dent of the United States, with my colleagues of the committee, and with distinguished scientists and engineers.

The Renewed Bombing of North Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the Democratic leadership announced to the House that President Johnson had ordered resumption of bombing in Vietnam. Of special interest to me was the statement that the issue of peace in Vietnam had been referred by the President to the Security Council of the United Nations.

I have had misgivings about resumption of bombing and still have with regard to acceleration of the war. Especially, Mr. Speaker, I do not understand the failure—indeed the opposition of our State Department to a policy of asking all free world nations to boycott North Vietnam. I have felt we should bar our ports to foreign ships that supply the enemy.

Furthermore, I have urged that Congress bring out all the facts by a full debate on the war.

But, today, Mr. Speaker, I must support our President. Right along I have said that if I had any doubts or uncertainties about what the United States should do, I would support President Johnson. He has the full facts; I do not.

So, Mr. Speaker, I join today the Members on both sides of the aisle who have spoken out in support of President Johnson's decision. He has done what he believed to be in the best interests of our Nation. I know he has had a difficult decision, and I think the least I can do, as a Republican, is indicate a solidarity that exists across the aisle of the House of Representatives.

So I say to President Johnson: I support you. You have taken the course you believe best will protect and support our GI's in southeast Asia.

This, I say to the President, is a time when you need my support, and you have it.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1966

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 26, 1966)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord and Father of mankind, we come to Thee this morning in the interest of the good proceedings of this session of the U.S. Senate.

These men and women take this moment for prayer because they need divine help. The responsibilities of debate and vote reaching in influence to the ends of the earth are heavy upon their shoulders.

May they now, through the faith in which this prayer is given, be assured that the God who created all will continue his creation for good through sincere deliberations in this high assembly.

Be with our President, the members of the United Nations who meet today to hear a proposal for peace. Influence through this action the capitols of the world as they evaluate and give support to a just peace.

Be Thou the God of comfort, healing, and eternal life to those who fight, suffer, and die this day on battlefields of a world where its citizens have not learned to live with each other. In the Master's name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal be considered as read and approved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements or speeches limited to 3 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I presume the majority leader means for the transaction of routine business only?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Exactly.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I did not object, because I understood it was implied in the unanimous-consent request of the majority leader that the morning hour be limited to the transaction of routine morning business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Morning business is in order.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for 25 minutes.

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

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 22d World Health Assembly in Boston, Mass., in 1969 (Rept. No. 955).

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO STUDY ORIGIN OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS FINANCED BY DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MUSKIE (for Mr. HARRIS), from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 218), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. RES. 218

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, from February 1, 1966, through January 31, 1967, to make studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to:

(1) the operations of research and development programs financed by departments and agencies of the Federal Government, including research in such fields as economics and social science, as well as basic science, research, and technology;

(2) review those programs now being carried out through contracts with higher educational institutions and private organizations, corporations, and individuals to determine the need for the establishment of national research, development, and manpower policies and programs, in order to bring about Government-wide coordination and elimination of overlapping and duplication of scientific and research activities; and

(3) examine existing research information operations, the impact of Federal research and development programs on institutions of higher learning, and to recommend

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

the establishment of programs to insure equitable distribution of research and development contracts among such institutions and other contractors.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized—

(1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable;

(2) to employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority of the committee is authorized at its discretion to select one employee for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and

(3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize on a reimbursable basis the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $66,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 2854. A bill for the relief of Dr. Gottfried R. Kaestner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2855. A bill to amend chapter 207, title 18, United States Code, to prescribe procedure for the return of persons who have fled, in violation of the conditions of bail given in any State or judicial district of the United States, to another State or judicial district, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 2856. A bill to authorize the expenditure of appropriated funds for insurance covering the operation of motor vehicles in foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 2857. A bill to increase the investment credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S.J. Res. 132. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing 4-year terms for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. COOPER:

S.J. Res. 133. Joint resolution designating February of each year as American History Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

RESOLUTION

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO STUDY ORIGIN OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS FINANCED BY DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. MUSKIE (for Mr. HARRIS), from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 218) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to study the origin of research and development programs financed by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HARRIS, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

TO AUTHORIZE THE EXPENDITURE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR INSURANCE COVERING THE OPERATION OF MOTOR VEHICLES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the expenditure of appropriated funds for insurance covering the operation of motor vehicles in foreign countries.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Attorney General, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from the Attorney General dated January 14, 1966, to the Vice President in regard to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2856) to authorize the expenditure of appropriated funds for insurance covering the operation of motor vehicles in foreign countries, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2856

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That appropriations for the departments, agencies and independent establishments, including wholly owned Government corporations, shall be available, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, for payment of premiums or fees for contracts of indemnification or insurance of officers, employees, and agents for their liability, or that of the United States, resulting from (a) the operation by them of private motor vehicles, while in foreign countries, where such operation is within the scope of their employment, and (b) the operation by them of official motor vehicles, while in foreign countries.

SEC. 2. Thirty days following the date on which regulations are issued by the President, subsection (a) of section 3 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 890), is repealed, and subsection (a)(9) of section 636 of the Act of September 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 458), is amended to read as follows: "(9) insurance of aircraft acquired for use in foreign countries;".

The letter presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., January 14, 1966.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: There is attached for your consideration and appropriate action a legislative proposal "To authorize the expenditure of appropriated funds for insurance covering the operation of motor vehicles in foreign countries."

The proposal would authorize the use of agency appropriations, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, for the payment of premiums or fees for contracts of indemnification or insurance of officers, employees, and agents for their liability, or that of the United States, resulting from (a) the operation by them of private motor vehicles, while in foreign countries, where such operation is within the scope of their employment, and (b) the operation by them of official motor vehicles, while in foreign countries. It would further provide that 30 days following the date on which regulations are issued by the President, existing law (5 U.S.C. 170h(a)) authorizing the Secretary of State to purchase insurance on official motor vehicles operated in foreign countries would be repealed and that similar authority provided under the Act for International Development of 1961 (75 Stat. 458) would be amended by deleting the reference therein to insurance of official motor vehicles used in foreign countries.

As originally submitted by this Department in the 88th Congress and introduced in the Senate as S. 2902, the proposal would have allowed the purchase of insurance covering the operation of personal and official motor vehicles by employees while in the scope of their employment. At the suggestion of the Agency for International Development the proposal has been modified to permit the purchase of insurance for some employees operating Government-owned vehicles on other than official business. The proposal as modified would permit the Agency for International Development to retain the authority it now has to permit some of its employees to use insured Government vehicles outside the scope of their employment. This modification would not affect operations of the Department of Justice since employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service may not use official motor vehicles outside of their employment.

The proposal has been drafted so that its application would not be limited to the Department of Justice but would include all departments, agencies, and individual establishments, including wholly owned Government corporations. In these circumstances this submission will relate primarily to the need for this legislation from the point of view of the Department of Justice. It is understood that other agencies to be affected will either separately, or through the Bureau of the Budget, indicate their needs. The following agencies, in offering views on the proposal, have supported its objectives: the Departments of State, Defense, Health, Education, and Welfare, Agriculture, and Treasury.

The problem faced by the Department of Justice is that if an employee of the Depart-

ment, while operating a motor vehicle in a foreign country on official business, becomes involved in a collision, which causes personal injury or property damage, there is no provision of law whereby the Department may pay damages to a third party. Employees of the Department, particularly those in the Immigration and Naturalization Service, are stationed in overseas countries and in connection therewith are required to operate motor vehicles. Also, such officers who are stationed in the United States at points along the borders use automobiles on a day-to-day basis, and it is necessary to use such vehicles in entering Canada and Mexico for the purpose of performing their official duties.

It is our view that there should be some provision for protecting employees operating motor vehicles in foreign countries on official business. Furthermore, some countries, where employees of the Department operate motor vehicles, have compulsory liability insurance laws. Failure by the United States to assume responsibility in third-party claims as a result of the operation of vehicles in a foreign country could cause embarrassment for this country and could conceivably result in international incidents. For the protection of the employee, to avoid embarrassment or unfavorable publicity for the United States, and in order for our employees to comply with the laws of countries where they operate vehicles while on official business, approval of this proposal is recommended.

Insofar as the Department of Justice is concerned the purchase of insurance affecting the operation of approximately 276 vehicles is presently contemplated, including all vehicles located permanently in foreign countries and only those vehicles located in the United States which are frequently operated in Canada and Mexico. It is estimated that the cost of insurance to cover operation of these vehicles would be about $9,500 annually or an average of $34 per vehicle.

The Department of Justice urges the prompt and favorable consideration of this legislation.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Attorney General.

DESIGNATION OF FEBRUARY OF EACH YEAR AS AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution to designate February of each year as American History Month, and ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee. I ask also that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and lie at the desk through Lincoln's Birthday, February 12, for the convenience of Senators who may wish to cosponsor the resolution.

In addition to designating February as American History Month, the resolution asks the President to issue annually a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate ceremonies and activity.

I know there are many "weeks," "months," and "days" now. But especially for schoolchildren, with their keen awareness of the birthday of the Father of our Country and of Lincoln's Birthday, February is a time for special recognition of the traditional values we cherish, a time to remember our great leaders as well as the common people who broke new ground—and it can be a time of rededication to the legacy they gave us of noble character, hard work, and practical wisdom.

I think it would be a good thing to designate a month during which we might recall the lessons and problems of the past, and seek guidance in the continuity of history for the problems of our own time and the challenge of the future.

We live in an age when many of the events which touch the lives of all of us require as never before a knowledge of geography, and may be illuminated by an understanding of history. I know that these two subjects, included now in what has become known as social studies, are receiving greater attention and new emphasis in many schools. I would hope that the designation of February as American History Month would encourage, at least in a small way, this development, and provide an opportunity to attract the attention of schoolchildren, and all of us, to what can always be fascinating and rewarding study.

Mr. President, my resolution renews the proposal made by Senator Keating in the 88th Congress, and I understand a similar resolution has been introduced in the House of Representatives. I hope it may meet with approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Kentucky.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 133) designating February of each year as American History Month, introduced by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 133

Whereas the study of history not only enlivens appreciation of the past but also illuminates the present and gives perspective to our hopes;

Whereas a knowledge of the growth and development of our free institutions and their human values strengthens our ability to utilize these institutions and apply these values to present needs and new problems;

Whereas Americans honor their debt to the creativity, wisdom, work, faith, and sacrifice of those who first secured our freedoms, and recognize their obligation to build upon this heritage so as to meet the challenge of the future; and

Whereas it is appropriate to encourage a deeper awareness of the great events which shaped America, and a renewed dedication to the ideals and principles we hold in trust: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That February of each year is hereby designated as American History Month, and the President of the United States is requested and authorized to issue annually a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe such month in schools and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bill and concurrent resolution:

Authority of January 18, 1966:

S. 2786. A bill relating to the carryover of net operating losses of certain railroad corporations: Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HART, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. SALTONSTALL.

Authority of January 19, 1966:

S. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution to approve selecting of the U.S. Olympic Committee and to support its recommendations that the State of Utah be designated as the site for the 1972 winter Olympic games: Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BASS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PELL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio.

DEATH OF NEWCOMB MOTT

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon, in the town of Sheffield, Mass., a young man was buried. His name was Newcomb Mott, and the circumstances of his death are of most serious concern—not just to his family and his countrymen, but to the cause of justice, and to future relations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Newcomb Mott is dead because of a tragic and mysterious tangle of events which engulfed him when he wandered across the border of the Soviet Union, more than 4 months ago. His crossing of that border was unspectacular, and in fact not even unusual for that part of the world. But the way he was treated, the sentence he was given, the way in which he has been used, and the circumstances surrounding his death, are most unusual—and they have raised questions that must be answered in the interests of relations between our countries.

And let me make it clear that in raising these questions and asking for these answers, I am doing no more than the Soviet Union would do, if the situation was reversed and what happened to Newcomb Mott had happened to a Russian citizen who crossed the border of the United States. In that case the Government of the Soviet Union would be asking the same questions, asking them publicly, and demanding their answer.

Newcomb Mott was 27 years old when he died. He came from a respected family in the Berkshire mountain town of Sheffield. His father is a dealer in rare

books and drawings, his mother a registered nurse. He went to school in California and to Antioch College, where as one of his assignments under the work-study program offered by that school, he spent several months working for the Associated Press in the Press Gallery in the House of Representatives here in Washington.

Newcomb Mott inherited his father's love of books and history. His first 2 years after graduation from college were spent in teaching history. In 1963, he became a school textbook adviser and sales representative for the D. Van Nostrand Co., of Princeton, N.J., a company specializing in the sale of textbooks. He traveled throughout New York, Pennsylvania, and New England, to high schools and colleges, consulting with teachers and professors about teaching texts and new publications. He worked hard at his job and found it rewarding. He looked forward to a long and fruitful career in this field, and gave promise of making a significant contribution in the field of education.

Some idea as to the kind of young man Newcomb Mott was, is contained in the following excerpts from a letter written last November by Mr. Francis W. Adams, former U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York and former police commissioner of New York City, who has known the Mott family for many years. Mr. Adams says:

> Mr. Newcomb Mott has very high ideals and a real desire to be of help to others. For a time about 3 years ago he taught at Kingsley Hall in a small boys' school near our home in Alford, Mass. I remember talking with him about some of the problems he met in teaching and taking care of the boys. I was very much impressed by his deep interest in the welfare of the boys and his kindness to them.
>
> I have found Mr. Newcomb Mott to be a young man who has a keen and intelligent interest in life, not only in America but in other parts of the world. He also has a lively curiosity about people, places, and life in general. This has led him to travel widely during his holidays. I have talked with him after he has come home from his holiday trips and have noted that he has greatly enjoyed learning about how people live in other parts of the world.
>
> Mr. Newcomb Mott has always shown a careful and scrupulous regard for the law and for the rights of others. He is, perhaps, not too sophisticated or worldly and it is quite possible that this characteristic might lead him to act without realizing that he might be contravening some rule or regulation. Certainly, in my opinion, based on my intimate knowledge of his background and character, he would not knowingly, willfully, or with intent, do anything wrong.

Newcomb Mott's trip to Europe, which ended in his death, began as a vacation tour of the countries of Scandanavia. After visiting Denmark, Sweden and Norway, he spent the last part of August in Helsinki, and was scheduled to fly from there to London to meet his parents. Because he had a few days before his parents arrived, he arranged to visit the arctic area of Finland and the Norwegian town of Kirkenes, near the fjords. He had no fixed itinerary for these extra days but, as many tourists do, went from one spot to another on the suggestion of hotel clerks and people he met in the area.

Kirkenes is on the Russian-Norwegian border, just across from the Russian town of Boris Gleb. Newcomb Mott, by nature an inquisitive young man, asked various people in Kirkenes about the possibility of making a brief trip across the border to Boris Gleb. He received conflicting advice: some people told him that Boris Gleb was open only to Scandinavians, others said that anyone with a passport could cross the border. The confusion even among the local residents is easy to understand, for Boris Gleb had been open to Norwegian and Icelandic tourists without Soviet visas during the summer of 1965. The fact is that Boris Gleb is not a security area because it is on the Norwegian side of the river and in order to continue to travel in Russia from Boris Gleb, one must cross the river.

On September 4, having 10 hours to spare before the plane on which he had a reservation was scheduled to take him back to Finland, he decided to try to visit Boris Gleb. He would go to the border and ask the border guards if he were permitted to enter without a visa. If he was not allowed into the Soviet Union, he reasoned, at least he would be able to see what Russian border guards looked like, perhaps exchange some coins and obtain some souvenirs.

The road leading to the Soviet border that Newcomb Mott took did not have a guard post. There was a sign with a hammer and sickle. He knew he was crossing the border but the consequences of his crossing did not come home to him. He was intent upon reaching Boris Gleb, or at any rate, encountering some people after a long and lonely walk. Finally he saw three people. He went up to them, showed them his passport and tried to convey to them that he was an American and that he was lost. The people were Russian border guards. They arrested him and took him into custody.

What had occurred so far was not too very much out of the ordinary. A naive and inquisitive American tourist had failed to exercise the appropriate caution, and had strayed across the Iron Curtain. Such border crossings are not uncommon. Norwegians who cross at this point are routinely turned back. Seven non-Norwegians have crossed this very border accidentally since 1947—including one American. Their detention ranged from a few days to a maximum of 4 weeks. Yet Newcomb Mott, who crossed the border at a point where it is not clearly marked, was sentenced to 1½ years at a labor camp. Two months later, while being transferred from Murmansk to a camp in the interior of Russia, he died of a slashed throat. Yesterday he was buried in Sheffield, Mass.

This is the sequence of events that ended in death for Newcomb Mott. But it is not the whole story. A part of the rest of the story can be pieced together, from his trial and subsequent events. Another significant part has yet to be revealed by the Soviet Government.

