can be closer to the people than the Congress of the United States and, especially, Members of the House.

The three great branches of Government are the hearthstone and the fountainhead of our form of government. If any single branch becomes topheavy through the assumption of powers not granted under the Constitution, then a crack appears in these vital and indispensable foundations of our Government and our freedoms are threatened.

And yet, for the past few years, there has been an increasing tendency on the part of some people to ridicule the Congress of the United States; to describe the Congress as outmoded and inefficient; to look upon it as an organization that is not responsive to the needs of a modern society; and, more important, to deny or disregard the constitutional duties and powers that are imposed upon the Congress.

Those who ridicule the Congress, those who join this iconoclastic throng, are sowing the seeds of destruction of our form of democracy.

The Congress of the United States is an institution. It is part of our way of life. And just as our society has its folkways, mores, and customs, so does the Congress have its customs and precedents.

Every sound institution grows and changes with its growth. Congress is no exception. Thus, Congress can, and should, be amenable to constructive criticism and acceptable modifications.

But change is one thing—ridicule is something else.

I wonder if it has occurred to those who belittle the Congress for being too cumbersome, too slow, too oldfashioned, that the checks and balances built into our form of government were not the result of accident, but the deliberate intent of our Founding Fathers.

The Congress has proved time and time again that when speed is essential it can act quickly: but the Congress also frequently makes haste slowly, and while this may be irritating to those who seek immediate change, it is a safeguard for the interests of others who may be vitally affected.

We are a nation of many and varied interests. We hear much about minority groups, but sometimes we forget that minorities in this Nation also consist of physicians, farmers, social workers, housewives, railroad employees, lawyers, teachers, bricklayers, soldiers, pilots, and lion tamers. We are a nation of a multitude of minorities—and it is only when a substantial group of minorities share a common interest that they become a majority.

Your great organization, the Reserve Officers Association, for example, is a minority group, because less than half the population of this country are members. But it will have its day in court with respect to the proposed merger of the Army Reserve and the National Guard. This I guarantee.

Those who recommend this change in our reserve structure do not necessarily represent the views or opinions of a majority of the American people. And, certainly, they cannot exercise a power given only to the Congress of the United States.

Who, then, has the right—or even beyond that—the responsibility to question this decision? The answer, obviously, is the people's representatives, the Congress. Without this haven of refuge, those affected, or their organizations, would have no place to go.

How else can the American people make their voices heard if not through the Congress of the United States?

Last month, I stood on the floor of the House while our great and beloved Speaker administered the oath of office. Here is what the Speaker asked each of us:

"Do you solemnly swear that you will support the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter. So help you God."

With my hand raised, I answered, "I do"—and to myself I said, "Believe me, I do."

And do you know what that oath means to me? It means that I will support that Constitution—that I will bear true faith to it—and that I will discharge the duties of my office. So help me, God.

And one of the provisions of the document I swore I would support says that the Congress has the power to provide for the common defense; that the Congress has the power to raise and support armies; that the Congress has the power to provide and maintain a Navy. And since no other branch of Government has that power, then obviously only the Congress has the responsibility in this area.

And the Congress, in turn, has passed on this responsibility—in the formative stages of the legislative process—to the Committees on Armed Services, the gavel of which fate has placed in my hands.

This is not a light responsibility. And it is one I can assure you the Committee on Armed Services of the House, as far as I am concerned, will meet in every respect.

For example, there is a group who would like to see our Chiefs of Staff system changed. Having won World War II with a Joint Chiefs of Staff system, there are those who would abolish it and substitute in its place a single Chief of Staff—a system that brought defeat to two major powers who have tried it.

I can assure you—the Congress will be the final arbiter of this question.

There are also those who think that the Congress should merely appropriate funds and let the Executive spend them in accordance with his wishes.

This is not my understanding of my responsibility under the Constitution. Certainly, changes can be made in our legislative process, but back of our whole form of government stands the bulwark of the Congress of the United States, represented as it is by every major religion in this country, by every major nationality, by every major profession, and representing a cross section of the entire gamut of the American people.

This is the strength of our Government.

The Congress of the United States is you—the people.

But, today, when a Member of Congress visits a military installation in a foreign land, there are those who refer to such a visit as "a junket." If a civilian Defense Department official visits the same installation, it is a highly important visit to discuss defense matters.

If a Member of Congress, trying to represent his people to the best of his ability, votes against a proposal submitted by the executive branch of Government, he is called an obstructionist. But if he votes for it, he may be called a rubber stamp. A Member of Congress is a bird on whom all seasons are open.

I would suggest to the carping critics of the Congress that they take stock of their own well-being and of the success this Nation has enjoyed in the past, and is now enjoying.

Certainly, some of this success must be attributed to what the Congress has approved or disapproved.

Our way of life, our steadfastness, our well being, our economic progress, and our security may not necessarily be a monument to the Congress, but no one can deny that the Congress has been a living, growing institution while all of this has taken place.

I would be the first to agree that the Congress, as a body, and that Members of Congress, as individuals, have made mistakes. But I suppose that this is inevitable since we share one characteristic in common with all others who are engaged in the activities of government. Be they chief executive, kings, sultans, admirals, generals, filing clerks, or messengers—we are human beings.

And just as there is a variety of personalities in every organization, so is there a variety in the Congress.

But regardless of his capacity or his ability, each Member has been elected by the people of his district or State to serve in the Congress of the United States. The people are the judges of his qualifications. He must account to them.

Notwithstanding the fact that we may have shortcomings and admitting that improvements can be made, not only in the legislative process but also in the executive and judicial fields, our form of government is still acknowledged, in the free world, as the finest that has ever existed in the history of civilization.

Be critical of the Congress if you will, but those who are contemptuous of the Congress and its responsibilities are undermining a way of life that has brought greater

freedom, greater security, and greater economic benefits to a nation of people than has ever been enjoyed by any collective group in the history of the world.

Be assured that there is an ever-increasing number of Congressmen who are aware of their responsibilities—and more important—intend to meet those responsibilities.

National security is a team effort—but all members of the team have to know the signals.

As far as I am concerned—the Armed Services Committee of the House will know the signals, and on occasions, may even call the plays. We demand at least an occasional opportunity to carry the ball. It's just possible that our team has some stars of its own. How can we ever find out if our team never carries the ball?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KASTENMEIER (at the request of Mr. ZABLOCKI), indefinitely, on account of illness.

Mr. HANNA (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the balance of the week, on account of a death in the family.

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. RYAN for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. MCDOWELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), for 10 minutes, on Tuesday, March 2; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), for 60 minutes, on Wednesday, March 3; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FUQUA (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), for 60 minutes, on Monday, March 8; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. TENZER.

Mr. STANTON.

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

Mr. CRAMER to insert tables in remarks made in the Committee of the Whole today in a colloquy with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN].

The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCCLORY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. YOUNGER.

Mr. RUMSFELD.

Mrs. MAY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

Mr. MOSS.

Mr. STAGGERS.

Mr. WHITENER.

Mr. WOLFF in two instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 21. An act to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 2, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

651. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of unnecessary dollar grants to a foreign country under the foreign assistance program, Agency for International Development, Department of State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

652. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes" (H. Doc. No. 96); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

653. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the ninth annual report on the financial condition and results of the operations of the highway trust fund for fiscal year 1964, pursuant to section 209 (e)(1) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (H. Doc. No. 97); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

654. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, establishing the minimum price support level for peanuts"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

655. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes for the quarter ended December 31, 1964, pursuant to subsection 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

656. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell uniform clothing to the Naval Sea Corps"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

657. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a semiannual report on military construction contracts for period July 1, 1964, to December 31, 1964, pursuant to section 605, Public Law 88-390; to the Committee on Armed Services.

658. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report relative to the proposal to transfer *Massachusetts* (BB 59), now condemned as not suitable for naval use, to the U.S.S. Massachusetts Memorial Committee, Inc., Boston, Mass., pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 7308(c); to the Committee on Armed Services.

659. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report on the continuing review of voluntary agreements and programs, pursuant to section 708(e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

660. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

661. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of the unused mail-flo system equipment at the Chicago post office, Post Office Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

662. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of the deficiencies in contract administration resulting in additional costs for exterior concrete construction at the Brecksville, Ohio, hospital, Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

663. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on inadequate administration of centralized payroll activities, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Government Operations.

664. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on inadequacies in procedures and practices relating to selection of and review of performance of recipients of social security payments on behalf of minor and incompetent adult beneficiaries; Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

665. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs to the Government by leasing rather than purchasing electric power facilities; Goddard Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

666. A letter from the Governor, Panama Canal Zone, and President, Panama Canal Company, transmitting a report of disposal of foreign excess property by the Panama Canal Company and Canal Zone Government for year ended December 31, 1964, pursuant to section 404(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 398); to the Committee on Government Operations.

667. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend title 28 United States Code section 2241 with respect to the jurisdiction and venue of applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody under judgments and sentences of State courts"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

668. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting a report of a study of selected programs of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, pursuant to Public Law 85-315, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

669. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report indicating proposed actions by the Administration to conduct certain research and development programs at levels in excess of those authorized by the NASA Authorization Act for fiscal

year 1965, pursuant to section 4 of 78 Stat. 310, 312; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4185. A bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 4152. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to provide means for expediting the retirement of Government capital in the Federal intermediate credit banks, including an increase in the debt permitted such banks in relation to their capital and provision for the production credit associations to acquire additional capital stock therein, to provide for allocating certain earnings of such banks and associations to their users, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 5075. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 in order to increase the limitation on the amount of loans which may be insured under subtitle A of such act; with amendment (Rept. No. 115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 5555. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 5556. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to include the variety known as "Compana" as a malting barley eligible for increased acreage under the 1965 feed grain program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5557. A bill to make permanent the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954 and to increase the amount of payments available under such act to an amount equal to the gross receipts from duties; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 5558. A bill to provide support for public elementary and secondary education in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5559. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 5560. A bill to provide research, technical, and financial assistance with respect to the disposal of solid wastes to the several States and political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 5561. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase widow's benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 5562. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to correct an inequity in the application of such act with respect to the U.S. Botanic Garden, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5563. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921, in order to provide that the foreign market value of imported firearms and ammunition which have been disposed of as surplus by a foreign government shall, for the purposes of such act, be not less than the constructed value of the merchandise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 5564. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize retirement without reduction in annuity of employees with 20 years of service involuntarily separated from the service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 5565. A bill to prevent the importation of flat glass which is the product of any country or area dominated or controlled by communism; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 5566. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to provide that the authority to enter into trade agreements under such act will expire at the close of 1965; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5567. A bill to provide for the transfer of income taxes to the States for use for educational and other purposes without Federal direction, control, or interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 5568. A bill to provide research, technical, and financial assistance with respect to the disposal of solid wastes to the several States and political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FALLON (by request):

H.R. 5569. A bill amending section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1948, relating to the support and maintenance of the Permanent International Commission of the Congresses of Navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5570. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt State-conducted lotteries from the taxes on wagering; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 5571. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of incentive pay for submarine duty to personnel qualified in submarines attached to staffs of submarine operational commanders; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 5572. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 5573. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to liberalize the Federal-State programs of health care for the aged by authorizing any State to provide medical assistance for the aged to individuals eligible therefor (and assist in providing health care for other aged individuals) under voluntary private health insurance plans, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage prepayment health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H.R. 5574. A bill to authorize a 3-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical education facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5575. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to establish the number of hospital beds and domiciliary beds to be operated in facilities of the Veterans' Administration, and limiting the authority of the Veterans' Administration with respect to closing of facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 5576. A bill to amend section 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to proceedings against certain witnesses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 5577. A bill to provide that certain corporations shall continue to be treated as corporations for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 5578. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it a crime to steal certain trade secrets or to transport stolen trade secrets in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 5579. A bill to further economic development by rehabilitating areas presently damaged by deleterious mining practices; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 5580. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to pay certain expenses of moving property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 5581. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H.R. 5582. A bill to establish a program of voluntary comprehensive health insurance for all persons aged 65 or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 5583. A bill to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 5584. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 5585. A bill to permit any wage earner to defer payment of a portion of the difference between the income tax imposed for a taxable year beginning in 1964 and the amount deducted and withheld upon his wages during 1964; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 5586. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to curb the tax-exempt financing of industrial or commercial facilities used for private profitmaking purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5587. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the tax exemption for interest on State or local obligations issued to finance industrial or commercial facilities to be sold or leased to private profitmaking enterprises; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 5588. A bill to provide for the conveyance to Pima and Maricopa Counties, Ariz., and to the city of Albuquerque, N. Mex., of certain lands for recreational purposes under the provisions of the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1926; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 5589. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that certain veterans who were prisoners of war shall be deemed to have a service-connected disability of 50 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5590. A bill to prescribe the size of flags furnished by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to drape the caskets of deceased veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 5591. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 5592. A bill to protect the public health and safety by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish special controls for depressant and stimulant drugs and counterfeit drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 5593. A bill to provide for the implementation of voting rights, the appointment of Federal registrars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 5594. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5595. A bill designating the fourth Friday in September of each year as National Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 5596. A bill to provide a system of health and safety rules and regulations and proper enforcement thereof; health and safety inspection and investigation; health and safety training and education for metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines); and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 5597. A bill to relieve physicians of liability for negligent medical treatment at the scene of an accident in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 5598. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to curb the tax-exempt financing of industrial or commercial facilities used for private profitmaking purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5599. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the tax exemption for interest on State or local obligations issued to finance industrial or commercial facilities to be sold or leased to private profitmaking enterprises; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY (by request):

H.R. 5600. A bill to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe in North Dakota and South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5601. A bill to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Rosebud Sioux Tribe in South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5602. A bill to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe in South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R.5603. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H.R. 5604. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 5605. A bill defining the jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court and all Federal courts inferior thereto, in certain instances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 5606. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide vocational rehabilitation, education, and training, and loan guarantee benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after January 1, 1962, in combat zones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5607. A bill to provide Federal cooperation in a program to preserve certain historic properties in the city of Boston, Mass., and vicinity, associated with the colonial and Revolutionary periods of American history; to authorize the establishment of the Boston National Historic Sites; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 5608. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for charitable contribution will not be allowable with respect to contributions to certain charitable organizations which fail to make full disclosure to the public; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 5609. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 5610. A bill to prohibit disturbances in the Chambers of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 353. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.J. Res. 354. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.J. Res. 355. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TENZER:

H. Con. Res. 338. Concurrent resolution authorizing the publication as a House document of the Department of State white paper relating to North Vietnam's campaign to conquer South Vietnam (Department of State Publication 7839); to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. Res. 250. Resolution to prohibit the Civil Aeronautics Board from discontinuing service by local service airlines until after a thorough review by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H. Res. 251. Resolution to express the sense of the House against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

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

60. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, petitioning that the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States be urged to restore the payment for the production of castor beans on diverted land to 50 percent of the basic payment for diversion; to the Committee on Agriculture.

61. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the enactment of legislation increasing the basic sugarbeet quota to a minimum of the 1965 restricted acreage production; to the Committee on Agriculture.

62. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to bring the question of the liberation of the Baltic States before the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

63. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to calling a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States concerning apportionment of one house of State legislatures on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

64. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting all Federal and other non-California agencies which were damaged by recent storms to utilize to the fullest extent personnel and equipment available in the vicinity of the damage for the repair or reconstruction of damaged facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

65. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging the House of Representatives to permit the continued activity of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

66. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the reversal of the Veterans' Administration decision to close the Cheyenne, Wyo., offices of the Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADAMS (by request):

H.R. 5611. A bill for the relief of Satoshi Nakayama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 5612. A bill for the relief of Andrea Castellano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 5613. A bill for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 5614. A bill for the relief of Miss Mamako Yoneyama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 5615. A bill for the relief of J. L. Bryan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 5616. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Mario Mure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 5617. A bill for the relief of Antonio Gigante, his wife Marietta Gigante, and their minor children Mario Guiseppe Gioacchino Gigante, Valentino Gigante, Graziella Gigante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5618. A bill for the relief of Gioacchino Parete and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5619. A bill for the relief of Miss Rosalia Elvira Sparacino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5620. A bill for the relief of Christos Tassigiannis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 5621. A bill for the relief of Chun Yin So; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 5622. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jorge Ignacio Miquel Franca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5623. A bill for the relief of Barney E. McElyea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 5624. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of Mrs. Hazel M. LaFrance against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 5625. A bill for the relief of Milena Fedel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5626. A bill for the relief of Hadbo Nahas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 5627. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Mariano B. Pimentel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 5628. A bill for the relief of Mario Cianciulli and his wife Candida Cianciulli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5629. A bill for the relief of Trenton Mack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5630. A bill for the relief of George Demetrious Maniatis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 5631. A bill for the relief of Phebe Viola Bravo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 5632. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sang Kyung Lee (nee Choi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 5633. A bill for the relief of B. Matusow & Son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 5634. A bill for the relief of Thomas A. Pruett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 5635. A bill for the relief of Charles B. Franklin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF (by request):

H.R. 5636. A bill for the relief of Saadet Erolgac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5637. A bill for the relief of Oliva Furlan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

114. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city clerk, Millbrae, Calif., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the need for a constitutional amendment on reapportionment, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Gold Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the administration's attitude toward our gold reserve is confusing to the nth degree. First, we have a bill presented by the administration and passed by the House increasing the capital of the Inter-American Development Bank by $750 million which is to be loaned to Central and South American countries. While the House was passing this bill, the President was addressing 370 business executives called to the White House, admonishing them to cut their expenditures to the bone where they involved sending our dollars abroad.

Then I read in the Independent Editorial Services, Ltd., issue of February 23 a statement that our colleague HALE BOGGS, of the Ways and Means Committee, is expected to offer an administration-backed bill providing for generous tax credits for private U.S. investments in underdeveloped countries and they refer to the President's mention of such plans in his foreign aid message. The tax credits would be applicable to insured investments—against expropriation, nationalization, discriminatory tax treatment, and so forth. On February 23 the Secretary of Commerce issued a news release of his talk before the Travel Advisory Council asking them to stimulate the travel of foreigners into this country but to curtail the travel of our people into foreign countries.

Because of the heavy drain on our gold reserve, it would seem that the time is right for the administration and the various departments of the administration to get together and at least play the same tune even though they might be using different instruments. It is apparent that dollars sent abroad, regardless of how they are sent, may return in the form of a demand for gold.

The Death of Justice Felix Frankfurter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM D. FORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we in the United States have been saddened by the passing of Mr. Felix Frankfurter, retired Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, and a man who has left an eternal mark on the legal and judicial history of this Nation.

Mr. Frankfurter enjoyed a career of nearly 20 years on the Supreme Court bench, beginning with his appointment in 1939 by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He brought to the Court his experience as a Harvard University law professor for 25 years, as well as a background as an attorney, scholar, presidential adviser, and Government administrator.

He has been recognized as one of the greatest scholars and teachers of law in Harvard University's long and distinguished history. Numbered among his former students are judges, former Cabinet members, and assistant prosecuting attorneys.

Mr. Frankfurter, as a friend and adviser to President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, was considered one of the architects of the New Deal, which helped steer the United States out of the disastrous depression of the early 1930's.

As a Supreme Court Justice, Mr. Frankfurter embodied a philosophy which has become known as judicial restraint. He firmly believed that a judge should look only at the validity of a law, and not its merits. He urged extreme caution in making decisions on the actions of the legislative and executive branches of the Government. He felt that the courts should move exceedingly slowly and deliberately in overturning actions of men and bodies elected by the people.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Mr. Frankfurter will stand in history as one of the truly great Justices of our Federal Supreme Court, ranking with such giants as John Marshall and Oliver Wendell Holmes. Let me close by citing the tribute paid him by his fellow Justices upon his retirement in 1963: "He has already made a contribution to our jurisprudence rarely equaled in the life of our Court."

Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1965

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

In the proposed Peace Corps legislation that this body has received from our President, there is the opportunity for us to continue a part of our foreign relations program which has shown great return on the dollars we have authorized for it. The significance of this legislation is that it will authorize funds which represent only a small fraction of our overall budget for the next fiscal year, and only a small part of our total oversea programs.

The dollars spent in the Peace Corps program have gone a long way to prove to nations around the world that we seek to help others better themselves, and that we are a country seeking peace. Peace Corps volunteers, now numbering almost 10,000, have shown and are continuing to

show that Americans will take the extra step to lend a hand to those who ask for it.

I am told that the authorization requested will provide the capability to put 17,000 volunteers in training and at work by the end of August 1966. It is unfortunate that we are required to spend billions for means of defense, when it can be shown that through much more modest expenditures we can contribute so much for the good of nations which are requesting our help. We should continue our efforts to be strong with our defense, but also provide the funds necessary to continue the work of the Peace Corps. I shall join those who work to enact this legislation for the next fiscal year.

For Meritorious Service to the Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER L. WOLFF
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend one of the outstanding weekly newspapers in America. The Locust Valley Leader, published in the Third District of New York, recently received well-deserved honors from the New York Press Association for the meritorious service it has rendered our local community.

This weekly publication, created in 1947 by Edith Hay Wyckoff, who is still owner and publisher, has consistently won honors and awards since its inception. In fact, Edith Hay Wyckoff received her 15th photographic award since she has been competing in the statewide contest in this year's ceremonies in Syracuse.

The awards received in the 1964 contest include first prize in spot news photography, third prize in general excellence, honorable mention for best news story, and honorable mention in use of locally originated feature material.

Across the Nation our "weeklies" are rendering us a service that is a part of Americana. These publications mirror our lives, interests, and community occurrences. We depend on them for exposure of what is happening in our local government, where we may join our neighbors in local meetings and general information about the communities in which we live. It is such weekly publications as the Locust Valley Leader that keeps our communities throughout America informed of the local news and makes us aware of what is occurring in our immediate area.

The Locust Valley Leader has always been an enlightening source of information for the citizens of our community. It has upheld the highest merits of journalism in reporting the news. The awards it has most recently received exemplifies its quality and caliber.

Our community has grown to depend on the Locust Valley Leader. We look forward to each publication of this informative paper. We are proud of the Locust Valley Leader and its superior quality.