To begin with, his detention and trial were most unusual. He was kept in isolation for an unusually long period. He was not tried until almost 3 months after his arrest. He was subject to extensive interrogation by officials of the Russian secret police. He was denied bail—even though Soviet law permits release on bail in cases of border violation. He was kept in a single cell, 7 feet wide by 20 feet long and not permitted to see or talk to any other prisoners.

When the vice consul of the American Embassy in Moscow was finally allowed to interview Newcomb Mott in jail, he learned from Mott that he had been told he would be tried and convicted and sentenced to a labor camp; that there was no possibility of a suspended sentence, and that the trial might be secret. All this suggested that a decision had been made, at a political level, to convict Newcomb Mott—before he had a chance to plead his case, before the evidence was introduced—all in violation of the stated principles of the Soviet legal system.

The trial itself omitted crucial evidence. A border guard was allowed to testify that no one had been allowed to cross this area in the last 6 years. But a signed statement from an official of the Norwegian Government containing the names of persons who had crossed the border within that period, and the dates, was excluded from evidence.

Newcomb Mott's sentence was extremely harsh and unfair. As I have said, no one else who had crossed this unusual border, in which the Russian town is separated by a river from the rest of Russian territory, had ever been sentenced to jail. Past precedents, even in the case of clear-cut border crossings, called for early release.

The Soviets seem to have handled the case, in its later stages, with excessive haste. Normally, when a sentence is imposed and an appeal for clemency filed under Soviet law, the execution of the sentence is stayed until a decision on the appeal is made. But in this case, Newcomb Mott was sent to the labor camp so far as we know while the clemency appeal was still pending—and it was on this trip that he met his death.

The harshness and unfairness with which the Soviets dealt with Newcomb Mott was compounded by the way they tried to undermine his morale while in prison. Interrogators and prison officials tried to do their best to convince him that no one was showing any interest in his predicament. Moscow Radio said last week:

> Both his parents and the American Embassy walked out on Mott, leaving him to his own devices.

This statement is quite false. From the time of Newcomb Mott's arrest until death, U.S. Embassy officials and the State Department labored long and conscientiously in an effort to secure the release of this young man.

On September 18, the Embassy's political counselor met with officials of the American section of the Foreign Ministry and urged the early release of Mr. Mott in conformity with past Soviet actions in cases of this kind.

On September 23, the American Ambassador in Moscow, Foy D. Kohler, met with Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister

Vasily Kuznetsov and expressed his strong hope that the case of Mr. Mott would be handled like previous illegal border crossings, and that the Soviet Government would send Mr. Mott back across the border in the near future.

On October 23, the American Chargé d'Affaires in Moscow told the Chief of the Foreign Ministry's American section that the U.S. Government was disturbed by the circumstances surrounding the case, and particularly by indications that Mr. Mott would be brought to trial. Our Chargé d'Affaires pointed out that a trial of Mr. Mott could have a negative effect on United States-Soviet relations and on American tourism in the Soviet Union. Before and after the trial, State Department officials in Washington have supplemented our Embassy's efforts by urging Soviet officials to release Mr. Mott without delay. All told, 30 separate contacts were made by our Government and the Soviet Government between September and January.

I have been involved in this effort as well. On November 30, I addressed a letter to the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet, Mr. Ignatov, urging favorable consideration of the appeal of the sentence. On two occasions, I filed formal clemency petitions with the Soviet courts on behalf of Newcomb Mott.

On January 11, 1966, I personally met for 2 hours with Ambassador Dobrynin in Washington in an effort to facilitate his release. The senior Senator from Massachusetts, the Speaker of the House and other public officials from my State have also been active in appealing to the Soviet Government.

The statement of Moscow Radio is especially unfair to Newcomb Mott's parents who, for the past 5 months, have been totally absorbed in the single purpose of securing the release of their son. They have talked and written to the State Department and the Embassy, talked with Senators and Representatives, with anyone and everyone they felt might help. They traveled to Moscow and made personal appeals to Soviet authorities. They attended the trial in Murmansk—although they were not allowed to talk to their son until after his conviction. These efforts were trying and physically debilitating to both Mr. and Mrs. Mott. But through it all, their devotion and love of their son was never in doubt.

The record is clear that far from leaving him to his own devices, his family and his Government worked persistently to help him. But Newcomb Mott, alone in his tiny cell, set apart from his fellow prisoners, with no one to talk to in English, never knew this. He only knew what he was told by the Russian authorities and his guards: that he had been abandoned by his family and his country.

On December 16, Newcomb Mott's appeal was rejected by the Supreme Court of the Soviet Union. Our Government then asked that he be granted clemency.

On January 8, the judicial review of the procedural aspects of the case was denied.

On January 13, our Embassy in Moscow received a letter from him in which he indicated that he had been told that he would not be moved from Murmansk until a decision on the clemency appeal had been made. We never heard whether clemency had been granted or denied, for 1 week later, our Embassy was told of Newcomb Mott's death.

One of two things must be true: Either Newcomb Mott met with foul play while in the custody and full control of Soviet officials; or he took his own life while in the custody and full control of Soviet officials. In either case, the Government of the Soviet Union is to blame for his death.

Regardless of the circumstances of Newcomb Mott's death, the Soviets failed in their responsibility to protect a man who was in their custody. When they jailed Mott, they accepted an obligation, basic in international law, and in their own legal system, of caring for and protecting him. His death, from whatever cause, is clear evidence that they failed in this obligation.

If Newcomb Mott did take his own life, he must have shown some indication during his imprisonment of a depressed mental state. What was his mental condition during his imprisonment? Did Soviet officials do anything to preserve his mental health? If they knew he was disconsolate, why did they not take sufficient precautions to protect him from himself? What kind of unbelieveable neglect allowed his guards to let him out of their sight, knowing that he had a dangerous weapon in his possession?

These are the standard precautions that any prison authorities from any country should follow when dealing with an individual who might have suicidal tendencies. We have a right to know why they were not followed in this case.

Far from trying to answer these questions, Moscow Radio made a clumsy attempt to blame American officials for Newcomb Mott's death. They have stated that he slashed his windpipe with a razor blade sent him in a gift package from the American Embassy. They said that by furnishing these blades, the Embassy was responsible for giving Newcomb Mott the means by which to take his life.

We do not know at this time what instrument he used to take his life, if indeed he did so. But let me make it clear that the American Embassy in Moscow had been sending Newcomb Mott packages of food, clothing, and other articles on a regular basis since shortly after his arrest last fall. After he was sentenced, his parents had specifically requested that packages be sent as often as possible. So any attempt to suggest that the Embassy, by sending blades among other toilet articles, meant for Newcomb Mott to use them to kill himself is preposterous.

In short, what we see is that the Soviets have imprisoned a young man guilty, if at all, of an inadvertant crossing of a confusing border point; sentenced him to a harsh and unprecedented term in prison; permitted him to die in their custody; and then clouded his death with a smokescreen of misinformation and clumsy accusations.

We were told last week by Russian authorities that a report on the death would be made "in a day or two."

On two occasions since being told this, U.S. Embassy officials have inquired about the report. Assurances were given that the report was imminent. Still it has not come.

I am asking today that the Government of the Soviet Union do the following:

First. Explain why Newcomb Mott was sent into the interior to begin to serve his sentence, before his appeal for clemency was determined.

Second. Produce the weapon alleged to have caused Newcomb Mott's death.

Third. Allow officials of the U.S. Embassy to question the security guards that were responsible for him at the time he died.

Fourth. Allow our officials to question the doctors and prison officials responsible for his health and custody while in Murmansk to ascertain what his psychological state was at that time.

Fifth. Supply Newcomb Mott's parents and our Government with a full and accurate account of his death and the events leading up to it.

Sixth. Punish those whose acts or neglect were responsible for this death.

I feel that our Government and his family deserve these courtesies from the Soviet Union. As I said, they are no more nor no less than what the Soviet Government would ask if this tragedy had occurred to one of their innocent citizens on our soil. I intend to press for them and to keep pressing until satisfactory answers are forthcoming and until those responsible are punished.

I think the Soviets have handled this case badly from the beginning until now. But I have no desire that this case damage the relations between our two Governments in the very difficult matters of international relations in which we share a mutual concern. I make this speech not to embarrass the Russian Government, but to see that justice can be done in the future. I would hope that whenever an American citizen is arrested in the Soviet Union, he be permitted quick and continuing contact with American Consular officials. I would urge that at trials of this nature, the Soviet Union allow an American lawyer to visit the defendant and be present at the trial and consult with the defendant and the Soviet defense lawyer handling the case.

I would hope that in the future the Russian Government let all appeal procedures allowed under their laws to go to final determination before executing the sentence.

These changes could prevent this from happening to other Americans. And I would be prepared, of course, to urge that our country be prepared to grant Soviet citizens accused under our laws the same safeguards, when they request them.

When Newcomb Mott's mother left Russia after attending his trial, she said:

> Our 12 days in Russia have changed us a lot. What they will do to Newcomb is difficult to guess.

None of us knew what a sad answer would be given to her question. I know

I am joined by all my colleagues in publicly extending our sincere sympathy and condolences to Mr. and Mrs. Howard Mott at this difficult time.

It is a long way from Murmansk, in northern Russia, to Sheffield, in western Massachusetts. But the tragic connection that culminated yesterday afternoon shows that simple justice, applied in every country, is something that affects us all. The actions I have asked for can no longer help Newcomb Mott. But they could result in more humane treatment for those who may stumble into trouble in the future, and they should show that we care about American citizens, about their rights and their welfare, everywhere in the world.

Mr. President, in conclusion I would like to place in the RECORD a chronology of this case, showing all the formal contacts made between our Government and that of the Soviet Union since last September. This does not, of course, include the many informal contacts and expressions of concern that were registered with the Soviet Government in Moscow, here in Washington, and in the United Nations.

I would also like to place in the RECORD, excerpts from a letter written by Newcomb Mott to a Vice Consul of the American Embassy in Moscow, Mr. William Shinn, whose help and persistence to Newcomb Mott and his family in this case have been most admirable. In the letter, Newcomb Mott tells in his own words of how he crossed the Soviet border.

Finally, as evidence of the type of appeal made to the Soviet Union in this case, I would like to insert the text of the letter I sent to the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet.

I ask unanimous consent that these items be included at this point in the RECORD.

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

CHRONOLOGY OF NEWCOMB MOTT CASE[1]

1965

September 8: Department received telegram from U.S. Embassy Oslo that American Citizen Newcomb Mott arrived in Kirkenes, Norway, September 2. Last seen 7 a.m., September 4. Had voiced interest in visiting town of Boris Gleb in U.S.S.R.

UPI correspondent in Moscow requested background on Oslo press reports that Mott had inadvertently crossed Soviet border. First Embassy knew of incident. Embassy made inquiry to Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Department initiated investigation. Sent biographic and passport information. Notified parents.

September 9: Kirkenes police chief queried Soviet border officials. Was informed Mott held by Soviet police, probably in Murmansk. Mott's father telephoned Embassy Oslo.

September 10: Embassy Moscow again approached Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Ministry said unfamiliar with the case but would investigate.

September 11: Ministry of Foreign Affairs confirmed Mott detained for illegal border crossing and held in Murmansk while case under investigations. Soviets agree grant access by consul. Embassy requested prompt release.

September 13: Vice Consul Shinn interviewed Mott in Murmansk for 1 hour.

September 18: Embassy Moscow counselor met with official of Ministry of Foreign Affairs and again urged early release of Mott in conformity with past precedents.

September 20: Kirkenes acting police chief informed American Embassy Oslo that there have been eight illegal border crossings in his area, including Mott, since 1945.

September 23: American Ambassador to the U.S.S.R., Foy Kohler, met Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Kuznetsov and requested Mott's release, citing similar cases where this action was taken by Soviet authorities.

September 29–October 1: During series of talks in New York between United States (Secretary Rusk, Ambassador Goldberg, Ambassador Thompson, Ambassador Kohler) and U.S.S.R. (Foreign Minister Gromyko, Ambassador Fedorenko; Ambassador Dobrynin), U.S. representatives urged prompt and satisfactory settlement of Mott case.

October 15: Vice Consul Shinn had second interview with Mott in Murmansk which lasted 1½ hours. Vice Consul not permitted interview with prison doctor. Mott had been questioned and told he would be tried and convicted and sentenced to labor camp, that there is no possibility of suspended sentence, that trial may be closed and that he may have lawyer from Murmansk only. When asked for date of trial, investigator said this was "secret." (Ministry of Foreign Affairs subsequently stated Murmansk investigator had no basis for making such statements.)

October 23: American Charge d'Affaires in Moscow protests circumstances surrounding Mott case, especially indications that Mott would be tried and not simply released and investigator's comments indicating political decision to convict him already made. Pointed out that a trial would have bad effect on United States-U.S.S.R. relations and on American tourism in the Soviet Union.

October 26: In Washington, Ambassador Thompson raised Mott case with Ambassador Dobrynin expressing concern over situation noted by Shinn on second visit. Dobrynin promised to look into case.

October 27: Embassy Moscow informed by Ministry of Foreign Affairs that preliminary investigation in final stage and Mott will be informed of conclusion October 29. Embassy protests implication that trial will be held.

October 28: Mott's parents and brother Rusty visited Department. Later had interview with Soviet Minister-Counselor Zinchuk. Lawyer from Moscow bar recommended to defend Mott.

October 29: Shinn departs for Murmansk for third meeting with Mott. Kirkenes police chief reported they had established no evidence of contact between Mott and Norwegian officials or any official advice to Mott against visiting Boris Gleb as alleged by Soviets.

October 30: Shinn telephoned Embassy to go ahead and request services Moscow lawyer Zolotukhin. Shinn remained in Murmansk to discuss case with Zolotukhin, Shinn interviewed Mott, transmitted food package and reading material. Mott said he was in good health, but nervous.

November 1: Charge d'Affaires at American Embassy Moscow again expresses concern on Soviet handling of Mott case to Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

November 2: Lawyer Zolotukhin arrives in Murmansk to discuss Mott's defense with him.

November 6: Zolotukhin returns to Moscow and reports to Embassy. Recommends that plea be based on mitigating circumstances of case.

November 12: Embassy officer discusses case with Ministry of Foreign Affairs, stressing Embassy's desire to obtain permission for official observer and Mott's parents to attend trial. Requested Mott's release on bail in accordance with Soviet law.

November 15: Zolotukhin informs Embassy that trial scheduled for November 22 in Murmansk.

November 22: Trial begins in Murmansk. Embassy officer, Mott's parents, and two American reporters present. Border guard falsely testified that Mott was first foreigner to cross border illegally at Boris Gleb.

November 23: Trial continues. Mott's lawyer submits Embassy telegram contradicting border guard's testimony and pointing out seven similar border violations by foreigners, all of whom were expelled after brief periods of detention. Telegram refused as part of record of trial but read by judges. Prosecution submits letter from Norwegian border commissioner stating that Mott had been warned that he could not cross Soviet border without visa. Prosecutor asks for 2½-year sentence.

November 24: Mott sentenced to 18 months "corrective labor." Permitted 4-hour meeting with parents. Department spokesman deplores "extreme and harsh" sentence "inconsistent with past Soviet practice in similar cases."

November 27: Embassy officer points out to Ministry of Foreign Affairs interest of American political made by Senator EDWARD KENNEDY in a November 24 speech in New Bedford, Mass.

December 1: Mott's Soviet lawyer files juridical appeal to decision.

December 11: Embassy informed that Mott appeal to be heard December 16 by RSFSR Supreme Court.

December 13: Embassy obtains approval from Ministry of Foreign Affairs to send observer to appeal hearing. Ministry officials again informed of concern of U.S. Senators and Representatives as well as leading Massachusetts officials over treatment of Mott.

December 14: Embassy delivers letter from Senator EDWARD KENNEDY in support of Mott's appeal to Ministry of Foreign Affairs for forwarding to Supreme Soviet of RSFSR.

December 15: Embassy delivers letter from House Speaker MCCORMACK supporting Mott's appeal.

December 16: Mott's juridicial appeal rejected by RSFSR Supreme Court; clemency appeal prepared and submitted.

December 17: Embassy delivers letter from Senator SALTONSTALL and Massachusetts Attorney General Brooke supporting Mott's appeal.

December 22: Ambassador Kohler requests favorable decision on Mott appeal in conversation with Foreign Minister Gromyko.

December 23: Ambassador at Large Llewellyn Thompson, in discussion with Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin, urges Mott's release.

December 29: Ambassador Kohler requests sympathetic consideration of Mott case in appeal to Supreme Soviet Chairman Podgorny.

January 8: RSFSR judiciary denies request for judicial review of procedural aspects of Mott case. Lawyer prepares brief for presentation to U.S.S.R. procurator general. Clemency appeal also being pursued.

January 13: Embassy receives letter from Mott indicating he had been told he would not be moved from Murmansk until decision on clemency appeal made.

January 21 (3 p.m.): Embassy Councelor inquires of Ministry of Foreign Affairs about status of Mott case and decision on clemency appeal. Informed that there are "no new developments."

[1] This chronology only lists the more important formal representations made by U.S. officials on Mr. Mott's behalf. Numerous other, informal approaches were made which are not recorded here.

January 21 (6 p.m.): Embassy informed that Mott committed suicide while being transported from Murmansk to unspecified place where he would serve out his sentence.

January 22: Ambassador Kohler called on Deputy Foreign Minister Kuznetsov and deplored tragic result of Soviet actions against Mott. The Ambassador requested full investigation of circumstances of his death.

January 23: Soviets deliver Mott's body to Moscow.

January 24: Embassy doctor and consular officer present at autopsy conducted by director of Soviet Institute of Forensic Medicine. Investigation into death continuing.

MURMANSK,
October 10, 1965.

DEAR MR. SHINN: My summer vacation was when I was detained. Now there is snow on the ground here. My vacation is long gone. My reporting date for work has passed. I seem less close to release than on September 5. In Massachusetts, in the Berkshire County area and Sheffield, there are many varieties of fresh, fall apples for sale. The leaves on the trees are changing to all the colors of the rainbow and beginning to drop off. Pumpkins are ripening in the fields. School has begun everywhere. The temperature of the air is often brisk, but not cold except some nights. This has all occurred while I am here. I have missed it so far. I do miss it.

I may have told you that I left the United States on July 19, as a tourist flying on SAS to Copenhagen. From there I went to Sweden, stopping for some days in Malmo, Kalmar, and Visby, on the island of Gotland. Afterwards, I took a boat to Helsinki, Finland, spending 11 days there. As the student hotel I was in was closed to tourists August 31 (and opening for students), I decided I would leave Helsinki as well. The desk clerk, a law student, suggested, since I had a few extra days before I planned to go to Stockholm and London (where I was to meet my parents), that I visit Finnish Lapland and the Arctic. He called Finnair for me; the round trip (back to Tampere) fare was inexpensive (about $70). I decided to go that afternoon.

After staying in Rovaniemi overnight, the plane trip continued to Ivalo September 1, where I spent the night in the Touristhotell. In Ivalo I discovered I could go by bus to nearby Norway. For a long time I've wanted to see fjords, so I planned to go September 3. On September 2, the two desk clerks worked out the semicomplicated bus schedule to Lakselv, Norway. Kirkenes was too far by bus to even consider. One clerk telephoned the Touristhotell in Inari, Finland, on Lake Inari, the third largest in the country, and secured a reservation for me for that night. Having approximately 20 minutes before the bus to Inari was due, I walked over to the Finnair office to reserve my seat back for September 5. A female Finnair agent suggested I go to Kirkenes instead of Lakselv because the former was prettier. Besides, Finnair flew to Kirkenes ($15 round trip) in 1 hour, leaving in an hour. I could return to Finland September 4, and save many hours on a bus. I agreed. The hotel desk clerk had my reservation in Inari changed to September 4.

From Kirkenes Airport I traveled into town with two Finns, the only other passengers on the plane. I mentioned that it was too bad I couldn't see the U.S.S.R. since it was so close. They said that on the contrary I could. There was a tiny tourist base just across the border open to anyone with a passport. I hadn't known that before. Later a Finnair representative said I couldn't visit it. The two Touristhotell desk clerks (on September 3) in Kirkenes (I mentioned the male one to you on September 13) told me that Boris Gleb (on the Norwegian side of the river) was open just to Scandinavians. The same day, later, I was very kindly given a private tour of the Syd-Varanger iron mines by the maintenance engineer. As I related to you, he said anyone with passport could visit Boris Gleb. It did not occur to me to check with any Norwegian officials on this. Sometime on the 3d, I decided I would go on the 4th to see for myself if I would be permitted to see the tourist base (the church, vodka, and souvenirs). But if I were not, it would matter very little because I would at least, so I thought, be able to see what a Soviet passport control-customs post and Soviet border officials looked like (for the first time in my life) and have used up some of the 10 hours before my plane (5:15 p.m.) left for Ivalo. My curiosity, unconsciously carried me into danger. I had walked around Kirkenes, which is small; and there were no buses going and returning in time, so I was told, around any of the fjords in the vicinity, so I had a lot of free time that day.

I had not ask anyone what the border crossing-point or the way to it, was like, so, with other reasons I think I gave you, I was not surprised that the second right-hand road (the one with the sign "Sovietique"), which I took because of the sign, became a path. Perhaps, I should have been able to see the correct border crossing point a few times. However, I did not see it. It was an accident that I missed it. As you heard September 13, I have admitted from the first day detained, that when in the mountains, after going through the reindeer fence, I saw a Soviet border pole with a hammer and sickle. Thus I knew I was crossing into the U.S.S.R., but, as I told you, "it stupidly did not occur to me that I was doing something illegal." I'm told I broke a Norwegian law too, so I might be arrested in Norway if I went back. I was tired from walking and I was lost, I thought. I was so intent upon finding the place that I was not conscious that by walking past that pole I would commit an illegal act. If I had been, I would never have done it, nor would I have continued walking right up to where I expected to find people * * *.

I would like the American Embassy present at any trial. Several times I have requested additional visits by you, Mr. Shinn, but at last I've been told that you have to request the visits yourself. Please come. I would be most interested, of course, if you could bring news of my impending release, or, what is being done about it. I appreciate all your efforts, Mr. Shinn.

As of now I can console myself with the notion that it hasn't been a complete loss because I have reduced by about 25 unnecessary pounds with little effort on my part.

Due to my unthinking action, my parents and brother, my other relatives, Van Nostrand and I have suffered. Problems, I never had any intention of creating, have arisen for the United States and U.S.S.R. Governments as well. I am very sorry it happened.

I look at your calling card everyday to renew my hope. If the word "hope" seems to appear frequently, it is because hope and my knowledge that I speak the truth are all I have for comfort.

I am told that the American Embassy can send me food, parcels, and money (for buying food here). I need something else to supplement my diet here in prison. However, some extra food is provided for me by the kind assistant director of the prison. I would appreciate having some newspapers—the New York Times.

Sincerely yours,

NEWCOMB MOTT.

P.S.—If the U.S.A. leaves me here and they decide to convict me (a probability is the latter) I'd want my two bags in Kirkenes stored in Helsinki by U.S.A.

NOVEMBER 30, 1965.

Chairman N. G. IGNATOV,
The Supreme Soviet, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, Moscow, U.S.S.R.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing this letter to you on behalf of a constituent of mine, Mr. Newcomb Mott, a young American from Sheffield, Mass. On November 24, 1965, I was informed of the 1½-year sentence given Mr. Mott by a Murmansk court for a violation of the Soviet border.

I have personally investigated this matter in an attempt to determine the circumstances surrounding Mr. Mott's actions. On the basis of all of the information I can learn, and from the reported testimony at the trial, I feel that Mr. Mott's straying into Soviet Union territory was inadvertent.

There is presently pending an appeal taken by Mr. Mott from the sentence of the Murmansk court. I would sincerely urge that great consideration be given to the merits of Mr. Mott's appeal, to his remorse, and to his desire to return to his home State of Massachusetts.

It strikes me that this young man is in no sense a criminal, a villian, or a person who need be taught a permanent lesson through an extended jail term. I therefore respectfully request that Mr. Mott's appeal receive favorable treatment and that he be allowed to come home to his family.

Sincerely,

EDWARD M. KENNEDY.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. I wish to express to the junior Senator from Massachusetts my deep appreciation and my deep commendation of both the content and the form of his excellent statement relating to one of the most tragic events of our day.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I join the Senator from North Carolina in his commendation of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I appreciate the statements of the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Oregon.

AIR ATTACKS ON NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, now that the President, as a matter of national policy, has made the decision to renew air attacks on North Vietnam, I would hope they would be undertaken against more meaningful military targets. The result to us of such a change in military policy would be a major increase in the effectiveness of our conduct of this war.

In my report to Chairmen RUSSELL and FULBRIGHT about my recent visit to South Vietnam, I said:

> Air operations against North Vietnam have been relatively ineffective, to the point where these operations should not be resumed unless there is more target license; license to hit such military targets as powerplants, oil stores, docks, etc.

My conclusions in this regard were partly the result of rereading the conclusions of the strategic bombing surveys of 1945 and 1946.

It would seem that we are attacking the least important targets most, the more important targets less, and the most important military targets not at all.

I agree with some leading military authorities that a real air effort to knock out important military targets, instead of periodic attacks on targets of far less importance such as bridges, barracks, and buses, might eliminate the necessity of sending hundreds of thousands of additional ground troops to South Vietnam.

In this way we would be using the qualitative advantage characteristic of our sea and air power, instead of struggling with the enemy on a quantitative basis where they are strongest, on the ground, in Asia.

So far our attacks on North Vietnam have been a nuisance but they have not done any real damage to the enemy's growing military potential.

Attacking more important North Vietnam military targets could be done with the same planes and pilots that are now being used; and would result in less cost and less casualties in South Vietnam.

COMMUNICATIONS RELATING TO RESOLUTION OPPOSING UNCONSTITUTIONAL WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain telegrams and communications which I have received in support of my opposition to the unconstitutional and illegal war in South Vietnam be printed in the RECORD.

I have received over 450 wires since Sunday. Except for four of them they all support my opposition to the illegal Executive war in Vietnam. I am inserting the four critical wires also with my answer to them.

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

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God for your courageous stand on Vietnam. Let's trust U.N.

Mrs. JAMES THOMPSON.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

You are not alone on your Vietnam position. We cannot police the world.

Mr. and Mrs. TRUMAN JOHNSON.

MILWAUKIE, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Concerning CBS television appearance thanks again for standing firm on Vietnam.

Mr and Mrs. J. F. DELORD.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Press for peace.

MATHEWSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations, let's give the country back to the people. We don't need a Texas dictator.

GEORGE H. WEBER.

LAKE OSWEGO, OREG.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

When Secretary Rusk speaks of our commitment in Vietnam tomorrow I hope someone will ask him how about President Johnson's commitment to the American people when he gained our trust by campaigning on a reasonable attitude in Vietnam and has subsequently betrayed us by pursuing immoral and illegal aggression there.

JANE ERICKSON.

EUGENE, OREG.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I'm gratified by your courageous stand on southeast Asia policy.

THOMAS DUNCAN.

EUGENE, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

More power in efforts to restore responsibility to elected representatives regarding Vietnam.

MARY STAHL.

SALEM, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We favor your courageous stand against the Vietnam policy of the President and his experts. We fear the cost of our sons in the defense of the corrupt power groups in Vietnam and elsewhere. We fear the consequence of American bombing anywhere.

Mr. and Mrs. JAMES E. NELSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations to you and Senator CLARK. Your reference to that dictator was perfect. Senator BOGGS should try, for a change, to operate this country as a private enterprise. I am fed up with all this waste and graft. Why should we support all these countries, nobody pays my bills.

THERESA STEIN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your opinion concerning the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. Thank you.

NICK SAMMONS.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The following telegram was sent to President Johnson with 58 signatures:

"We the undersigned Unitarian-Universalists believe that the moratorium on the bombing of North Vietnam should be continued. We welcome your peace campaign efforts and recommend you make unequivocal your willingness to negotiate with the national liberation front as an independent force."

E. L. HELLER.

VANCOUVER, WASH.
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We appreciate your stand on the Vietnam policy.

Mr. and Mrs. JOSEPH H. GILL.

SALEM, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Grateful for your resolutions on Vietnam. Our illegal immoral offensive unilateral action there must end.

MARVI and VIOLET METTLETON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God for a Senator who speaks the hopes of those who don't want war.

Rev. BRUCE KLINE.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We are in complete agreement with you on Vietnam. Insist on United Nations participation.

ROBERT BRADEN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I was proud of my Senator on CBS-TV. Please convey arrival to Senator CLARK.

PAT DUREN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Saw you on TV. Didn't vote for you but back you 100 percent.

CHARLES L. O'BRIEN.

ASTORIA, OREG.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Agreed with your plea on CBS program.

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM C. REUTER.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your television stand on Vietnam greatly admired. Continue your fight to end this war.

Mr. and Mrs. W. R. STONE.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am on your side. Keep going.

PATRICIA BRAXTON.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Re Vietnam, thank you.
ALAN YOUNG.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:
Re headlines Sunday Oregonian dear Senator bravo.
Mrs. ALFRED POWERS.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Congratulations on continued strength of your stand on Vietnam. We support you completely.
Mr. and Mrs. VERN RUTSALA.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Admired your position in Sunday debate. Likewise all your efforts regarding Vietnam.
SIDNEY BERLAND.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Endorse wholeheartedly position regarding Vietnam. Approve views expressed by CLARK, MUNDT, and yourself.
Dr. and Mrs. LAWRENCE ROSENTHAL Jr.

EUGENE, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Behind you 100 percent.
NOEL and DOROTHY DANN.

SALEM, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
American eagle becoming vulture. Civilization jeopardized. Congressional responsibility demands continued denunciation of Pentagon's heinous solution.
MARTHA FULLENWIDER.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
I would heartily endorse your continuing efforts to place the issue of the Vietnam war or peace efforts before the legislative branch for debate rather than in the executive branch of the Government exhibit the deciding influences on policies in Vietnam.
Sincerely yours,
Dr. JAMES L. SCHNELLER.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
We are in complete agreement with you on Vietnam. Insist on United Nations participation.
ELWYN BRADEN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
We agree on your Vietnam stand, your search for truth, respect your unpopular stand.
Mr. and Mrs. IVAN ICKES.

HOMINY, OKLA.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Continue opposing President's Vietnam policies. Surely reason will prevail.
Dr. and Mrs. V. MAZZARELLA.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Your courageous challenge to the unhuman and illegal activities of the Government in Vietnam deserves full support.
ERWIN FEHER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Of course Johnson is exceeding his constitutional rights. The situation is desperate. God prosper you.
FLORENCE BATTERSON.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Heartily commend you and associates for opposing our stupidity southeast Asia. Our military must leave.
Mr. and Mrs. FRANK G. CLARK.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate, Washington, D.C.:
Strongly support your efforts for Vietnam de-escalation; please continue.
JUDITH LUSTIG.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
By all means rescind the 1964 Presidential mandate. Good luck.
PATRICIA E. ROWE.

SANTA ROSA, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Against resumption of bombing. Favor full congressional debate on alternatives to present unsatisfactory Vietnam policies.
MIKE JOELL.

STATE COLLEGE, PA.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
You have my fullest support on trying to halt escalation in Vietnam. Am absolutely opposed to President Johnson's chauvinism.
HELEN STRIEDIECK.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Our Nation owes you gratitude for your position on Vietnam. Urge you continue courageously.
ALINE E. HOWER.

SANTA ROSA, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Washington, D.C.:
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Please support the Fulbright position on Vietnam and try awhile longer for diplomatic settlement.
Mr. and Mrs. HARRY B. FORTMAN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
We applaud and are grateful for your steadfast sanity and courageous fight to get us out of this most unwanted war. Keep up the fight.
SARAM AMERLING and
Dr. MARTIN SHEPARD,
Representing 14 residents of 50 West 96 Street, New York City.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Bravo. Stage talkathon for rescinding. Arrange maximum publicity. Hit Senate and public with facts.
ALICE FRANKLYN BRYANT.

FULLERTON, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
I support your stand on Vietnam. Congratulations, we need more independent thinkers like you.
R. SHURY.

GLENDALE, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
If the President resumes bombing without allowing time for action by Congress to revise previous actions, I request that you initiate impeachment proceedings without delay. There will be only one rubicon. Please reply to this message collect.
GEORGE C. THOMSON.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE D. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
The stand you are taking against this immoral, undeclared war has my fullest support.
JOANNA DE JESU.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE D. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Your fight against illegal war is one voice worthy of the name human being.
DAVID H. MANN.

ALHAMBRA, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senator Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Gratitude to you for your courage and efforts. World survival depends upon men like you.
IRENE WALKER.

SEBASTOPOL, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
We ask your continued support of Senator FULBRIGHT on his latest stand on Vietnam, thank you.
JAMES E. HENNINGSON.

HAMPDEN, MASS.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Our full support to you and associates for Vietnam stand.
JULIA WINETROUT,
KENNETH WINETROUT.

EVANSTON, ILL.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I admire your courageous efforts for rational politics for constitutional legality and democratic process. Fully support your fight against presidential dictatorship. Agree Rusk, McNamara should be ousted. Thank you for speaking the American conscience. God bless you.

HANS NOLL,
Professor of Biology, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

COLUMBUS, OHIO,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As American citizen, taxpayer, and registered voter, I humbly request that you order withdraw of the memorandum giving President Johnson authority to conduct the conflict in Vietnam as he sees fit. If state of war exists, let's declare it or get out.