To the Locust Valley Leader, its owner and publisher, Edith Hay, her able assistant Edwina Bradic, their excellent staff and workers, I extend my praise and congratulations. I know that they will continue to perform in the superior way in which they have performed in the past.

Hon. Frances P. Bolton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, we are justifiably proud of the many distinguished sons that the State of Ohio has furnished to these legislative halls. We are equally proud of that eminent daughter of our great State whose 25th anniversary of service, I would call to your attention.

The Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON was elected at a special election to fill the unexpired term of her late husband, Chester C. Bolton, and took her oath of office on February 27, 1940. That most able Member of this body served five terms with great distinction.

I need not detail the entire legislative career of the most competent gentlewoman from Ohio. Her capability as a Member of this House is fully recognized by us all.

As senior ranking Republican member of the Committee of the House on Foreign Affairs, she has demonstrated that she is indeed possessed with outstanding diplomatic ability. Her capability in this field has received recognition, not only here in our country but throughout the world. I am of the firm conviction that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] would be a most able Secretary of State.

I know of no one who has a greater knowledge of the complex problems of the newly founded nations of the continent of Africa. She has studied these with great diligence and has traveled in that continent to improve her knowledge.

I need not speak of her personal attributes. Here indeed is a most gracious lady. I wish to here acknowledge the aid and good advice that she gave me when I first came to the House of Representatives. Now 15 years later, I still rely on her good judgment.

I would not have you think that she has confined all of her activities to the field of foreign affairs. Her great interest has brought fine advances in the fields of education and health. Her great modesty prevents us from learning of the many philanthropic things that she has originated and continues to support.

I have often heard it said that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] is a great inspiration to all of the women of the world. Certainly she has shown that women can be most successful in public service. I do say that the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON is an inspiration to all Americans, men and women alike.

Here is a truly great American.

The 1965 Fundraising Appeal by the National Council of Christ in the U.S.A., the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and the United Jewish Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement which I recently prepared, upon request of the sponsoring organizations, in support of the spring fundraising program to be undertaken by America's three great religious faiths—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish—through which funds are hoped to be raised to continue programs of assistance to the needy of other lands. These programs are emphasizing Sunday, March 28, as a date on which millions of Americans can make special contributions in response to the appeals which these organizations are making for support of religious voluntary assistance programs for the world's homeless, hungry, and destitute people.

The three appeals are: Catholic—"The Bishops' Relief Fund" appeal, March 21–28 in Catholic churches; Protestant—"One Great Hour of Sharing," with special offerings March 21–28 in the churches of participating denominations; Jewish—"United Jewish Appeal," a continuing effort with special emphasis at this season.

I am pleased to have had the opportunity to add my good wishes for success in the fundraising efforts and for continued effectiveness in the operations of these oversea relief programs, and I wish to insert, at this point, my statement of support of this fund drive.

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

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT C. BYRD, U.S. SENATOR FROM WEST VIRGINIA IN SUPPORT OF 1965 FUNDRAISING APPEAL BY THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHRIST IN THE U.S.A., THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE, AND THE UNITED JEWISH APPEAL

To all Americans, the opportunity to wish "Godspeed" to the joint appeal issued by the National Council of Christ in the U.S.A., the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and the United Jewish Appeal is a welcome one for me.

This combining of their efforts for funds by America's great religious faiths—to carry on their programs of assistance to the needy of many lands—is within itself an inspiring action. To so attack a common enemy—the misery of a major portion of the world's population, stemming from war, disaster, destitution—is to offer testimony to the will

to do service for others, a basic tenet of all three faiths.

We in the United States know that the lion's share of all oversea relief efforts stems from our voluntary organizations. But the compassionate and selfless programs which have been instituted by these organizations must be sustained by practical means. To fill the deep needs of the world's "have-not's"—for medical care, for food, for adequate shelter and clothing, and to obviate the terrible twisting of human minds from hostile and debilitating living conditions, all a daily part of millions of lives in Africa, Asia, and Latin America—costs many hundreds of thousands of dollars. It requires hundreds of millions of tons of food, medicine, clothing, and the varied implements of practical care.

Eradication of the world's ills does not seem likely in the early future, but one of the instruments at hand—the oversea relief programs sponsored by America's three major religious faiths—needs to be kept strong.

To share what we can abundantly afford, in answer to this appeal, is to invest in the betterment of our world, to make a contribution toward the advancement of mankind, and to take another step toward lasting peace.

The 145th Anniversary of the Birth of Susan B. Anthony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1965

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on February 15 the National Woman's Party sponsored a special celebration of the 145th anniversary of the birth of Susan B. Anthony. The ceremony was held in the Capitol against the background of the statue of Miss Anthony and two other pioneers in the suffragette movement, Elizabeth Stanton and Lucretia Mott. Floral tributes were laid at the base of this statue by representatives of a number of women's organizations and a number of tributes were paid by distinguished individuals, including representatives of foreign countries.

In my own remarks in this ceremony I recalled the work of former Members of Congress such as Katharine St. George and Jessica McCullough Weis, of New York, in supporting an equal rights for women amendment and I again reaffirm my support for this amendment to the Constitution for equality of rights for women in all fields not covered by the suffrage amendment. Following that ceremony I have again reintroduced a constitutional amendment resolution calling for this action.

I also quoted what I consider an outstanding tribute to Susan B. Anthony which was written by Ida Husted Harper. In her book on Miss Anthony she said:

Every girl who now enjoys a college education, every woman who has a chance of earning an honest living in whatever sphere she chooses, every wife who is protected by any law in the possession of her person and property, every mother who is blessed with the custody and control of her own children, owes these sacred privileges to Susan B. Anthony. We do not underestimate the splendid services of other pioneers or their successors, but it is Susan B. Anthony's name that stands, and always will stand, as the everlasting symbol of women's emancipation.

Mr. Speaker, the ceremonies were keynoted by the famous and beloved chairman of the National Woman's Party, Emma Guffey Miller, and in her words of welcome she said:

I am very happy and proud to welcome you to the 145th birthday anniversary of the indomitable and unquenchable Susan B. Anthony.

Had it not been for her and a few other determined women, we here today would not be enjoying half the benefits we now enjoy.

Why there is not more honor and acclaim paid to this remarkable woman seems incredible, for comparatively few young or middle-aged citizens realize what they owe to her—or even know of her. Something is surely lacking in our schools and histories.

But to Susan B. Anthony suffrage alone was not sufficient for she wrote in 1900, a few years before her death:

Perfect equality of rights for women—civil and political, is today and has been for a half a century the one demand of, yours truly, Susan B. Anthony.

We gained political equality in 1920 but we do not yet have that perfect equality of rights for women and will not have it until we make the equal rights amendment a part of our Constitution.

As Congress returns today from its Lincoln Birthday celebrations all over the country, and as we enter upon a countrywide celebration of the birthday of another great American emancipator, Susan B. Anthony, we remind Congress and the country of the famous words of Abraham Lincoln:

I go for all sharing the privileges of Government who assist in bearing its burdens—not excluding women.

Tribute to Congresswoman Bolton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 27 our esteemed colleague, the gentlelady from Ohio, FRANCES P. BOLTON, observed her 25th anniversary as a Member of this body. For over 15 of those years, I have been privileged to serve with the gentlelady on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Her dedicated and untiring efforts on the committee during some of the most critical periods in our Nation's history have helped shape the successful policies that have carried us through those troubled times.

Mr. Speaker, I have found FRANCES BOLTON a constant source of inspiration and assistance during these many years of our close association. I wish to extend my personal congratulations to the gracious lady for her long service and many great achievements.

Imports of Residual Fuel Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and include therein a very intriguing and educational discourse between the president of the United Mine Workers of America, Mr. W. A. "Tony" Boyle, and Congressman JAMES KEE, my colleague, on a recent television "roundup."

I believe this is very worth while and deserving of the consideration of each Member of the House of Representatives and Senate:

AN INTRIGUING AND EDUCATIONAL DISCOURSE BETWEEN CONGRESSMAN JAMES KEE AND MR. W. A. BOYLE, PRESIDENT, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA

This is JIM KEE, bringing you the "Kee Report."

I have with me today the president of the United Mine Workers of America, Mr. W. A. "Tony" Boyle.

As you know, the UMWA has been in the forefront of the struggle to restrict the importation of residual fuel oil—the waste product which threatens the coal market along the east coast. This is a problem of utmost economic importance to the coal-producing areas of the United States—especially southern West Virginia.

I have asked Mr. Boyle to tell you in more detail why the UMWA has so long—and so adamantly—opposed the unrestricted importation of residual fuel oil. Mr. Boyle.

President BOYLE. The underlying philosophy behind our policy on residual fuel oil imports is very simple. We do not believe that the fuel market of our east coast should be handed over to the products of a foreign nation. Nor, do we feel that the political or economic needs of the international oil cartel are sufficient grounds for allowing the dumping of a foreign waste product upon our shores to the detriment of our own industry and its workers. There is really a fundamental question of national policy at stake here. Our Government must decide whether or not the jobs and income of American workers are important enough to warrant protection from the ravages of unfair international competition. For this is what the importation of residual fuel is, and in the final analysis, it must always be treated as such.

We all know that residual fuel oil is a waste product, a product that can move only if the price is right, and if there is a market which has the equipment to use it. The only place where that market exists is on the east coast of the United States, in industries and commercial institutions especially equipped to burn it. Usually this places imported residual in direct competition with coal. Thus, residual oil stands poised above the coal industry and constantly threatens to crush it beneath a virtual deluge of a waste product.

A great deal has been said by the opponents of the current program to restrict the importation of residual fuel oil. To our minds however, they have skirted the major issue. They have failed to consider, or perhaps refused to consider what the importation of residual fuel oil means in terms of jobs. To our minds, this is crucial. To us a loss of markets is not a transfer of numbers from one sector of the economy to another.

Nor is it an exercise in economic manipulations. Rather for every lost market, for each conversion to another fuel, we must face the stark problem of unemployment, and want and despair. We thus witness the tragedy of American coal miners out of work, and American families plunged into the dark abyss of poverty.

This is the real question here. It lies at the very heart of the residual oil problem, and indeed in many of the other difficulties arising from the dumping of foreign products on our soil. And it places the task of protecting American jobs squarely upon the shoulders of the administration, an administration publicly pledged to bring all of our people to a level of prosperity consistent with their human dignity.

Congressman KEE. Therefore, Mr. Boyle, you point out that the importation of residual oil is intertwined with the whole position of our trade policy.

President BOYLE. I most certainly do. It is interesting to note that the very people, both in the Congress, and without, who are asking for greater importation of residual oil, are at the same time demanding protection for their own industries which are not able to endure the rigors of unfair foreign competition. But, despite this inconsistency, the United Mine Workers of America, will continue to oppose the unrestricted importation of residual fuel oil and the exporting of American coal miners' jobs to foreign countries to boost their economies. We will continue to demand that the Government of the United States protect our jobs and give us an opportunity to serve the needs of our Nation's industry and commerce.

Congressman KEE. Thank you for your most informative presentation. You are to be highly commended for your dedication to duty, and to me, it is a real privilege to have this opportunity to continue to cooperate with you in any manner possible.

Hon. Frances P. Bolton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise at this time to extend my own personal congratulations and those of the 11th Congressional District of Ohio to the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON on the occasion of the anniversary of her 25th year as a Member of the Congress of the United States.

It is most appropriate that the people from the 11th Congressional District pay tribute to Mrs. BOLTON on this grand occasion because most of the 11th Congressional District as it is now constituted was represented in Congress 25 years ago by this most gracious and most capable Congresswoman.

I believe that it would be of interest to my fellow Members of Congress that, with the exception of 6 years, members of the Bolton family have represented the county of Lake in Congress since March 4, 1929.

My first recollection of the Honorable Chester C. Bolton was on the occasion of a Flag Day speech in the city of Painesville some 33 years ago when I remember my father telling me that we were going down to the city park so that I might have an occasion to hear one of the great leaders of our times, the Honorable Chester C. Bolton, give the annual Flag Day address.

It is with great pleasure that I extend my warmest congratulations to Mrs. BOLTON with the hope that the Good Lord, who has been so kind to her in the past, will allow her to stay with us for many years in the future.

Address by Hon. Walter H. Moeller, Democrat, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, 1965, our distinguished colleague from Ohio, Hon. WALTER H. MOELLER, made an outstanding address at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner meeting at Hickory, N.C.

I am privileged to represent Hickory in the Congress, and I had the pleasure of introducing my distinguished friend to my constituents. I feel that my colleagues will be greatly interested in reading his inspiring speech, and I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ADDRESS OF U.S. REPRESENTATIVE WALTER H. MOELLER, DEMOCRAT, OF OHIO, FEBRUARY 27, 1965 AT THE JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY MEETING, HICKORY, N.C.

I am delighted to be with you this evening as we honor the memory of two great Americans, two great Presidents, two great Democrats—and two great southerners: Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson.

Let me say at the outset that I am a Democrat—a Democrat without prefix, without suffix, without hyphenation, and without reservation. So I feel perfectly at home in the South. For it was here that our party was born and here it was kept alive during the long droughts of yesteryear when the Republican Party somehow managed to retain control of the White House and Congress for the worst part of 70 years.

But, of course, the Democratic Party did rise again and with it rose the South to its present position of eminence in our party.

A southerner, Lyndon B. Johnson, sits in the White House.

A southerner, RUSSELL LONG, holds the second most important position of leadership in the U.S. Senate.

A southerner, HALE BOGGS, is our party's whip in the House of Representatives.

Southerners serve as chairmen of 25 of the 36 standing committees of Congress. North Carolina itself is represented in these august ranks by no fewer than three members of your excellent delegation.

The Secretary of State is a native Georgian, and until just recently, the Commerce Department was directed by North Carolina's gifted and able Luther Hodges.

Small wonder that it is said that our Government speaks with a southern accent. I think I ought to make it clear right now that I am from southern Ohio.

I want to take this opportunity to commend your Congressman and my good friend, BASIL WHITENER. He is one of the hardest working and most respected Members of Congress. I have watched with something approaching awe BASIL'S determined campaign, against long odds, to bring order out of the chaos that threatens the textile industry.

As you well know, the textile industry is being jeopardized by the almost unrestricted importation of goods from cheap-labor countries across the sea. Congressman WHITENER has been striving mightily to tighten up laws that permit this condition to exist—a condition that has contributed, at least, to the loss of more than a half million jobs in the domestic textile industry since World War II.

I am glad to say that BASIL is making progress to guarantee some needed protection to the American textile industry and to the remaining tens of thousands of men and women who learn their livelihood from it.

BASIL WHITENER was instrumental last year in the passage of legislation that makes American cotton available to American mills at the same price Americans were selling it to textile manufacturers overseas.