ROBERT S. SHAW.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In complete accord with your views on Vietnam, please continue efforts to prevent holocaust.

Mr. and Mrs. SPENCER W. FRANC.

PORT WASHINGTON, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the fight to rescind your resolution of the 1964 approval. We Americans are proud of you.

ESTHER CREEK.

JERSEY CITY, N.J.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations.

JOSEPH LYRKA.

STOCKTON, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly concur with your proposal for Vietnam.

JOHN TURNER.

JACKSON HEIGHTS, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR: Please continue your efforts for peace in Vietnam. All community supports you in your efforts for peace.

GEORGE STOGEL,
TERRY STOGEL,
ANNA YATES,
ABRAHAM YATES.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You were one of Americas great independent leaders. You have become a moral coward. Please support President.

ROBERT CHARLES.

ARDSLEY, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge full disclosure foreign policy. Get out of Vietnam.

THE LRENS ARDSLEY'S

BOULDER, COLO.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Fully support doubts and questioning of our present Vietnam policy. Urge continuation of debate.

Mr. and Mrs. JAMES FRANK.

GARDENA, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We offer our support and encouragement. How can we help you?

ALFRED FANTI.

SEBASTOPOL, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your Vietnam position and repudiate Rusk's.

ELMER P. DELANEY.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

You have our unqualified support of your courageous and forthright stand on the Vietnam war.

Mrs. ELIZABETH E. JONES,
Mrs. FREDERICK ELLIS,
Dr. FREDERICK E. ELLIS.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Revere your efforts to return sanity to high places.

FREDERICK SMITH.

ARLINGTON, VA.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

It is high time for people who back your position on Vietnam to let you know that they do. I count my wife and me among them.

THOMAS W. APPICH.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We commend and support you for your courageous peace efforts. We urge you to continue.

Mr. and Mrs. I. SHARROW.

WHITING, IND.,
January 29, 1966.

WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Endorse completely Vietnam stand. More war is not the answer. Don't give up.

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT W. SIEVERS.

FRESNO, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

SENATOR MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Demand executive orders be rescinded and stupid war in Vietnam brought to a close.

ROBERT R. HART.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your stand for nonresumption of bombing implementing Geneva Agreement.

Mr. and Mrs. A. LOZIER.

MONTE VISTA, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Commend your stand to rescind southeast Asia resolution will urge our Senators support you.

ADRIAN and MARY RAMUS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your effort toward peace in Vietnam. Please continue your efforts.

JERRY and BEVERLY DANIEL.

COLUMBIA, MO.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support appeal to prolong North Vietnam bombing lull. Urge continue your efforts.

DAVID WURFEL,
PAUL WALLACE,
RICHARD DOHM,
ARTHUR KALLEBERG,
DAVID LEUTHOLD,
Political Science Department, Missouri University.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud and support your courageous efforts to resist the President's disastrous military solution to Vietnam's political and social problems. We feel present policy doesn't reflect a true consensus and will serve to provoke war with China.

VETERANS AND RESERVISTS TO END THE WAR IN VIETNAM.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Earnestly support intended Monday action to limit executive authority for war without congressional consent.

I. H. POLLACK.

WHEATLAND, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We endorse your effort to rescind the congressional resolution approved on August 10, 1964, Public Law 88-408. We are counting on you to limit the powers of the President in regard to the Vietnam war.

IRENE CREPS,
Mrs. ENA DELCO CREPS,
THERESE PORCELLA.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your opposition Vietnam involvement. Please continue your efforts in behalf of peace.

ESTHER WURM.

STAMFORD, CONN.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your efforts for peace and agree that the legality of our undeclared war against North Vietnam should be questioned.

MORRIS and VERA SCHUPACK.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I strongly support your statement today relegating the power of declaring war to the people of the United States. Please hold fast.

DANIEL GOLDEN.

---

70 PD. INTL., CD FIRENZE,
January 29, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.:

I sent President Johnson this message. Don't let shelling start again. It is terrible almost apocalitch mistake. His misfortune that would fault like cyclone also on American people. Accomplish this Christian did of religion historich and political hope.

God will give you also historich and political reward. Hold on. Peace may not be so far.

Apocalitch did.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate, Washington, D.C.:

We commend you on the stand you have taken on Vietnam.

JEAN AND GEORGE USATCH.

GLENDALE, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you. Beg you to stand firm to help all from destruction.

Respectfully,

MRS. DOROTHY REID.

WESTPORT, CONN.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington D.C.:

(Please see that copies are made for Senator G. AIKEN, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Senator A. GORE, Senator M. MANSFIELD, Senator W. MORSE, Senator THOMAS DODD, Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Senator JACOB JAVITS, and Senator ROBERT KENNEDY.)

Support your and other Senators' efforts to continue pause in bombing North Vietnam with aim to obtain ceasefire in Vietnam.

Lillian Berkowitz, Jean Berman, Emma Lou Bi Tham, Helen Bonime, Clarence Broadnax, Beulah W. Burhoe, B. D. Burhoe, Phyllis Cady, Georgia Cassimatis, Clarabelle Chankaya, Ida Davidoff, Anna Lee Dayton, Maurisette Dembitzer, Frieda Easton, Murray Fox, Anne Gladstone, Dorothy Golof, Susanne Gordon, Gordon Hall, Doris Hallowitz, Cynthia Harrison, Mary Hennessey, Dorothy Hermann, Helen Hubbell, Dorothy Isenman, Molly Jacobson, Rose Jarmak, Edward Jarvis, Helen Jennings, Katherine Jones, Joan Kahn, Anne Marie Kearney, Clara Michael, Lillian Moore, Rhoda Moss, Esther Nothnagle, Jan Park, Helen Varsons, Lottie Perutz, Katherine Phelps, Ann Rappaport, Angela Reitzer, Margaret Reynolds, Sherwin Rosenstein, Frank Sales, Shirley Sarkin, Marriet Schneider, Gertrude Schuchard, Elizabeth Sharnik, Ruby Shaw, Eleanor Sheldon, Phyllis Singerman, John Sommer, Clarence Taylor, Beatrice Vogler, Helen Welch, Social Workers in Fairfield County.

NORTHRIDGE, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue your efforts against escalation. Regain the rights of Congress.

Mr. and Mrs. S. H. MANN.

SEBASTOPOL, CALIF.
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please support Senator FULBRIGHT's position favoring immediate negotiations in Vietnam.

Rev. and Mrs. LEWIS WHITEHEAD.

SEBASTOPOL, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Suddenly a ray of hope has come with Senator FULBRIGHT's statement on Vietnam. Please support.

GARY FOSTER.

KEW GARDENS, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations with your position on Vietnam.

WILLIAM OLTMANS,
Dutch Journalist.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I commend your opposition to bombing Vietnam and urge continued efforts toward negotiating.

ELIZABETH HELFRICK.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly protest the resumption of bombing in Vietnam especially with napalm.

GEORGE WM. MARTIN.

MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

You have my support and blessings in attacking this heinous war in Vietnam, God speed.

DR. BERNICE BAUMMAN.

BOSTON, MASS.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Millions know Pentagon prevaricated August 2, 1964, Tonkin. See Time magazine following United States attack PT's.

MRS. RITA FRELICH.

ELKINS PARK, PA.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support you 100 percent in your courageous stand on Severeid program and in Congress. You are truly a sane voice crying in a wilderness of irrationality.

ADELE KLEIN.

CASPER, WYO.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Applaud and endorse your proposed resolution urging Vietnam debate.

MARIAN M. NILSON.

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Watched the program. You were marvelous. I'm a Missouri Republican, but I vote for your ideas. Keep up your thoughts regarding Vietnam.

HOYT NELSON.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Your courageous stand on Vietnam as enunciated on Severeid's program admirable. Situation alarms us.

Mr. and Mrs. FRED BERGMAN.

MARTINEZ, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I applaud your advocacy of debate of our Vietnam involvement.

VIRGIL BOGARTH.

DENVER, COLO.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo Senator MORSE. I support your Vietnam views wholeheartedly as does the conscience of the American people. Curtail L.B.J. Fire Rusk and McNamara and end this mess by direct negotiations with the National Liberation Front.

WILLIAM HANNAH.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Am with you 100 percent on views expressed today on CBS. Feel free to advise Senators KUCHEL and MURPHY I have said this.

VOLNEY F. MORIN.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your position on Vietnam. Please continue in your determination to have the American people presented with the true facts. God speed you.

Mr. and Mrs. LEONARD PERLMAN.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We saw you on CBS. We support your stand.

Mr. and Mrs. JAMES L. COPP.

ROCKAWAY BEACH, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud your stand in reference to Vietnam. Your views on TV program were superb; as parents we appreciate.

The SUTTINS.

CHICAGO, ILL.
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington D.C.:

With all our heart and mind endorse your position and are grateful for your efforts in behalf of all that is decent and humane.

Dr. and Mrs. AARON LEARNER.

MEMPHIS, TENN.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington D.C.:

Thanks.

Mrs. RUBY HASSELL.

SOUTH BEND, IND.
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR: I heartily agree with your reasoning concerning Vietnam. Keep urging U.N. settlement.

PAUL WEDDLE.

PITTSBURGH, PA.
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I endorse your comments on CBS panel this date. May you continue saying them.

Dr. SAMUEL HAZO,
Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Agree with you on solution of Vietnam. Keep up good work.

Mr. and Mrs. EUGENE SPONAGLE.

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We approve of your courageous stand on Vietnam TV today.

The L. W. DENEVANS.

KALAMAZOO, MICH.,
January 30, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations for courageously speaking up.

DEAN COPPING.

WEBSTER GROVES, MO.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God for your views, keep plugging for our American boys.

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM A. THAU.

EVANSVILLE, IND.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Continue good fight for Vietnam peace negotiations.

ROBERT FENNEMAN.

KNOXVILLE, TENN.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We agree 100 percent with your position on the Vietnam situation.

KATHERINE AND DON VAN VLEET.

MOORESTOWN, N.J.,
January 30, 1966

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your position on Vietnam. I am your distant cousin. Heart surgeon in Philadelphia.

DRYDEN MORSE, M.D.

HAVERFORD, PA.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Entirely behind your views, please keep trying.

GERTRUDE L. ROBGINS,
Mrs. Edward Robgins.

PHOENIX, ARIZ.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support Vietnam stand. Public must have full-scale debate, learn facts now being withheld.

Mr. and Mrs. M. R. HAGERTY.

FERNDALE, MICH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your stand on Vietnam.

ANDRE PENNELL,
Clerk of Detroit Friends Meeting.

BALTIMORE, MD.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I urged you in 1964 to run for nomination for Presidency. Again I say please, please, please, announce now your candidacy for Democratic nomination for President at next election, start campaigning all over country to give people facts, not lying generalities and banalities concerning Vietnam war.

M. C. PINCOFFS, Jr.

BOSTON, MASS.,
January 30, 1966

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Republican mothers draft-age son sends unlimited congratulations. Demand return congressional rights. See STENNIS telegram.

Mrs. KATHRYN R. GRANT.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your courageous Vietnam stand especially letting the people have the truth. Suggest you introduce bill requiring all taxpayers to send in 10 percent more tax April 15 to pay current cost of Vietnam war. This would slow inflation and might even halt the war.

HARRY A. BARTH.

LA MESA, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We have agreed with you on Vietnam. From the first we heard you on radio today. We were proud of you. We are Democrats. Worked hard in Johnson's campaign. If the Senate allows this war to be escalated, we will deserve what we get.

Mr. and Mrs. GILBERT CARLSON.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We are in fullest agreement with your policies regarding Vietnam and hope you can induce the administration to clarify all the issues pertaining thereto.

ROBERT AND RITA ROBILLARD.

STAMFORD, CONN.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please accept our wholehearted support of your positions re Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT STEMBER.

WEYMOUTH, MASS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Agree wholeheartedly with your position as stated on "Today" program, keep talking.

ROBERT T. MCKENZIE.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations, Senator MORSE, on Vietnam stand. We're not in favor of the undeclared and illegal war. Hope your censorship of President will be successful. We're not in favor of war or draft in any sense. Your actions and deeds in our thoughts and prayers. Keep it up.

GAIL and BILL NEWHALL.

NASHVILLE, TENN.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God for leaders like you. If you keep speaking we may be saved yet.

Mrs. THOMAS FRIST.

SOUTHFIELD, MICH.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Heard and watched Vietnam perspective. Congratulations. Continue our support.

NEL and VILOET TUCKER.

SHELBURNE, VT.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We commend your support of halt in Vietnam bombing and negotiations with all parties concerned.

PIERSON and ALICE OSTROW.

SCARBOROUGH, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bless you, thank you, imaginative, sustained efforts peace Vietnam.

LESLIE and ALICE BALASSA.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of the National Board, YWCA, I urge your support for a policy of continued patience and conciliation in the Vietnam situation. We have the deepest sympathy with the President in his heavy burden of crucial decision and are profoundly anxious that he should be fortified and encouraged to the utmost by realizing

the great public support behind his efforts to avoid escalation and keep the spirit of negotiation even when these efforts appear to elicit no response as yet.

MRS. LLOYD MARTI,
President, National Board, YWCA.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Following is copy of telegram sent to President Lyndon B. Johnson, White House, Washington, D.C.: "Bombing resumption of North Vietnam will inevitably shatter chances of peace. War with China will draw in Soviet Russia on the side of China. We urge that you accept the counseling of Senators FULBRIGHT, CLARK, MANSFIELD, and others who are dedicated to the preservation of world peace."

JOHN WEILBURG,
JOHN F. RYAN,
LINDA F. BASCOMBE,
PATRICK FLANAGAN,
IRVING BEREZIN,
DOROTHY BEREZIN,
DOROTHY STULL WEILBURG.

DEERFIELD, ILL.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate your opposition to war as an accepted instrument of national policy.

JACK CROOK.

ALBANY, N.Y.,
January 28, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Please press for continuation of bombing pause.

MRS. ROBERT LAMAR.

ROCKVILLE CENTRE, N.Y.,
January 28, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

For God's sake and the world's do not resume the bombing. Deescalate. Recognize the NLF. Stand up for humanity and against Senator STENNIS and the Pentagon.

M. CLYDE,
Miss LORA,
MRS. F. FRIEDMAN.

CUMMINGTON, MASS.,
January 28, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Urgent refer Vietnam peace issue to United Nations. Continue demand clarification administration policy. Bless you.

REV. DAVID ROSE.

GAINESVILLE, FLA.,
January 28, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate *Office Building,*
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your protest against U.S. policy in Vietnam. The glaringly faulty official estimates of the situation since 1964 demand a revision of our whole Asia policy.

Mr. and Mrs. GEORGE G. FOX.

LAFAYETTE, IND.,
January 28, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Assure you our support urging continued bombing suspension North Vietnam. Your leadership appreciated.

HARVEY BATY.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 28, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks for questioning Rusk. Sincerely hope you can halt the snowball.

MAR AND ELIZABETH WHITCOMBE.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate *Office Building,*
Washington, D.C.:

Prevent world war III. Continue to challenge basic assumptions of our foreign policy. Indispensable that bombing not resumed and N.L.F. be considered main party in negotiations.

Mr. and Mrs. S. ROSENBLUM.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *January 29, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

You have our utmost admiration in respect for your courageous stand on our undeclared war in Vietnam. We could only wish that you were our Senator. We think in the end, history will be grateful for men like you. We sincerely hope that you can keep reason alive and most desperately hope that your views prevail. We must negotiate with those whom we fight, the NLF. You have our support, what little it is, in your efforts. We do not belong in Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. ALLEN KOENIGSBERG.

PASADENA, CALIF., *January 30, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please reply collect would it be effective if we the people all loyal law abiding Americans organized a doorbell-ringing census, block by block, polling voters regarding Vietnam and sending results to Washington. We do not believe that past polls represent present thinking of American voters.

JUNE MARSH,
PEGGY BLACK AND COMMITTEE.

SEATTLE, WASH., *January 30, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

You are courageous. We admire, and support you in your attempt to force a test vote on the President's authority to wage illegal war.

Mr. and Mrs. H. K. LARSON.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *January 30, 1966.*

Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your honest, wise, courageous stand against administration's dangerous course in Vietnam. Urge you to oppose further American involvement in southeast Asia and to work for withdrawal of our forces as first step toward peace.

DR. ALBERT PARETS.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *January 30, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wholeheartedly support your efforts to gain full and open debate on the Vietnam situation.

HAROLD BECKER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We strongly support your efforts to stop the illegal war in Vietnam. More people are with you than you might think, and the number is increasing daily. Please continue the fight.

CHARLES SOPHIE.
RICHARD ELLEN.
KENNETH AND ALLAN WALD.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Be assured of my support and that of millions of Americans in your efforts to end brutal Vietnam war.

Bless you.

BERNARD GERSTEN.