Prior to enactment of this long overdue legislation, our own mills were compelled to pay 8 cents a pound more for cotton grown in North Carolina, for example, than it was being sold to foreign producers. In short, the United States actually was subsidizing mills overseas at the expense of our own textile manufacturers and employees. Happily, Congressman WHITENER was able to help correct this gross inequity.

I know that you in North Carolina are well aware of BASIL WHITENER'S continuing fight to preserve the domestic textile industry—which means so very much to the economy of the South. I just wanted you to know that we in other regions also recognize that he is a can-do Congressman.

Now, we Democrats meet here tonight in the warm afterglow of one of the most decisive, one-sided election victories ever scored by a political party in the United States. The immensity of our victory has led some experts to write off the Republican Party as a dead or dying force. I beg to differ.

The Republican Party was battered and bruised; its choice of candidates was rebuffed and rejected; its image was further tarnished. But the Republican Party is not dead; it is not dying. And, in my judgment, the Democratic Party could make no graver mistake than to regard the opposition party with complacency and indifference.

The Republican Party still has tremendous financial resources; it still has dedicated supporters, at least 27 million of them; the Republicans still control the governorship in such important "swing" States as New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Washington. The press remains largely pro-Republican.

So we Democrats must begin now to prepare for the 1966 State, county, and congressional elections. You may be certain that our Republican friends will wage the campaign of their lives next year.

Indeed the battle for the House of Representatives already has been joined. And, frankly, there is no assurance that we will be able to retain all or any of the 40 House seats we picked up on November 3.

The overwhelming sweep we scored in November has tended to direct attention away from the fact that results were so close in more than 100 congressional districts that the switch of a relative few votes would have drastically changed the outcome.

I read in the newspapers just yesterday that our old friend, Tricky Dickie Nixon, is staking his efforts to regain control of the GOP on the 1966 congressional elections. He is not to be taken lightly.

And I predict that the real battleground will be right here in North Carolina and in the South. There is no doubt that the high command of the Republican Party is scheming night and day to purge your Congressmen and other Democratic officeholders.

The Republicans are a bit heady if not downright cocky about "operation takeover" in the South.

This operation was launched with a vengeance in 1964, and enabled the GOP to pick up five congressional seats in Alabama, one each in Georgia and Mississippi, and to retain House seats it held in Florida, Virginia, and North Carolina. So I say again that "operation takeover" has got to be regarded seriously. It must be combated at every turn.

Voters, North and South, have always responded to our cause, to the Democratic cause when we have taken the time to lay the Republican record before them.

We are going to have to do the talking about the GOP record—it is so sorry, so negative that the Republicans themselves would never dare to bring it up in public.

For the simple truth is that the Republican answer to the needs and aspirations of the American people is a constant, dogmatic "No."

Republicans in Congress said "No" to the social security program when it was conceived by Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1935. Only one Republican in the Senate voted that year against a motion to kill the Social Security Act. Last year, 89 percent of the Republicans in Congress said "No" to needed improvements in this essential program. The Democratic Party said "Yes."

Republicans in Congress said "No" to creating the Rural Electrification Administration, which brought the wonders of electricity to millions of farm families and other rural Americans. The Democratic Party said "Yes."

Republicans in Congress said "no" in 1938 to guaranteeing a minimum wage of 40 cents an hour to the working man and woman of America. And the GOP has been saying no, no a hundred times no ever since. The Democratic Party said yes—it says the laborer is worthy of his hire.

Republicans in Congress say "no" to the needs of the farmer; they say no to the need for programs to help develop our natural resources, timberlands, and rivers and streams; the Republicans say "no" to extending a helping hand to the elderly. They say "no" to housing the poor. In fact, the Republican Party would be left speechless if the word "no" was stricken from the language.

Look at the record.

It seems that the "no party" would rather have a balanced budget than a balanced diet for the poverty stricken; the "no party" would rather reduce Federal spending with a meat ax than to increase job opportunities for our people; the "no party" would rather make a token payment on the national debt than to make an investment in the youth of this country by building classrooms and college facilities. No, my friends, the Republican Party won't dare speak about its record. Instead, it tries to confound and confuse the American people by sermonizing about "fiscal responsibility" and about how the big, bad Democrats are leading our Nation down the road to insolvency and bankruptcy.

So it is rather ironic that the most devastating depression in American history came when the Republican Party held the White House and controlled the Nation's fiscal policies.

It is rather ironic that the last three recessions in the United States came when the Republican Party held the White House and controlled the Nation's fiscal policies.

It is rather ironic that the Republican Presidential administration in the 1950's failed to balance its own Federal budget not once, not twice, not three times, not four times, but five times in the 8 years it was in office. It is rather ironic that the national debt increased by some $23 billion during the last Republican administration.

It would seem that once in office, the Republican Party says "no" to its very own campaign promises.

Now, what about the Republican-branded fiscal insanity of the Democratic Party, of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations?

Here, briefly are some of the facts about that:

Under the leadership of first President Kennedy and now Lyndon Johnson, the United States is experiencing the greatest and most extended wave of prosperity that any nation has ever known.

Our national economy has been booming now for 47 consecutive months. That's an alltime record.

The gross national product—the business of the Nation—has increased during the Kennedy and Johnson years from $495 billion to almost $700 billion. That's an alltime record.

Personal savings, the money that you and I have put away for a rainy day, now exceed $100 billion. That's an alltime record.

During the 4 years of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations net farm income has increased by an average of $900 million a year. That is not an alltime record—the record was set during the Truman administration. The reason farm income is not at a record level now is that it nosedived by $20 billion during the eight disastrous confused years of the Benson-Eisenhower regime. But under the Democrats, our farmers are again making real progress.

The plain truth is that the American people have never had it better than they do today. Republicans can go on shedding crocodile tears about the fiscal insanity of the Democratic Party—and our people will go right on laughing all the way to the bank.

This is the factual story that we have got to carry to the people. We just cannot assume that the voters will be continually aware of the record of the party of Harding and Hoover, of Landon and Nixon, and, yes, of Goldwater and Miller. We have to carry the message to the people every day of the year—and not just during the campaign itself.

The attraction of our party is to the people who really want a choice and not an echo—an echo of the shrill, frightened voices which have always feared and rejected new ideas, which have always seemed to prefer stagnation to progress and retrenchment to growth.

The Democratic Party is the only party for those Americans who are willing to face up to the hard realities of the present and who look to the future not with suspicion and despair, but with confidence and boundless faith in the American way.

So let us go forth from this place and carry the message of the Democratic Party to every crossroad and branchhead in this great land of ours. It is a message that all of us can be proud of. It is a message that can be used to keep the Republican Party in its accustomed place—second place.

I have spent some little time tonight roasting our Republican friends. I should make it clear, however, that despite our differences, I regard them as good, loyal, patriotic Americans who are interested in sound government and doing what, in their judgment, is best for our country. It is just that they weigh the role of government in an entirely different scale than we Democrats use. As Franklin Roosevelt so eloquently said: "Governments can err, Presidents do make mistakes, but the immortal Dante tells us that Divine Justice weighs the sins of the coldblooded and the sins of the warmhearted in a different scale. Better the occasional faults of government living in the spirit of charity," F.D.R. went on to say, "Than the omissions of a government frozen in the ice of its own indifference."

Nobody has ever heard of a coldblooded donkey—or a warmblooded dinosaur, which seems to be the symbol of the Grand Old Party.

Now, if I may, a personal word of explanation about my pursuing a political career. I am an ordained Lutheran minister. Many people have asked why a man of the cloth would involve himself in the sweat and toil and pragmatism of politics.

The answer to that question, perhaps, may best be found in the parable of the Samaritan (St. Luke 10: 29-37).

You will recall that a man fell in with the thieves and they stripped him and left him half dead by the side of the road. Coming upon the unfortunate man, the priest and the Levite passed him by. They had no time to administer to the needs of their fellow man. But the Samaritan came along and did extend a helping hand to him. And Jesus said, "Go, and do thou likewise."

It seems to me that the profession of politics and government affords us the greatest opportunity to "Go, and do thou likewise," to lend a hand to the poor and the forlorn, to the sick and the halt. In short, to join in the exciting and challenging task of helping to build a better America.

That is my objective.

That is the objective of our Democratic Party.

What greater goal could man set for himself than to live by the teachings of the Master?

In closing, I want to cite a poem that to me points up the virtue of perseverance and the evils of complacency. I hope that we heed it always:

"Great nations rise and fall,
The people go from bondage to spiritual faith,
From spiritual faith to great courage,
From courage to liberty,
From liberty to abundance,
From abundance to selfishness,
From selfishness to complacency,
From complacency to apathy,
And from apathy back again into bondage."

Vietnam—White Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT TENZER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a concurrent resolution authorizing the publication as a House Document, of the Department of State white paper relating to North Vietnam's campaign to conquer South Vietnam—Department of State Publication No. 7839.

The document sets forth in clear and concise form the case against North Vietnam and the Communist aggression to take control of South Vietnam, and should be made available to those who want to know the facts.

This weekend's mail brought many requests from my constituents asking for an explanation of our involvements in southeast Asia. The Department of State white paper sets forth the reasons for our commitment to defend South Vietnam—a commitment made in 1954.

If our foreign policy is to succeed it must have not only bipartisan support, but the support of our elected representatives and the American people. To insure such bipartisan support we must make certain that the American people are aware of the underlying reasons and

the facts which justify this country's commitments abroad.

The solution to the Vietnam conflict is not offered by the Department of State in this white paper. It does not call for unprovoked escalation of the war in Vietnam or for withdrawal of U.S. servicemen. The white paper provides the facts and the proof of Communist aggression so that our citizenry may be able to judge the advisability of our role in southeast Asia and the future course of our defense of freedom in that area of the globe.

I urge my colleagues to support the concurrent resolution so that this document may be made available and distributed upon request.

The Republican Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, of New York, recently addressed the Executive Club of Chicago. His speech entitled "The Republican Challenge" was presented on January 22, 1965, and has received such widespread praise and favorable comment that I wish to call it to the attention of the Members of Congress.

His speech follows:

THE REPUBLICAN CHALLENGE

(By Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, Republican, of New York, before the Executives' Club of Chicago, January 22, 1965)

Republicans have a job to do in whatever capacity we may find ourselves, in rebuilding the Republican Party. It is a problem and a challenge, not only for the Republican Party, but for the country as well. What strengthens the Republican Party, strengthens the two-party system, what strengthens the two-party system, strengthens the country.

I am optimistic that there will be a resurgence of Republican possibilities in the United States and that we will see Republicans on the march, regaining seats in State legislatures, in the Congress, and in shorter time than most now think. I am optimistic because I have faith in the commonsense of the American people and faith in the commonsense of the enrolled members of the Republican Party throughout the country. It is they who will have to make the choice as to the direction and the commitment of the GOP.

As I see it there are three points that are relevant to this discussion. The first is that the Republicans must recapture the center. The strength of the Republican Party in the 100 years of its life has been its representation of the great center core of America. It is for this reason chiefly that the American people have put Republican Presidents in the White House more often than Democratic Presidents.

The second point is the importance of understanding the function of political opposition. This point is particularly pertinent to the party and to the country because the Republican Party is more of a minority at this moment than at any time in its history, with one brief exception.

Point 3 is the importance of understanding that party direction and growth will only come through Republican candidates who stand for election in primary and in general elections across the country.

The political center is where the Republicans have been and should return. It is the Republican Party over the decades that has best been able to keep the center balance between public and private uses, that has kept Government and free enterprise in tune with each other rather than at war with each other and has best understood that because the free enterprise system is the great dynamo of America and the strength of the Western community, it carries with it a social obligation which has to be discharged. A Republican philosophy of the center sees the use of Government to provide enough order in society that every human being may live in dignity, respect law and receive justice, and exploit to the heavens the best in himself.

Americans have prospered, helped build and led the free system around the globe. They have had a sense of fairness about it, because we Americans are pragmatists and commonsense people more, I think, than any other people in the world. Business and labor, employer and employee, most all who work in and share the benefits of the free enterprise system, have for the most part a sense of public obligation about domestic and international affairs.

Holding the center also means that the Republican Party must be open to all. There must be a welcome mat out to all; and it may not be merely a passive welcome; but it has to be an active one. Republicans must search out those who have left and millions more in addition. We must see to it that our Negro citizens come back to the Republican Party and that scholars, writers, teachers, and intellectuals in every occupation, find a political home here. Neither businessman nor laborer, professional man nor farmer, should ever feel a sense of discomfort in turning to Republican candidates. It must be an open society this Republican Party, in tune with the last third of the 20th century and ready for the 21st.

In a country as large as ours, as diverse, with as many different interests as ours, and with a unique system of federated States, there must be room in both of the two great parties for different shades of political opinion. If there isn't, we will no longer have a two-party system. Without sufficient intraparty flexibility, a big countrywide party will break. There must be sufficient bend in the arc that embraces the party in order to allow for and respect differences. Otherwise there will be a splintering into many parties which means the possibility of government by coalition, which our system is not geared for and the probability of government by minority, instead of majority, and, lastly, the certainty of sectionalism, East against West, South against North. I prefer to see the political debate take place within each community rather than between communities. I prefer also the countrywide communication that is caused by countrywide parties.

This wide umbrella of accommodation and respect, of course, means at the same time responsibility and the Republican Party in history, if anything, has been a party of responsibility, of reform, of good government, of sound administration. Responsibility means also the rejection of extremes of the right or left for the simple reason that extremes of the right or left refuse to be responsible or to assume responsibility. Neither do they respect the differences of others.

The center means individualism. It means keeping the balance between individual rights and group rights. It means protecting the individual and giving dignity to his uniqueness. Each person is important, for if one is degraded all are lessened. The integrity of each person should not be permitted to be breached by concentration of power beyond his control, whether it be the special concentrations of big business, or big labor, or big city political machines or local majorities, or the concentration of power that lies in government itself. Republicans should be sensitive to the balance point between individual rights and the natural expansionist tendencies of organized power groups. Republicans should be acutely conscious of check and balance, and the use of government itself to secure individual rights—their protection against invasion of other organized power groups.

This is the meaning of civil rights. Alexis de Tocqueville in his examination of the American system 20 years before the Civil War, astutely observed that the one thing he feared in America was the possible tyranny of the majority. It was the Republican Party that first saw the special duty of the National Government to lend its powers toward the protection of individual rights from their denial by local majorities.

The power of the National Government, in turn, must be checked, and individual rights secured from Federal invasion, by constant shoring up of the chief bulwark of individual freedom—the Bill of Rights laid down in our Constitution.

The Republican Party cannot be in the center if it ignores the cities, where 70 percent of our population now lives and therefore where 70 percent of the vote is found. How can Republicans as the best pragmatists of all ignore this area?

It is not as impossible to gain in the cities as some Republicans believe. If Republicans will demonstrate a care and concern for people who live in cities, they will be received with open arms. It isn't even necessary, I go so far as to say, to have final solutions to all of the agonizing problems that affect our urban centers. It is required that the people understand that Republicans understand the problems and pressures of the city people, care deeply, and work toward solutions.