WILTON, CONN.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support you wholeheartedly in your effort to rescind the broad powers given Johnson in 1964, in the conduct of the Vietnam war.

Dr. and Mrs. CARL MILLER.

DENVER, COLO.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Agreeing with Mansfield report that failure of negotiations probably means general Asian war, we favor both Morse resolutions for Senate to investigate Vietnam policies and terminate President's war-waging authority so that Congress maintains right to declare war or seek peace.

Dr. and Mrs. JOHN C. COBB.
Dr. and Mrs. STANLEY COBB.
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your policy on Vietnam.

God bless you.

Mr. and Mrs. J. A. DOMKE.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We strongly support resolution limiting President's powers re military action. Work for peace through U.N.

Mr. and Mrs. MANUEL GELLESS.

PHOENIX, ARIZ.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I admire your courage and intelligence in advocating the rescinding of that misbegotten mandate.

MRS. RUTH YEAGER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Hundreds of members, friends, relatives congratulate you for your courage, wisdom, humanitarism in opposing escalation of Vietnam war.

WOMEN'S COMMUNITY FORUM.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your position on Vietnam. Grateful for your voice of sanity.

Mr. and Mrs. E. SHINE.

SEBASTOPOL, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I ask you to support Senator FULBRIGHT's challenge of Vietnam policy.

Mrs. A. L. COLEMAN.

MOBILE, ALA.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I am for WAYNE MORSE's policy in dealing Vietnam.

MRS. RALPH C. STANARD.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your remarks on television today are sound, responsible, and courageous. Please continue your struggle against a dreadful war in Asia. Please teach your colleagues what revolutions are all about.

MARTIN,
Harvard University faculty.

YONKERS, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We strongly support your stand for peace in Vietnam.

IRVING and HANNAH SCHWARTZ.

WYNNEWOOD, PA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Your views over the air today meets our 100 percent unqualified approval. God bless you in your efforts.

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN H. STUTT.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your position against the immoral, illegal, and unconstitutional Asian war.

JOHN ONG.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As an American I congratulate you on your extraordinary courage on CBS today.

Mr. and Mrs. WALTER B. BAKER.

MIAMI, FLA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I am in complete agreement with your views.

BILL BARTISH.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

Concur completely inquiry presidential war powers and Asian policies. Advocate U.N. arbitration.

JENTE DANIEL.

POUGHKEEPSIE, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

Complete agreement remarks on "CBS Reports" deepest appreciation an American family.

Mr. and Mrs. JAMES A. BURNS.

MADISON, WIS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

Congratulations on your courage, honesty, and intelligence, keep it up.

VIRGINIA CRONICK.

PLACENTIA, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

In full support of your resolution on Vietnam, best of luck.

R. T. HUNTER.

BOSTON MASS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you Senator for your stand on Vietnam. I agree with you 100 percent. Let us have an open debate in the Senate and Congress and all over the country, not for 10 hours, but for 10 weeks. Let us also let the U.N. handle it.

AARON SHPIEGELMAN.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You are not alone in your courageous fight for peace.

W. SALTZMAN.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

You are a credit to our Nation.

TOM and BETTY O'CONNOR.

NEW BRUNSWICK, N.J.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Heard television debate. Support your stand. Urgent people hear truth of our position.

TERENCE BUTLER.

WHITTIER, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

WAYNE MORSE, man of greatness, I salute you. Down with the war hawks. End this immoral war in Vietnam before catastrophe engulfs the world.

Mrs. BERTHA DERKOWITZ.

SHORTHILLS, N.J.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you take action regarding your statement and convictions on Vietnam, am appalled at path our Government is taking. I speak as a loyal American, a student of foreign policy, and a believer in the U.N. as a potential arbitrator.

MRS. WILLIAM CAVANAGH.

KALAMAZOO, MICH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

May you rank with Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, F.D.R., and J.F.K. and be nominated for Nobel Peace in 1966. Bless you, Senator, for perhaps guiding our country to the United Nations. Your television outspoken convictions regenerated our hope in America.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ROBERT ADAMS.

URBANA, ILL.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We applaud your courage and integrity and support your position on Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. MICHAEL LEWIS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I hope that you will persist in your efforts for peace in Vietnam. Thank you.

JOHN DUFFY.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As conservative Democrat horrified resumption bombing. My support to you and others seeing danger clearly.

Mrs. ARTHUR W. LANE.

CLAREMONT, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We support you in opposing further escalating war in Vietnam.

JESSE BEER.

BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MICH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Cannot praise you enough for your speech in regard to war declaration.

SUZANNAH HATT.

SEPULVEDA, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your courageous Vietnam position. Cease-fire pending United Nations mediation is only solution.

Mr. and Mrs. MARK LUSTICA.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIF.
January 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

One thousand Stanford students support your opposition. Keep up the good work, make information public.

Mr. and Mrs. DENNIS PIRAGES.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIF.
January 1, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR MORSE: We are most deeply ashamed of our country's action of the past 24 hours. As voting constituents of the State of Oregon we heartily endorse your criticisms of America's Vietnam policy and urge you to press for full and open debate on the Vietnam war in the U.S. Senate.

JAMES L. SWENSON,
GEOFFREY A. MOORE,
ARTHUR E. WILSON.

NUTLEY, N.J.
January 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your views Vietnam. Keep fighting for legality, morality, sanity, and the preservation of the species.

CONSTANCE BARTEL.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We strongly commend your recent proposed resolutions in opposition to existing administration policy on Vietnam. Congressional debate on this topic is essential now.

Mr. and Mrs. CHARLES W. STEELE.

LANSING, MICH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Resist America's abhorrent and cynical warring.

JAMES DUKARM.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I protest the resumption of bombing in Vietnam. Work for peace.

SHAREN NLTING.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We wholeheartedly support your efforts to curb Presidential power re Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. JAMES BRYANS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. Thank God for courageous men that I think and act like you for our country.

BURRIS GRIMWOOD.

BOSTON, MASS.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulate you on yesterday's broadcast. We are proud of your courageous leadership.

PENELOPE TURTON.
MARGARET WELCH.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Have wired Senators KUCHEL and MURPHY to support your stand. Rescind President's war power immediately.

MABEL M. ROCKWELL.

RIVER FALLS, WIS.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good fight on Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. L. FELDHAMMER.

IOWA CITY, IOWA,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I am and always have been a Republican. I have in the past disagreed with you on many of your domestic and foreign policies. However support wholeheartedly your viewpoints on Vietnam as presented on CBS this Sunday afternoon January 30.

Mrs. VIGGO M. JENSEN.

JACKSON, MISS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

The position you took nationwide television today took great personal courage. May I offer my grateful appreciation.

ROY BENKE.

FORT WORTH, TEX.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I agree with you 100 percent, good luck, keep up the good work.

B. E. HUFFMAN.

RICHMOND, VA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I can't help but express my boundless admiration for your stand on the Vietnamese war on Sunday's television program. The morality of your position, uniquely consistent in all your thinking, breaks through the fog of murky semantics. For me, you stand head and shoulders above all your contemporaries. For me, you walk with Isaiah.

Sincerely yours,

I. GORDON FELS.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Am completely in accord with your views regarding Vietnam as outlined by you in the Sunday's CBS panel discussion.

Mrs. EVELYN W. BOWEN.

SAN LORENZO, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Broad based bay area group prepared to call meeting in San Francisco to push for full and open congressional debate on Vietnam in support of your challenge and efforts of other Senators and Representatives. We could draw 15,000 to 20,000 with 2 weeks' notice, including the pro- and anti-war community and the many still undecided questions. Would such an electorate mandate for debate be pivotal? Could we get California Congressman and yourself or FULBRIGHT or MCGOVERN here for a Sunday meeting if we pay the bill? Can we reach you by phone for your answer today or tomorrow?

Dr. FRED GORDON.

SAUNDERSTOWN, R.I.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I applaud your strong statements to stop the war in Vietnam. You have gained the respect and gratitude of all peace-loving Americans for your intelligence and human integrity.

Mrs. SARAH KABAT.

BROOKLINE, MASS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

The opinions and proposals expressed by yourself on the "Congressional Debate" moderated by Eric Severeid on television this afternoon, were by far the most reasonable I have yet encountered on the Vietnam problem. I am in complete agreement with your position. However, I am not at all familiar with the "Mansfield report" from which you quoted. The report from your discussion seems most pertinent. I would therefore appreciate information as to where I might obtain a copy.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK S. ZIMNOCH.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please make every effort to work for peace in Vietnam. Thank you. Praying for you.

Mr. and Mrs. HAROLD COCHRANE.

PACIFIC PALISADES, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please stop this insane war in Vietnam let the United Nations settle everything, bring any Vietnamese who don't want to be Communist. We'll take one family in with us. I worked in an Army hospital, McGuire General in Richmond, Va., in World War II, we had amputees. I have four sons now ages 15, 13, 11, and 3 and I won't let them come home without arms and legs for the military group in this country who are taking over and idiots like Senator DIRKSEN. I have always been a Democrat but now I'll vote for anyone who will promise not to try and boss the whole world. President Johnson got in under false pretenses. Goldwater, at least, let us know he would have a war like this.

ROSEMARIE D. SCHALLERT.

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We commend you and support your position on war in Vietnam.

PETER BALLOU.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Mothers all over the United States support your stand on legality Vietnam war. Save our sons.

Mrs. ELLIOT WAX.

HERMOSA BEACH, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building.

SIR: You were magnificent on Eric Sevareid's program Sunday. Many Americans, I am sure, got the message. Don't give up. Take care of your health. Regards.

As ever,

Dr. and Mrs. IRWIN COLE.

CROTON ON HUDSON, N.Y.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your long courageous fight against war is beginning to yield results. Congratulations.

RICHARD O. and SOPHIA A. BOYER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations, firm Vietnam stand, hope success for full Senate investigation.

WILLIAM C. BOHN.

UNIVERSITY CITY, MO.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We offer you our firm support on your courageous stand with regard to Vietnam.

Prof. and Mrs. PAUL CHASSY.

FITCHBURG, MASS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I applaud your position on Vietnam and urge your continuance of it despite attack.

KENNETH WILSON.

STOCKTON SPRINGS, MAINE,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Listening CBS broadcast. With you 100 percent. Keep hollering.

MAYNARD and AIMEE MACEWEN.

VALLEY STREAM, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo. Keep up the fight.

Mr. and Mrs. NAT HARRIS.

HEWLETT, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We heartily agree with your position. Keep up the fight. Thank you.

Mr. and Mrs. IRVING PRESCHEL.

DETROIT, MICH.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Wholeheartedly with you. Take the question to the United Nations.

JOSEPH N. RICE.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Full support to you and FULBRIGHT against Johnson's illegal, ridiculous war.

MIKE RAUGH.

PRINCETON, N.J.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Endorse your Vietnam position, urge continuous forthright explanation to people as on today's TV.

Mr. and Mrs. MELVIN SCHULMAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We continue to applaud your courageous stand on Vietnam. You are not alone.

Mr. and Mrs. JULIAN BERCOVICI.

MOUNTAIN VIEW, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Time is right for responsible opposition to Vietnam escalation. Nation desperately needs more national leaders such as yourself to lead responsible defense to this illegal and immoral war. I support your position and urge continued active organization of responsible calls for peace.

RICHARD L. BISHOP.

EDMONTON, ALBERTA.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

As an American citizen I extend firm support for your opposition to Johnson's actions in Vietnam which go far beyond the limits of constitutional authority, international law, or civilized morality. Johnson's actions are degrading American prestige here in Canada.

Mrs. JO DURIE.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. We thank God there are still men like you. We thank you for being today's man without fear. With deep respect.

Mr. and Mrs. O. J. NORTON.

EUREKA, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. Your views expressed on Vietnam today were 100 percent in agreement with ours. You carried the show in spite of the stacked opposition. The opposition may be interested to know the people are not behind Johnson 100 percent. Keep up the good work.

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT TAUTFEST.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I heartily support your efforts to achieve peace in Vietnam.

CELIA WOLSKI.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your peace efforts.

SAUL NIEDORF, M.D.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We appreciate your forthright Vietnam stand. Please preserve. You have the support of most Americans.

PHIL ALMA and GARY PATTON.

MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo. Acknowledge with deep gratitude your peace efforts in best interests of our Nation.

Mr. and Mrs. A. WEISS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo. Your sensibility, integrity, and courage are the very things our country needs in these perilous times.

ROSE and WILLIAM COLAVITO.

SWARTHMORE, PA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support TV statement clarification of policy submission to U.N. recognition NLF continued bombing pause.

JOHN and JANE NEVIN.

LEAWOOD, KANS.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We wholeheartedly support your position on Vietnam and have so advised our Senators from Kansas today.

Mr. and Mrs. LEE BREKKE.

YONKERS, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We endorse every effort to bring about peace in Vietnam.

SAM and DIANE WIDMAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D.C.:

We endorse your policy completely and are thankful for a WAYNE MORSE in our Senate. Bravo for your courage and commitment.

SHIRLEY and IRVING MICHELMAN.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Your Senate service has been a long record of iconoclastic independence. I believe your efforts to restore the rule of law and control of reason to our course in Vietnam is the peak of your career, requiring sheer toughness and scarce courage.

PAUL LION.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As a citizen I agree with you for reasons not political, but humanitarian, believe in practicality and life.

MARGARET MCGREGOR.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Am in favor of limiting President's power in Vietnam.

Dr. and Mrs. CHARLES CRIST.

LAKE SUCCESS, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

My family and I thank you for trying to secure peace.

HAROLD M. SUSS.

DETROIT, MICH.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud your position as stated on TV. You clarified in our minds the peculiarity of the Vietnam situation. What secret papers are you talking about? We are thankful that you are in Washington fighting our battle for commonsense and peace.

Dr. and Mrs. MORTON BARNET.

DALLAS, TEXAS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Over the years your courageous, often solitary stand in the Senate has been supported by millions of your constituents. Today, we, in Texas wish you to know that you are respected and admired more than ever.

Thank you for speaking the thoughts of silent Americans who are often misrepresented and seldom understood. Your courage has further renewed our hopes for the reclamation of man who, by his very origin, is disposed to peace and good will.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. GARDNER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue strong efforts, peaceful settlement Vietnam. Our faith and prayers are with you.

Mrs. WALTER E. LITTEN.

KALAMAZOO, MICH.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are in complete accord with your views in the Vietnam debate expressed today.

Mr. and Mr. W. T. TUBERTY.

CHAPEL HILL, N.C.,
January 31, 1966.

U.S. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

God bless you. Have just heard the TV debate and your fine presentation.

I have traveled and lectured in Asia and I know you are so right. Hundreds of millions of people in the world deplore our country's cynical disregard of the United Nations and our military policy in Vietnam. More power to you.

PAUL GREEN.

DETROIT, MICH.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I am a strong Republican but my greatest respect and admiration I pay to you for stand on the war in Vietnam. Regardless of party we should have more Senators like you.

Sincerely,

HARRY MCFATHRIDGE.

MIAMI, FLA.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The following telegram was sent to Senators GEORGE SMATHERS, SPESSARD HOLLAND, and Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER. I strongly urge you as my representative to give Senator WAYNE MORSE your full support and cooperation in bringing the Vietnam war before the U.N. Security Council.

BARBARA DIAMOND.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Congress and the war, atta boy, keep it up and cheers for the voters of Oregon.

KATHERINE MOONEY.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your position re Vietnam. Am advising President and others.

DAVID G. FUNK.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge an immediate and peaceful settlement of the conflict in Vietnam.

LARRY and DIANE LITTEN.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Fully support your position Vietnam. Urge joining with other Senators for maximum pressure on President to prevent bombing resumption and instead seeking disengagement through referral Security Council United Nations.

SAUL A. LIVINE.

GLYNDON, MD.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good work about Vietnam.

S. J. EBELING.

HARTFORD, CONN.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Emphatically behind your position. Congratulations Vietnam perspective. Await information as to procedure. Thank you.

JOSEPH TREGGOR.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks for your excellent presentation on the debate Sunday. Continue your fight for arbitration by the U.N. Save the lives of youth. No war. We are with you. Persevere.

RUTH M. HARRIS.

COSCOB, CONN.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Grateful for your leadership on policy in Vietnam. Completely support your position.

RALPH and JOSEPHINE POMERANCE.

BLOOMFIELD, CONN.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Senator, we wish to express our full support in your responsible and worthy effort to return this administration authority to the limits of reason.

Dr. and Mrs. JOHN H. FELBER.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for voicing so eloquently your opinion on the CBS television program.

EDNA and CARLA SNYDER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I fully endorse and support your position on the Vietnam crisis. The Senate has responsibility in time of serious decision. We are not yet a dictatorship.

MARGARET ST. AUBYN.

OAKLAND CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Commend your courage in denunciation of correct position on CBS Vietnam special.

JOE FEIT.

CHICO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We agree on illegality of Vietnam war and urge full congressional debate.

Mr. and Mrs. LEE A. STUKEY.

MALIBU, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Deeply admire your courageous stand. The world has never needed patience and reason more.

CAROL POTTENGER FRY, M.D.

WHITE PLAINS, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your position on Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. C. A. TUDBURY.

FLUSHING, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Senator MORSE: We young people offer thanks for wonderful statement. We have fought against war. It is good to know there are so many sane voices in adult community.

JUDITH, DAVID, and ESTHER TEICH.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo for your frank words and determined stand for peace. Keep it up.

ELIAS CRITCHLOW.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your brave battle and admire your courage.

MARIANNE SMITH.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily approve your present actions in bringing resolution to Senate for debate. Deeply grateful for facts as presented on TV today. Urge that you continue as spokesman for American people are demanding President Johnson take Vietnam issue to U.N.

Mr. and Mrs. MEYER EISENBERG.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 31, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We commend your present stand. Please do all possible to stop bombing resumption.

SUZANNE WERNER,
JUDITH GARTUND.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your move to stop the illegal war.

ELMER BENDINER.

ARCADIA, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am ex-World War II veteran and I am 100 percent on your stand of Vietnam.

BILL ROWE.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your courageous stand on Vietnam is heartening to all Americans who want a just peace. Stand firm.

ESTHER S. KECHLEY.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for an articulate, informative, and courageous stand in the face of an incoherent and uninformed opposition.

JILL REINLIEB.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Good luck with your bird hunting. And may your efforts cause the hawks to take flight.

JOHN HIGGINS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I applaud your stand on TV Sunday p.m. against escalating the war in Vietnam. Second your proposal to withdraw blanket approval to Johnson to conduct undeclared war. Urge you to support Pope Paul's suggestion for neutral arbitration by the United Nations.

JACOB C. LESSINGER.

LONG BEACH CALIF.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We salute your courage and forthrightness in opposing so firmly the unlimited powers of the President to accelerate the war in Vietnam when we could be acting through the United Nations to maintain the peace. Your bold and direct language and your fierce fight to bring the whole truth of our situation before the American public without deception and without flattery. So that we might take full responsibility for our Nations policies in chewing aggression instead of excusing it does you credit as a brave critic.

AUBREY B. HARTER.

STANFORD, CALIF.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strong support here for your stand on Vietnam; urge speedy investigation of U.S. policy.

MARY and THOMAS C. MOSER.

HOUSTON, TEX.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Completely in agreement with your Vietnam policies. Keep up the good work. God bless you.

Mrs. KEITH F. ALEXANDER.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You have kinship with mankind. Support you all the way.

JOHN RAGSDALE.

WINTER PARK, FLA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your stand on Vietnam war on Sunday TV. You changed some votes.

PAUL SANGREE.

EVANSTON, ILL.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Support appeal to United Nations Security Council. North Vietnam attacks will probably strengthen Communist cause.

CARL KEITH.

URBANA, ILL.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I give you my support on your stand of the U.S. role in the Asian war.

MARY JANE SNYDER.

BOSTON, MASS.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your stand on Vietnam policy.

RICHARD L. MARTIN.

NOVATO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations and thank you for forcefull clear antiwar stand.

A. V. BRERETON.

DETROIT, MICH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your excellent broadcast yesterday. Stick to your guns. Let's get it to the United Nations. MORSE for President. Regards.

R. W. CAVELL.

HARTFORD, CONN.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Affairs Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily support your current efforts to open congressional debate on Vietnam policy.

JAMES W. GARDNER.

PROVIDENCE, R.I.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the fight.

The SPIEGEL FAMILY.

HOUSTON, TEX.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Completely in agreement with your Vietnam policies. Keep up the good work. God bless you.

Mrs. ALFRED BOELSCHE.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support and commend you on your position on Vietnam.

ETHEL DORFMAN.

MEREFORD, TEX.,
January 31, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You have my respect and admiration for your stand on issues concerning Vietnam war. Don't let Mr. Boggs snow you with around-the-bush talk. United Nations is the answer.

GEORGE MASSO.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up your good fight on Vietnam. Millions of us are behind you.

JOHN M. THEA LOGAN.

SHEBOYGAN, WIS.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your Vietnamese position all the way.

SOL BENSMAN.

ATLANTA, GA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations excellent television appearance. We support your resolutions. Must stop bombing.

JON JACOBS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Commend introduction resolution rescinding powers of President to make illegal war, support you for peace.

EDWARD GOODLAW.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good work, we need more like you to make people think.

CORA L. STEFFES.

GLENCOE, ILL.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your stand against bombing Hanoi and further escalation.

Mr. and Mrs. MARVIN MANDEL.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We respectfully suggest that you vote to revoke the Presidential mandate on Vietnam.

DR. and Mrs. GUSTAV MARTIN.

SANTA FE, N. MEX.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

My deep appreciation to your excellent presentation for peace on special Vietnam program yesterday.

Mrs. CARL JENSEN.

PORT WASHINGTON, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the fight to persuade those Senators to sign your resolution curtailing the President's war powers. We citizens are 100 percent back of you. That $12 billion supplemental appropriation for Vietnam must not go through.

ESTHER CREED.

RIDGEWOOD, N.J.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate House, Washington, D.C.:

Support your views on Vietnam wholeheartedly. Please continue your fight.

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT G. FLEURIOT.

COLLEGEVILLE, PA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Fight like ----. We're with you. Filibuster if need be.

ALLAN RICE.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Executive war illegal. Urge Senate take stand. Rescind Asia resolution. Stop bombing.

Prof. KEITH and ELIZABETH BOYLE.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your courageous TV appearance, agree with you 100 percent, keep up good fight.

ALLAN BLACK.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Support fully your resolutions to rescind 1964 congressional approval Presidential action Vietnam and complete investigation all aspects U.S. policies Vietnam. Will advise my congressional representatives accordingly and urge submission of problem to U.N.

HERBERT WEISBERG, M.D.
CAROLINE HUBER.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Issue a call, we will answer, 500 students faculty, local citizens lead us.

STANFORD COMMITTEE FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM.

NEW YORK., N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Horror and shame, President's resumption bombing. Urge you continue fight against the new Hitlers.

WILLIAM and MARY GANDALL.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God for you, the only voice protesting the war.

POWELL FAMILY.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your presentation on CBS was reasonable and persuasive, we urge you to continue your campaign to inform the American people of the facts of our involvement in Vietnam.

P.S.—We particularly support your effort to involve the United Nations.

FRED and RUTH HOEHLER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We approve your resolution to rescind the blank check given the executive branch on Vietnam. It has been grossly and stupidly misused and should be, as your second resolution demands, thoroughly investigated and exposed. We, too, would like to know how every Member of the Senate stands. Best wishes.

Mr. and Mrs. PHILIP NEWILL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your heroic efforts urging for solution ending war in Vietnam, urge you continue.

Mr. and Mrs. RIVING LERNER.

UNION CITY, N.J.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Total in agreement your desires re Johnson's illegal war. Fire office boys Rusk and McNamara. My letter Armistice Day 1965 to Johnson via Mrs. Johnson and ridiculously answered by Fenilist Greenfield, State Department Assistant, in direct contrariness of my ardent views, copy of which I will furnish upon request, strictly advocates to stop this Mongolian holocaust before it is too late. Mongolians are not Caucasians. Johnson great disappointment to me, just another Truman.

Sincerely,

Mrs. HELENE ROOT.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations for your courage and greatness on Sunday TV.

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM BECIC.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily endorse your views on Vietnam. Keep up the good work.

L. ABRAMS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations, your marvelous, on criticisms of Vietnamese insanity.

MARGURITE YOUNG.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud your stand on Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. E. HARRITON.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

With your continued zeal peace-loving desires of our people will not bog down.

JOHN ABRAMS.

BROOKLYN, N.Y., *January 31, 1966.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the fight we must stop this war.

Mrs. BETTY F. GOLDBLOOM.

ROCHESTER, N.Y., *January 30, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We strongly support and congratulate you for your stand against resumption of bombing of North Vietnam and for a full debate on the issue.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,
Liberal Party of Monroe County.

BROOKLYN, N.Y., *January 30, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Endorse every word by Senator MORSE on Vietnam perspective, January 30, 1966.

McKINLEY WHEELER.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *January 31, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You were heroic, magnificent on CBS. Keep fighting for peace and sanity.

ROBERT and JOAN HOLT.

FLUSHING, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations for your admirable and courageous stand re terminating Vietnam war and for turning matter over to the United Nations.

MAXWELL J. MARDER, M.D.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the fight. We must stop this war.

Mrs. BETTY F. GOLDBLOOM.

ALDERWOOD MANOR, WASH.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God for your voice of truth on Vietnam. I pray that it shall be heard before it is too late.

DALE NOFZIGER.

SKOKIE, ILL.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Again today you spoke for reason, prudence, peace, national morality, and international law. Heartfelt gratitude.

Dr. DAVID B. BARRON.

WELLESLEY HILLS, MASS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly oppose resumption of bombing and escalation in Vietnam.

Mrs. STEWART A. ARMSTRONG.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We strongly support your call for thorough investigation of our Government's objectives and policies in Vietnam and we oppose resumption of bombing in North.

HELEN and EDWARD COLBY.

BELMONT, MASS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Have just heard congressional debate on Vietnam on CBS Television. Wish to express 100-percent endorsement for position of Senator WAYNE MORSE. We are conservative Republicans who voted for Goldwater.

Mr. and Mrs. MARC G. WOLMAN.

HOUSTON, TEX.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Your public pursuit of truth and law applauded. How can we secure Mansfield report?

Mr. and Mrs. BRYAN OGBURN.

MILL VALLEY, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Our support to you and Senator FULBRIGHT for your Vietnam policy.

Dr. and Mrs. KURT SCHLESINGER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Americans owe you eternal gratitude continue your efforts for peace. Many support your view.

Mr. and Mrs. VICTOR LUDWIG.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations—your present struggle to help restore sanity and commonsense to our foreign policy with regard to Vietnam and elsewhere is typical of your boundless courage. Your long unbroken Washington record of vigorously fighting for justice, integrity, honesty, compassion, morality, and ethics in domestic and international affairs has long been greatly admired by both of us. Please accept our humble thank you and appreciation.

Mr. and Mrs. K. C. HOAGLUND.

HARRISBURG, PA.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

To those of us who share your views and fears regarding the Vietnam situation, it's most heartening to hear you on Eric Sevareid's program on Sunday afternoon. Thank you and congratulations for your highly articulate and sane presentation.

Mrs. HENRY M. MILLER.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Our most sincere congratulations on your courageous effort to limit the President's authorization on the war in Vietnam and institute a Federal investigation of the U.S. role in that country.

ED J. DREIS, *President,*
Congregation All Souls
Unitarian Church.

FRAMINGHAM, MASS.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your CBS discussion. Yours is still a minority position but the questions you have raised hopefully will lead more people to rethink the problem.

Mr. and Mrs. EDWARD F. LINCOLN.

EVANSTON, ILL.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your position and efforts to end the tragedy in Vietnam. Thank you.

PERRY and EVELY WINOKUR.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Continue heroic Vietnam struggle for sake of America history. Will condone. Can I help?

ERROR COWAN.

FORT WORTH, TEX.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your discussion on the TV program Sunday was the only part of the discussion that made sense. I am with you 100 percent.

Mrs. X. R. WALLACE.

ELKHART, IND.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We agree with views expressed on today's TV panel show. We sincerely hope your advice will be heeded.

EDNA and PAUL WILMOT.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Wish to congratulate you and to express great admiration for your honesty, wisdom, and courage.

MARY HENDERSON.

KEZAR FALLS, MAINE,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for so eloquently and articulately expressing our sentiments concerning Vietnam. Please continue your efforts with Senator FULBRIGHT for peace.

Mr. and Mrs. R. GIOVANELLA.
Mr. and Mrs. H. CHAIKLIN.
Miss LOUIS GIOVANELLA.
Mrs. K. RAFFY.

LARCHMONT, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Applaud your heroic fight for end to Vietnam war.

Prof. and Mrs. PAUL DAVIDOFF.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on Senate speech. Keep up opposition to hawks, autocrats.

Thank you, thank you.

JOE PALMER.

FLUSHING, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Senator MORSE, on your heroic television statement you have our full support. Please continue your efforts for peace.

SELMA and MICTOR TIECH.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the great work on your stand against bombing of Vietnam.

DORIS HERRON.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. Your forthright elucidation on today's television conference was great.

DONALD and MARY JANE RACKNER.

SHERMAN OAKS, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We gratefully strongly support Vietnam position you clearly responsibly expressed on CBS Sunday P.M.

BOB and ESTHER MITCHELL.

EAST WILLISTON, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate of Chamber Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulate you on your courage on today's TV program. We agree with your opinions and program and have wired President, our Senators, and Congressmen.

Mr. and Mrs. ROSS BUCHALTER.

NEWPORT, R.I.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for what you said on television this afternoon. You made great sense. Please keep the pressure on.

Gratefully yours,
Mr. and Mrs. JAMES G. VERMILLION.

CAMPBELL, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

God bless you. Keep up the good work.

Mrs. EARL RICE.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily endorse your stand on our Vietnam policy.

Mr. and Mrs. S. DOROFF.

MAPLEWOOD, N.J.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for the good fight to save humanity from a terrible fate.

Mr. and Mrs. MILTON SCHACHTER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for bringing Vietnam issue forcibly before the people. We all want peace.

Mrs. CATHERINE LESTER.

RAPID CITY, S. DAK.,
January 31, 1966.

U.S. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Commend highly your argument over network opposing U.S. policy in Vietnam. Continue your fearless fight for the sake of America and the world. The people must know the truth. Soon it could be too late. Don't let opposition silence you (WAYNE MORSE knows his rights). I salute you.

Mrs. GRACE KTOFT.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Fully support your resolutions to retrieve congressional authority and responsibility from Johnson and the Pentagon.

KENNETH H. and RUTH R. GLASGOW.

CULVER CITY, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We commend your courageous efforts against war in Vietnam. Urge U.N. action.

NORMAN BAILOW AND FAMILY.

SHERMAN OAKS, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Approve action to rescind President's Vietnam war mandate and support peace efforts through U.N.

ELEANOR and ROBERT SCHMORLEITZ.

DENVER, COLO.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

After World War I Germany was, according to the Versailles Treaty, to be policed to prevent rearming for 20 years by the United States, France, and England and was forbidden submarines forever but $90 million per year. The U.S. Army policed Germany and prevented them from rearming from 1918 until 1924, the French Rothchilds from 1924 until 1928 did the same. The English Rothschilds paradoxically instead of preventing Germany rearming rearmed Hitler to fight Communistic Russia and in 1933 in violation of the Versailles Treaty gave Hitler the right to build 10 submarines which grew to 400 and they would have in World War II, as in World War I, have starved England if the United States had not entered World War II that the English Rothschilds started by not policing Germany and preventing their rearming from 1928 until 1932. After France pulled out of Germany the Rothschild Industries of France and England are now selling munitions to Hanoi and our troops are a proving ground for the developing of deadly Russian weapons. According to trade journals L.B.J. has used up the stockpile of World War II 1,000-pound bombs and to tool up to make them again would cost millions of dollars, wreck our economy and take a years time to get started. The 1,200 tons of bombs we dropped per day for the past year is a lot of bombs to make every day this year. Actually the French tried to save the Rothschilds rubber plantations in Laos but failed and actually that is what the United States is trying to do now. You according to my thinking were the only sensible Senator on the TV panel today.

Regards,

JOSEPH P. RUTH.

PARAMOUNT, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Have wired California Senators urging they support your upcoming resolution. We endorse your views.

BENJAMIN and MARY SALAZAR.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I applaud your views about Vietnam and trust you can make them prevail.

HARVEY CURTIS,
Webster University of Montana.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue and intensify your courageous protest against escalating war.

Prof. RONALD A. REBHOLZ.

CANTON, MASS.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Fine broadcast on Sunday. Please continue your fight for peace not too late.

SHERWOOD HOUSEHOLD.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your new resolution to force Senate vote on Vietnam.

LOU MAURY.

SAN PEDRO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We think you are taking the right position on Vietnam.

Dr. and Mrs. LEONARD B. THOMPSON.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Your opinion wholeheartedly supported. Organizing support Sevareid's TV historical. President Johnson's reports must be published.

JEAN B. PETERS.

BELLINGHAM, WASH.,
January 31, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We thoroughly support you in your stand on the Vietnam issue.

WILLIAM R. PIERRON,
THELMA M. PIERRON,
OLIVIA K. HAMELIN.

WEST LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Completely support position against resumption of bombing. Beg you continue fighting for national sanity.

Mr. and Mrs. HAROLD FOSTER.

BELLINGHAM, WASH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We were moved by your courage and concern over the dangers in Vietnam which you expressed on television today. We fully support your conviction.

Mr. and Mrs. MARTIN TUCKER,
Department of Art,
Western Washington State College.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for opposing illegal, self-defeating, disastrous Viet war from bottom of my heart.

GEORGE HILL, M.D.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We agree with your ideas on Vietnam. All success in continuing the fight.

LILLIAN COHEN,
A New Yorker.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your statements on the Sevareid program were magnificent. You speak for millions of Americans.

Dr. and Mrs. DANIEL SIMON.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wholeheartedly support your stand on the war in Vietnam and endorse your proposed legislation which will limit the President's broad powers to escalate the war in Vietnam. We sincerely hope your efforts will win widespread support.

Dr. and Mrs. I. D. PODORE,
Mrs. HENRY KLEINMAN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I fully support the actions being taken by yourself and others to bring about a rational end to the war in Vietnam. The Government must know that perhaps a silent majority of private citizens do not support this futile war and wish it a speedy end.

ROBERT KOLKER.

FALL RIVER, MASS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate your support of cessation of bombing, negotiating with Vietcong, use of United Nations arbitration.

Rev. HAROLD MELVIN.

BLOOMFIELD, CONN.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Applaud your courageous stand on Vietnam. Pray your wisdom prevails.

Mr. and Mrs. BENTON BERMAN.

BUFFALO, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.:

I wish you were representing New York State in the Senate. Your suggestions offered during the Sevareid program won my admiration. You are right. The American people do not know what is going on. I do not and I try to find out through all the media available to me. I believe in the U.N. too, and if necessary in declaring war. If John Kennedy were writing "Profiles in Courage" today he would write about you.

Vaya con dios,

MARIE BULLOCK.

MADISON, WIS.,
January 30, 1966.

U.S. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate and agree with your stand expressed on CBS today. Carry on.

Rev. LUTHER BORGEN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We agree with you 100 percent about Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. LEON JANCZAK.

BRIDGEPORT, CONN.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Call to your attention much active and latent support in Connecticut for your dissent, continue.

LARRY J. BERCOWITZ.

CHERRY HILLS, N.J.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

TV good. Full support. Amen.

JOHN EGGIE.

HASTINGS ON HUDSON, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

My wife and I and numerous friends support your position on Vietnam and urge action.

ADEL MEEROPOL.

DAYTON, OHIO,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo for your timely and valiant stand on the Vietnam situation. Please let me know how I may help.

VERA L. TIMM.

ST. LOUIS, MO,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I agree with your ideas as expressed Sunday, January 30, on CBS program, the Congress and the war. I am wiring Senator SYMINGTON and Congressman CURTIS to support your views on the Vietnam war.

JANE H. YOUNT.

NORTH EAST, PA.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo. God bless you. Keep fighting.

Mrs. CARL RIZZO.

COLUMBUS, OHIO,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you continue investigation involvement in Vietnam regarding possible U.N. action, negotiation, or enslavement.

LOUISE CHACON.

LYNBROOK, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I admire your courage and agree with your suggestion of how to settle Vietnam war.

SARAH SLUTZKY.

RUTHERFORD, N.J.,
January 30, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE DEAR SIR: You are to be commended for your courageous stand during CBS Congress in the War TV appearance. Would that a majority of your colleagues were as sincerely committed to our cause. If available would appreciate copy of Mansfield and Galbraith reports.

Respectfully,

J. GREGORY BAILEY.

MADISON, WIS.,
January 30, 1966.

WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We completely support your Vietnam position and appreciate your courage.

ELSA FAUERBACH,
SIDNEY ANDERSON,
VIRGINIA LUECKE,

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We fully support your views on Vietnam stated January 30. Take conflict to U.N. Keep up the good work.

CHRISTINE GRIFFITH,
SALLY CROSS.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Army officer with son in Vietnam agree completely your policy; please continue so.

———.

GARY, IND.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your television appearance. We agree.

MARION MASON.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We wholehearted with you in the problem peace be turned over to United Nations.

ETHEL STROM.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our hearts, hopes, thanks are with you in your continued initiative toward negotiating Vietnam peace.

RICHARD C. FOUST FAMILY.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for this afternoon; congratulations and stand fast.

E. DUNN.

MIAMI BEACH, FLA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud your position on Vietnam and urge you to continue pressure for negotiated peace through U.N.

Rabbi LEON KRONISH.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I heartily concur in your thoughtful and courageous stand on Vietnam. We rely on you to safeguard our liberties at home and abroad at this critical time.

Sincerely yours,

ESTHER EHRMAN LAZARD.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your courageous, patriotic, and wise presentation of the case for peace in Vietnam.

HAROLD CAMMER.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: God bless you for your stand on Vietnam.

Mrs. F. E. HYDE,
Mrs. ISABEL MCLAUGHLIN.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Along with others in our community we stand behind your stand in the Senate to get United States on the road to peace and withdrawn from Vietnam. Congratulations.

Mr. and Mrs. ELMER JOHNSON.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Very pleased with your stand in asking for Senate study of Vietnam problem. Am seriously concerned least we play into Russian hands by being drawn deeper into war. As we and China struggle, Russia enjoys our former peacemaker role and grows strong. Possibly she waits for South American eruption if we wear out men and wealth and lose allies from illogical war in wrong place.

The bull in a bull ring dies because an obvious red flag distracts him from a clever enemy. I pray our Nation's intelligence can win over our blind pride in brute strength.

Sincerely,

MARVIN BORELL.

DOWNEY, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your courageous stand opposing Vietnamese war. Bring this undeclared war to declared peace.

Mr. and Mrs. SAMUEL BERLAND.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud your efforts and support your position on Vietnam.

FRANCES and PHILLIP BRODSKY, WENDY and ROBERT REASENBERG, EUGENE BRODSKY, SALLY MORRIS.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We fully back your stand on Vietnam. May your voice always ring loud and clear.

Mr. and Mrs. FRANK SKURSKI.

MENLO PARK, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your opposition to escalation of war. Continue to press for negotiation.

KEITH R. BENTZ.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your Vietnamese policy.

DAVID HELLERSTEIN,
ROGER KOHN,
TOM ZANIELLO.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your position against bombing. Urge continuous protest and recognition of Vietcong in negotiations.

JOHN W. LITTLA.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your efforts to end Vietnam war. Keep up the battle for peace.

Mr. and Mrs. M. KELEMAN.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We admire and support your efforts to bring an end to Vietnam war.

Mr. and Mrs. PETER LEACH.

SAN LEANDRO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We commend you and urge your continued efforts to move Vietnam problem to United Nations.

DIANNE and PAUL NEWMAN.

MERCER ISLAND, WASH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We fully support your position on the war in Vietnam and wish you success in your effort to rescind the President's authority to wage an Executive war.

JESSIE BLOOM,
MARCELLA BENDITT,
MORTIMER RAYMAN,
MICKEY and LEO SREEBNY,
CYRUS and GRACE RUBIN.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. Stand against bombing in Vietnam. Urge United Nations investigation and control of consulate.

MARION DUNLAP.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The following Democrats condemn the present illegal U.S. involvement in Vietnam and demand issue be placed before United Nations. Stop Johnson's dictatorial usurpation of legislative powers.

PAUL A. HALL,
PAUL J. HALL,
FRANCES M. HALL,
MARK ROSEN,
JOSEPH SCHULTZ,
JACK SCHULTZ,
SAPPHIRE HALL

RADNOR, PA,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

I completely support your courageous stand and agree with your political view. Keep up the good work.

Mrs. RICHARD V. ZIMMERMANN, Jr.,

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Americans everywhere applaud your questioning our so-called commitments in Vietnam. Congress alone can make war or peace. Why has Congress failed to protect this power?

JOHN UPTON, M.D.
ANNA LOGAN UPTON.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your position on Vietnam and urge you to keep up your campaign to obtain peace.

M. GRAVIN.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo * * * let them explain hypocrisy of defeating tyranny by aiding tyranny.

RAY E. DE BARRA.

CHILLICOTHE, OHIO,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your excellent debate on CBS program of yesterday (secrets) in State Department save on Vietnam should we as you so admirably stated to the American public for their own appraisal.

Very sincerely yours,

BREWER AND BREWER & SON,
PAUL BREWER CONAWAY, *President.*

MENLO PARK, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We concur in the courageous stand you are taking to clarify position in Vietnam.

LEONARD AND MARY HILDEBRANDT.

DULUTH, MINN.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Heard your comments on Vietnam perspective today. For God's sake stay healthy and keep talking or we are lost.

BRUNO SCIPIONI.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We heartily endorse your stand to rescind the 1964 resolution and your solution in Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. W. LLOYD MAGIE.

SWARTHMORE, PA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your position on Vietnam urge use of U.N. for arbitration.

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN A. PRICE.

OAK PARK, MICH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your stand on Vietnam.

CHARLOTTE KLEISS.

NEWTON, MASS.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Warmly applaud your forthright statement in today's televised Vietnam discussion regarding honorable course for America.

Mr. and Mrs. E. B. KOVAR.

LILLIAN, ALA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are grateful for your stand in reference to the bombing of North Vietnam. Keep up the good work.

I. B. and C. H. RUTLEDGE.

GREAT NECK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You were magnificent. Have my complete support. Please keep fighting.

Dr. GORELICK.

HAYWARD, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulation on your stand today concerning Vietnam. United Nations must be used.

DORIS and JOHN DELGADO.

STONY POINT, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Dismayed by resumption of bombing North Vietnam. This action violates international law and brands the United States as determined to bring about world war III.

LEO F. KOCH.
MARY W. KOCH.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations NBC debate, agree your position completely. So advised JAVITS, KENNEDY. Please keep pressure up.

PETER SABIO.

SAN CARLOS, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Debate tremendous, what can we do to support you?

CLEON STOCKER.

STONEHAM, MASS.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your views on Vietnam war have my complete support, let United Nations do the job.

RUTH BARTON.

CHAPEL HILL, N.C.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your Vietnam stand.

J. W. LASLEY,
Attorney.

WEST LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly protest resumption of bombing, doubt President's sincerity about peace, urge Senate initiative for peace.

ARIS ANAGNOS.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We highly approve your courageous stand and hope you continue your questioning of the war.

HELENA CHASE JOHNSON,
MANSI KERN and FAMILY.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We are grateful for your determined, consistent, and courageous leadership against involvement in the Vietnam war.

Mr. and Mrs. ARTHUR EISENBURG.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your courageous Vietnam stand. Press on Foreign Relations Committee secrecy.

J. SANDERSON.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urgent you continue outspoken remarks regarding administration's policies. Civilization's future at stake. Keep it up.

LOIS LESTER.

GALLIPOLIS, OHIO,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support without reservation your remarks CBS show Sunday.

CHARLES E. HOLZER, Jr.

NORTH HIGHLANDS, CALIF.
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Gratified to hear your timely remarks on TV debate. Saddened by President's decision to resume bombing.

Mrs. EVELYN CARTER.

ALBION, MICH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Heard you on TV. Congratulations on peace efforts.

ARTHUR W. MUNK.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support you in full in your action regarding Vietnam.

Mrs. ROSE L. BROWN.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Palo Alto Chapter, American Association United Nations, representing 350 members, thank you for your efforts to limit Vietnam war and urges you to continue.

ISABELL ROSE,
President.

POUGHKEEPSIE, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Beg you redouble effort along line of fine and important letter to Johnson on Vietnam. It cannot be too late to stop this escalation by administrative fiat.

NANCY STOVER.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Sincere thanks and deepest gratitude for your leadership on Vietnam.

MARY WRIGHT.

GLENDALE, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your fine and courageous presentation of Vietnam situation. Keep it up.

S. A. SOUTHER.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Am in accord with your opinions 100 percent our country needs many more honest unselfish legislators.

JOHN and DORIS KIGHT.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Fully support two resolutions you offered in Senate Saturday, January 29.

GERTRUDE GOTTLIEB.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Following telegrams to Senator TYDINGS, Senator BREWSTER, of Maryland. I wish to express support for position taken by Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, of Oregon on the CBS program January 30, 1966.

Best wishes,

JOHN A. SULLIVAN.

FREMONT, OHIO,
January 31, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Completely support your Vietnam statements. Both veterans World War II Republicans. Please continue opposition.

Rev. and Mrs. REUBEN RADER.

PLEASANTVILLE, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I love my country best and WAYNE MORSE next. Your continued leadership is crucial to the peace of the world.

ELAIN KLEIN.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I appreciate your courageous words on this immoral involvement in Vietnam, please stand firm.

IRENE TICE.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I applaud your courageous denunciation of Johnson's immoral and illegal Asian war.

CLIFFORD BORBAS.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your views expressed on CBS program, yesterday.

GERALD H. BIDLACK.

DUBOIS, PA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God we have a man like you in Congress. Rescind the mandate, and let's turn this over to the United Nations as Pope Paul and you suggest.

ROBERT E. COCHRAN.

ROSLYN, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your voice yesterday was like a breath of fresh air in a smoked-filled room. Congratulations.

Mr. and Mrs. SAMUEL PANZER.

PLEASANTVILLE, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on brave and forthright TV statement Sunday. Heartily support your resolution and have informed my Senators.

CONSTANCE HOGARTH.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your magnificent performance on CBS. We fully support your position on Vietnam war.

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM ROTH.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo. Your words on Sunday telecast were apathetically expressed and urgently needed.

Mr. and Mrs. DELBERT E. BLAKE.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Highly commend and support your continued position on Vietnam. Hope you can convince your colleagues to work with you for peace efforts and cessation of bombing.

EVELYN ELDRIDGE.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your efforts to debate Vietnam policy in Congress, protest bombing North Vietnam.

WINIFRED J. HEARN.

STROUDSBURG, PA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Full approval and deep appreciation for your stand Sunday. Letter follows with policy suggestions.

PETER COHEN.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

As a concerned American I urge you and the committee on Foreign Relations to continue and to intensify your questioning of administration policy in Vietnam. You are the last resort of the American people.

EDWARD M. KEATING.

HANCOCK, MICH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your TV presentation January 30th. Keep up the good work on insisting the war in South Vietnam be brought before the United Nations.

GORDON J. JAASKELAINEN.

EAST LANSING, MICH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your courageous efforts to bring peace to Vietnam.

STUART and JANET DOWTY.

STOCKTON, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We are behind you 100 percent. We would like your views discussed more.

PHOEBE AND JOE WALSH.

FULLERTON, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We salute you on your position in Vietnam.

JAMES E. GROOM.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We pray for your good health to keep up your good work for real peace.

Dr. and Mrs. LEONARD SCHEINMAN.

UTICA, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Listened to CBS. Thought your views excellent. More Senators should share same. If our so-called allies do not do something we should pull all men, money, equipment out of Europe and Asia and let them take the burden of defending themselves.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE ACEE.

DUNKIRK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: The Government of the United States has again outraged the tenuous peace of the world. Best wishes for the success of your effort to bring the Government to reason. All those recognize the wisdom of restraint and judgment at this critical time. We congratulate you on your courage.

MICHELE D. STAUFFER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Expenditure, lives, money, Vietnam, insane. Present U.S. bombing nullifies power of Congress and foundation UN.

DULCIE THORSTENSON.

HEREFORD, TEX.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your courageous stand on the Vietnam war merits the highest praise. Please accept my thanks.

Rev. V. W. MARCONTELL.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Fully support your efforts. Full debate on present illegal Vietnam policy.

GEORGE C. KISKADDON.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Resumption of Vietnam bombing contrary to human ethics seed UN peace.

JEROME B. and JOAN AFALLERT.

BOULDER, COLO.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I commend your excellent Vietnam stand and value your continued leadership toward wiser policy.

MALCOLM CORRELL.

DENVER, COLO.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Wish to commend you most heartily for your courageous position and statements in Senate and on CBS radio panel Sunday opposing administrations dangerous policies in Vietnam believe increasing number of Americans support you even if not heard from hope you can secure many other Senators to support prompt study of U.S. position in Vietnam.

EDWARD L. WHITTEMORE.

EL CERRITO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

My family and I thank you for frankness instead of claptrap.

PATRICK DEVANEY.

EAST LANSING, MICH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Continue your courageous struggle against the war. You speak for millions of Americans.

BRIAN KELLEHER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Heard you yesterday on CBS Forum. Appreciate your work and support your position wholeheartedly.

JACQUELINE LOWENGARD.

BOULDER, COLO.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are deeply concerned with the pursuit of bombing diplomacy. We support your important efforts to bring the Vietnam holocaust to an end.

DOROTHY and JULIUS LONDON.

SPOKANE, WASH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We commend you for your views as expressed on Eric Sevareid's broadcast. Time for open discussion in Congress before the American people is long overdue. Today there is doubt and dissension in our country regarding our foreign policy and commitment in Vietnam. Let this policy be carefully examined and also effect some discipline and control over foreign aid given to

these allies shipping supplies to be used against our fighting forces and endangering them.

Very sincerely,

KATHERINE SCHUSTER.

BERKELEY, CALIF., *January 31, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your courageous action is uniting the opposition to our militaristic administration. Tell all you can.

DOROTHY HILL.

PALO ALTO, CALIF., *January 31, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your stand on Vietnam. Do what you can.

NATALIE SCHMITT.

PALO ALTO, CALIF., *January 31, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I protest the resumption of bombing in Vietnam. Stop the bombing now.

WILLIAM G. GARWOOD.

PALO ALTO, CALIF., *January 31, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Fully support your position in Vietnam.

PATRICIA JUDSON.

PALO ALTO, CALIF., *January 31, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your stand on Vietnam. Stop the bombing. Recognize the Vietcong.

GEORGE PETERS.

PALO ALTO, CALIF., *January 31, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Continue support of opposition to war. Americans will yet see the light. God bless you.

THEODORE HERSHBERG.

SAN JOSE, CALIF., *January 31, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We who are denied the truth support you.

Mr. and Mrs. H. R. ZANDER.

BURNSVILLE, MINN., *January 31, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your Vietnam stand.

WALTER LUND.

EL DORADO, ARK., *January 31, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanking you for present stand taken in regard to Vietnam conflict.

VICTOR DUMAS.

EAST LANSING, MICH., *January 31, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We absolutely stand behind you in your heroic rationality. We cheer and support you.

Mr. and Mrs. RONALD PHIPPS.

PALO ALTO, CALIF., *January 31, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge continuation of your efforts to bring Vietnam policy under congressional examination. Your constituent.

TERENCE EMMONS.

OAKLAND, CALIF., *January 31, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Eastbay Joint ILWU Legislative Committee represent more than 5,000 ILWU members and their families support your position on Vietnam as expressed on television Sunday. We urge you to continue your efforts for full debate on this paramount issue so that an informed citizenry may help put our Government on the right road to a policy consistent with law and the aspirations of all Americans for a sound and lasting peace.

WILLIAM BURKE,
Secretary.

BROOKLYN, N.Y., *January 31, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Persist in your efforts to clip Johnson's war wings. Withdrawal of all our forces is the solution to the ungodly mess in southeast Asia.

SUE BROWDER.

EAST LANSING, MICH., *January 31, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue your efforts to stop war. Dissent means freedom.

ETTA C. ABRAHAMS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 31, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo and thanks on your CBS Vietnam presentation yesterday, agree 100 percent.

Mrs. GRACE DOWMAN.

BUFFALO, N.Y., *January 31, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Capitol,
Washington, D.C.:

Our hopes are still with you in your struggle for a sane policy on Vietnam. Today's tragic decision must be reversed.

PETER NICHOLS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 1, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulation on your stand on Vietnam. Keep up the good work.

JOSEPH MOORE.

CHELTENHAM, PA., *January 1, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Your appearance on Sunday's TV debate was absolutely thrilling. It is a rare occasion that a Senator has the guts to candidly speak out on TV about true facts on Vietnam to the people and to the President who has been less than truthful to the Nation. I agree with your enlightened position 100 percent. Please send a copy of the Gilbraith report.

WILLIAM TOTO.

PALO ALTO, CALIF., *January 1, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Agree now time to withdraw 1964 resolution. American people deserve debate. Keep up your dissent.

RICHARD R. THOMPSON.

PALO ALTO, CALIF., *January 1, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The American people want democracy by debate; not by dictatorship. Keep calling for Vietnam debate.

J. T. VERNALLIS.

MOUNTAIN VIEW, CALIF., *January 1, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Please do not allow the President to end debate on Vietnam.

JOHN and ANN MATTHIAS.
STANFORD UNIVERSITY.

OAK PARK, ILL., *February 1, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Millions of frustrated compassionate Americans thank you for opposing Johnson's war. Please keep up your fight to bring truth and reason to our executives.

EUGENE FRANCES BARBOUR.

PALO ALTO, CALIF., *February 1, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud your stand on Vietnam and support efforts to end this illegal war.

BARRY LOEWER,
Department of Philosophy,
Stanford University.
MARJORIE LOEWER,
Department of Classics,
Stanford University.

PALO ALTO, CALIF., *February 1, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Vietnam bombing immoral. We are trading lives for prestige and affluence. Please make us heard.

PAUL F. DICKERT.

EAST LANSING, MICH., *January 31, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

No, don't bomb. Urge acceptance Vietcong legitimate bargainers. Supervised free elections.

LARRY BARIL.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *February 1, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Hang on. Continue to be the sole voice of reason in Congress. We admire your guts and only hope that you may somehow save us from world war.

ERIC, MARSHA, AND BJORN NILSON.

PALO ALTO, CALIF., *January 1, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your position. Deplore resumed bombing. Push for Senate debate to stop war escalation.

Mr. and Mrs. PETER B. YOUNG.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 1, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We fully support your request for a full debate of the Vietnam issue in Congress.

BERNARD YOUNG.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate your effort to have Senate review foreign policy and restore war powers to Congress.

ERICH and ELIZABETH LINDEMANN.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Grateful for your courageous stand. Recommend your continuing pressure for United Nations action toward Vietnam settlement and congressional debate.

Roberta Roberts Klotsche, Sandra Brown, Atty. and Mrs. Jack Eisendrath, Mr. and Mrs. Don Olesen, Dr. and Mrs. Arnold Kaufman, Mrs. Aimee Brown, Evelyn Knapp, Mrs. Richard Howelln, Bertha Rubin, Mrs. Marian Leidgen, Dr. and Mrs. Morton R. Phillips.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We cheer your courageous stand in denouncing escalation in Vietnam; you make us proud as Americans.

The STEIN FAMILY.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks for your courage in questioning our administration on Vietnam. It is indeed heartening to have a voice echoing the concern of those of us who are deeply troubled by American colonialism in southeast Asia.

J. M. KEATING.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue the fight against President Johnson's policy in Vietnam.

L. J. RATHER,
Professor of Pathology,
Stanford University.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you do all possible to halt bombing in North Vietnam immediately.

HARLAN ROBINSON ABRAMS.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator W. MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on courageous efforts to stop Vietnam war; many students, faculty at Stanford behind you.

MARCELLE DABBERACCI.

CHICO, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on stand on Vietnam. Keep fighting. We can't vote for you but you have our moral support.

Mr. and Mrs. TOM RODGERS.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Vietnam is matter only for U.N. action. Profoundly grateful for your leadership in opening congressional debate. Applaud your protest against executive measures, support your attempt to rescind 1964 Congress resolution for intervention, there is no war with honor.

MIRIAM YOUNG.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

SIR: It is obvious to me that President Johnson wishes to ignore and squelch congressional debate concerning the constitutional legal, and moral question on the Vietnam war. The Security Counsel of the United Nations cannot and will not agree on any solution. I wholeheartly support your challenge of the administration policy along with several of your colleagues. This is the best way to help American boys in Vietnam and prevent further useless slaughter more important if the American people were given the truth surrounding this issue you would gain sufficient support to prevent a disasterous spreading Asian war. You are one of the few true American patriots left and I know that your courageous statesmanship will continue. Would you please copy your supporters in the Senate.

ROBERT DRAKE.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I oppose escalation of the war in Vietnam. Stop the bombing.

MARCIA RUOTOLO.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I look to Congress now to do whatever in its power to stop the present administration from leading us ever closer to a third world war.

MATTIE WEST CROW.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Commend your stand on the Vietnam crisis. Please remain outspoken on behalf of peace in Vietnam and throughout the world. The real world leadership of the United States is possible only by bringing peace to the world.

MARIAN and CHARLES LUPU.

INGLEWOOD, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Tremendously impressed by your CBS statements on Vietnam. Would like transcript if possible or other information.

C. J. BOEDEKER.

CINCINNATI, OHIO,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You are absolutely right in your assumption the majority of American people are opposed to the Vietnam war. Please do not relax your efforts to have the southeast Asia resolution rescinded enlisting EHA difference of Senators GRUENING, LONG, and Chairman FULBRIGHT.

IDA E. SCHIMWEG.

STATE COLLEGE, PA.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Senator MORSE: We support your continuing opposition to the unnecessary and unjust war in Vietnam. Yours is the kind of fighting we believe in.

JUDY BUCK.
MAX MOLINARO.
DANIEL ESTERSOHN.
DAVID FERLEGER.
PENN STATE UNIVERSITY.

DAVENPORT, IOWA,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Yesterday's Senators' debate should be printed for public distribution. Our local publisher does not even know of the debate.

R. E. HAESLY.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the following telegrams were received and answered by me. I also ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

ROWAYTON, CONN.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your files will indicate my support of much of what you fought for over these many years. Perhaps it is time you take a back seat. America needs no disappointed politicians to bite at her heels. President Johnson deserves your support. Your ego is proving your undoing.

MANUEL HERMIDA.

FEBRUARY 1, 1966.

Mr. MANUEL HERMIDA,
Rowayton, Conn.:

You will fail as did MacBeth in washing the blood off your hands. Ordinarily I put such wires as yours in the file reserved for crackpot mail. However, you should know better.

WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator.

SARANAC LAKE, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I disagree with everything you said on the Vietnam TV program. I consider your policy un-American and pro-Communist.

Dr. F. X. IPOLYI.

January 31, 1966.

Dr. F. X. IPOLYI,
Saranac Lake, N.Y.:

Your wire makes you look as ridiculous as you apparently are. Why don't you volunteer to substitute yourself for a drafted boy in Vietnam and you do the dying for him?

WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator.

EAST AMHERST, N.Y.
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

It is our considered opinion that we must not back away in Vietnam. No person and no country has ever avoided a conflict as long as the second party insisted on fighting and refused to discuss peace. This is a sad

fact of life and sadder fact of history. We sincerely believe that a failure of responsible leaders to support the President in Vietnam will seriously hurt the chances of our four children to inherit a peaceful world and will ultimately force us to an even greater war.

Mr. and Mrs. ERNEST RUDA.

JANUARY 31, 1966.

Mr. and Mrs. ERNEST RUDA,
East Amherst, N.Y.:

Your four children will have no world to inherit if you support our illegal war in Asia which will end up in world war III, if the President isn't stopped.

WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator.

GULFPORT, MISS.,
January 28, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Catastrophe and appeasement your battle cry during period of ultimate survival American democracy.

GEORGE LANDWEHR,
New Orleans, La.

JANUARY 31, 1966.

Mr. GEORGE LANDWEHR,
New Orleans, La.:

Your wire constitutes pure nonsense.

WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator.

DEDICATED SERVICE RENDERED IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DURING RECENT SNOWSTORM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to take a minute or two to call the attention of the Senate to the public services being rendered in the District of Columbia by a large number of dedicated public servants who have worked on behalf of the District of Columbia far beyond the call of duty.

I speak for a moment as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia which works closely with the District Commissioners, the Police Department, the Fire Department, and various welfare agencies.

I hope we are cognizant of the fact that since the disastrous storm struck, our District Commissioners have been at their desks through long hours of the day and into the night. Also, our Police Department has performed great dedicated service for all of us as has our wonderful Fire Department.

I have taken some time, Mr. President, to go to the various parts of the city to observe our Police Department and Fire Department at work.

I wish to say to our policemen and firemen this morning that we are greatly indebted to them. All of the people of the District of Columbia are indebted to them. The people of the District of Columbia are also indebted to the service department in charge of cleaning the streets.

What is being done is a herculean effort to remove this snow. A word of commendation and congratulation is certainly due for the devoted public service that is being extended to us up and down the line by District employees.

The people whom we have hired by the hour to work in our behalf under very inclement weather conditions also deserve our thanks.

I talked with one of the Commissioners yesterday. He said that some of these men have gone to work at 6 a.m. and have worked until 9 o'clock and 10 o'clock at night with no time off for meals except for the coffee and sandwiches that have been handed to them on the job.

Too often in our busy lives in the precincts of the Senate we are not fully aware of the services being rendered to us by officials of the District of Columbia and its employees. I am proud to stand on the floor of the Senate today as a member of the District of Columbia Committee and express my thanks and pay this deserved tribute to not only the Commissioners, the Police Department, the Fire Department, the welfare agencies, and the service department that is working on the snow removal, but to each and every one of those who have worked so hard in behalf of all of us to meet this emergency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Is there further morning business?

RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS, SO-CALLED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I fully agree with the statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who urged in this Chamber that the majority leader should propose maintaining the Senate in session around the clock, 24 hours a day, until such time as this prolonged discussion in depth or filibuster against taking up and considering repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law on the merits of the proposal is voted on. It happens that according to the calendar I am one of the older U.S. Senators, but I am certain that no one need fear my health will be impaired were we to have these prolonged sessions in order to dispose of legislative business that was left over from the first session of the present Congress.

People are only as old as their doubts, their lack of confidence, their fears, and their despair. In that regard I feel at least 40 years younger than some who oppose the repeal of section 14(b) and yearn for the era of William McKinley. In those days the major labor problems were whether or not to lower the working day to 12 hours or whether Government had the right to limit the working hours and control the working conditions of men, women, and little children.

Many of those expressing strong opposition to repeal of section 14(b) are never heard calling for higher wages. They never speak out for greater job protection or security. They opposed Federal aid to education and hospital and medical care for the elderly and other beneficent legislation for the welfare of all Americans. It is only when they are urging the adoption of right-to-work laws, so-called, or retention of section 14(b) that they show any interest whatever in the problems of American workers.

Then, we hear cries of anguish from all sorts of committees, each claiming to seek freedom for the captive union member chained to his union against his will. Their concern for union members is as phony as the so-called right-to-work laws they advocate. Their real interest is in weakening the labor union movement, and in establishing a cheap labor force.

Repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act will not affect in the least labor relations in States such as Illinois or Ohio. We have no so-called right-to-work laws in these States. In fact, in Ohio in 1958 our citizens by a majority of more than 800,000 defeated the proposed right-to-work amendment to our constitution.

Whether the present effort to repeal section 14(b) is passed in the Senate as it was in the House of Representatives will really have no effect on labor relations in the State of Ohio, in Illinois, and in 29 other States. It will affect 19 States in which less than 29 percent of Americans live and work. In these 19 States, mostly in the South and Southwest, the wage scale for men and women who work in industry is substantially lower than the average in States where there are no so-called right-to-work laws.

By repealing 14(b) the Congress can make a substantial contribution to the war on poverty—without adding any expenditure items to the Federal budget—since repeal will give unions in those low-wage States an opportunity to build their strength and win decent wages and working conditions for the underpaid workers who are the true victims of section 14(b).

Though other factors are unquestionably involved, the fact is that in States with so-called right-to-work laws labor standards are lower. These States lag behind free collective bargaining States in economic growth and in per capita income. Their workmen's compensation laws, minimum wage laws, and unemployment compensation laws are weaker, and other laws protecting workers are less effective or nonexistent. In this space age, economic factors do not recognize State boundary lines. Since 1958, the jobs of at least 15,000 Ohio workers have been transferred to States with so-called right-to-work laws, where wages are lower and legislation to protect working men and women less stringent.

In human terms, people in right-to-work States have a lower standard of living. They do not receive as much for their work. They cannot buy as much. Their job conditions are poorer, and their job security shakier. What is worse, their prospects for improvement are dimmer, and their children's future less promising.

Despite the misleading title, right-to-work laws are not meant to help working people or to guarantee anyone a right to a job. In reality, they are union-busting laws. Since passage of the Wagner Act, the cornerstone of Federal labor law has been encouragement of labor organizing and of free collective bargaining. Under this Federal encouragement, trade unions have grown and have helped build a strong economy and an unparalleled standard of living. Right-

to-work laws stand as a constant threat to the continued growth and welfare of trade unions, and to the continued expansion of our economy.

These laws are bad. They plant government squarely at the bargaining table and interfere with orderly free collective bargaining between management and labor. They penalize employers by creating instability and uncertainty in the work force. They penalize employees by weakening the unions that represent them. They protect neither rights nor jobs. They are simply a smokescreen for union busting.

If I were a worker instead of a lawyer and presently Senator of the United States, I would belong to the union of my craft, and sit in the front row.

Free trade unions are vital to the welfare and growth of our Nation. They stand for mankind's loftiest aspirations. Through their unions, working men and women have won hard-earned victories, the fruits of which will continue to be reaped by generations yet unborn.

The facts are, if any Americans should be and are enthusiastic over the American way of life and the American free enterprise system, it is members of labor unions.

Under our system, they have won for themselves a full life with the highest standard of living anywhere and a fair share of their own production. American workers and American labor unions are the envy of workingmen and workingwomen the world over. They rear their families on the right side of the railroad tracks and they walk with dignity and love of country.

Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is unfair to both labor and management and has a deterrent effect on our entire economy. It has accomplished no purpose worth the bitterness and controversy it has stirred up among our citizens. It should be repealed and forgotten, unwept, unhonored, and unsung.