Cities too long have been in the grip of a combination of special interests that have ignored the health, education, and welfare of individuals, that have in fact subverted individual betterment in the interest only of perpetuating machine powers. The political bosses and their special allies in business and labor get fat while the people suffer.

I believe that a whole campaign across the country can be waged around the neglect of the consumer, the harassed cliff of box dweller in the city, in the suburb, or in the countryside. When has he personally felt the benefit of alleged Democratic beneficence? He is beginning to catch on that the city hall politician takes to the soapbox just before elections and then retires to the clubhouse. If the harassed consumer discovers that there is just one person who really cares about him and who is independent of these tired political bureaucracies, he will turn to this person. This person can be, and should be, a Republican. All he has to do is show that he has a heart.

Policy is essentially a response to demands and demonstrated needs. Republicans, especially, being practical people, should understand the importance of responding to changed conditions. Frederick Louis Allen once noted that the Republican Party had labored long on a basic principle of "unrevolutionary and unsystematic and experimental change." A wise statement. Unrevolutionary change is better than revolutionary change. At the same time changes that are too systematic, or change merely for the sake of change can result in an overplanned society. Experimental change, designed to fit the needs of the occasion, is sound because if it doesn't work, it can be adjusted or dropped because it is experimental.

Superplanning, no; adjustment, yes; otherwise the free enterprise system either

will not be allowed to work, or it will not work sufficiently in the public interest. Here again is the balance between public and private uses. "Wise progressivism and wise conservatism go hand in hand, and the wise conservative must be a progressive, because otherwise he works only for reaction which inevitably produces an explosion." These were the words of Theodore Roosevelt, a very practical Republican. Better there be carefree adjustments to the legal and social structure in any free country than there be bloodshed in the streets. And has it not occurred to all of us that this country has become the most powerful country in the world and the fastest moving of any newly emerging country, which we have been, in the shorter space of time, with only one bloody revolution? No other newly emerging free power has been able to do this in its history.

The second point that is relevant to this discussion is the function of the opposition. Its job as the minority is to try to become the majority. The opposition must really want to govern. If it has the attitude that its role is merely to oppose for the sake of opposition, it must mean that it has no real desire to govern. A political minority will not become the majority unless it demonstrates to the people what it would do if it had the power of government in its hands. This means programs, as programs are always required to meet different conditions. Here again I return to the theme that Republicans must demonstrate that they care.

Republicans should break new ground. I understand the importance of Republicans putting themselves on the side of the consumer. There is another neglected area where Republicans can and should define the role of the individual in an age of bigness and organized conformity.

President Eisenhower on leaving the Presidency warned the country to beware of the central power of the industrial military complex. Here is the biggest area of Central Government power of all. This is, in fact, the major part of the Federal Government, measured by the tax dollar and the budget. The Republican Party, consistent with its historical concern about big government can make a national issue out of the whole question of reconversion. What happens when that happy day comes and the industrial military complex has to be unwound? What happens when garrison state attitudes, in which every special interest in our system has a stake, overwhelm our initiative or sap our freedoms, or make us so dependent on "hardware" that we lose sight of individual excellence and ignore the humanities and other spiritual, cultural, and social values. There is no planning at all for this complicated eventuality. There is no new thought about it, or program—no idea. This is an issue by itself in any community which feels short changed in the allocation of taxpayers' money for the production of hardware. It ought to be a matter of deep concern to all Americans.

In foreign policy it is especially important for Republicans to understand the function of opposition. We have an obligation as the minority to insist that the Government state its policy. This administration is demonstrably weak in this area. Its tendency will be to avoid debate rather than conduct intelligent discussions.

Presently there is no clear policy with respect to the Far East, Vietnam, China. There has been little if any understanding of the new currents that have swept Europe or of the surges of nationalism that have been gripping the countries of Europe and the Continent itself. Clear policy, we, as members of the opposition, have a right to expect and an obligation to demand.

The third and last point that is pertinent to this discussion, is understanding the significance of running candidates. Policy has little meaning in the abstraction. It needs flesh and blood. It is right and proper that the political systems of each community develop and organize themselves around local candidates. This is meaningful. Abstract policy will not sell in the absence of the personality of candidates to put it around. The shape of the party will be controlled by the extent to which local candidates for office are developed, educated, supported, and tested. The extent to which the community is willing to involve itself in this production, is the measure of the health and vigor of the political system.

Dr. Johnson once said, "Our minds are only clarified by the sight of the gallows." One only discovers the meaning of the loss of power when a candidate is lost in a local or other election. Power lost is power gained by others, and here the control of parties and the formulation of issues and policies takes place.

Those who wish to shape the Government will do so by their involvement in local campaigns and with the daily headache that people in office or standing for office have. And it is almost trite to say that government is only as good as you wish it to be and candidates are only as qualified as you want them to be, but it can stand repetition because it is true. Involvement is the answer and involvement is the obligation.

My conclusion, then, can be simply stated. First, the Republican Party must recapture the middle ground which it abandoned and which the Johnson administration skillfully occupied as the result. Second, it must understand the function of the opposition in the parliamentary and governmental process. The Republican Party must demonstrate that it wants and deserves to govern. Third, the party's preoccupation must be the caliber of candidates for elective office.

I am optimistic about the future of the Republican Party because I believe in the commonsense of the people in their commitment to the two-party system and in the commonsense of the Republican electorate who ultimately will judge and declare what they want. It is not an easy business to run a party because the free democratic system and its processes are full of imperfections. But take comfort from the words of an honorary citizen of the United States, who, with love and sadness we remember today, Sir Winston Churchill, "Remember," said Sir Winston, "that democracy is the worst form of government ever devised by the mind of man, except for every other form of government."

A Great Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER L. WOLFF
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, 1965, a young constituent of mine, Pfc. James Rory Cook, U.S. Marine Corps, died tragically at the young age of 19 as result of an automobile accident near North Tarrytown, N.Y., and is now buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

On January 6, 1965, he had graduated from the U.S. Marine Corps boot camp at Parris Island, S.C., where he was a member of an honor platoon and had qualified as an expert marksman, and also had been promoted to the rank of private first class.

His parents, Mr. and Mrs. James Cook, and his sister, Rua Cook, all of 31 Bayside Avenue, Port Washington, N.Y., were justifiably proud of this young marine, who had determined to dedicate his entire career to the service of his country with the Marine Corps. On the day of graduation from boot camp he said to his parents:

> I have learned something of great importance in the Marine Corps * * * unless you are willing to try 100 percent, you might as well not try at all.

Rory tried 100 percent. He gave of himself completely as his short-lived record as a marine indicates only too well.

Rory resided in the Third Congressional District of New York for 12 years. He graduated with the class of 1963 of the Paul D. Schreiber High School in Port Washington, where he was a member of the varsity lacrosse team.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to extend my deepest heartfelt sympathy to Mr. and Mrs. Cook and family on this great loss they and the Marine Corps have suffered.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 2, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with these words from Romans 15: 13: *Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing.*

Let us pray.

Eternal God, as we come unto Thee with our many needs, may we dare to trust and be obedient to Thy counsel and commands, following Thee faithfully and without fear.

We acknowledge that when man looks into his own heart, clearly and honestly, he will find there the cause and cure for the troubles of the world and see there those discords and disharmonies which are written large in the strife and struggle of humanity.

Grant that men and nations everywhere may yield themselves to Thy divine sovereignty whose authority we cannot doubt and whose appeals of love and grace we cannot silence.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed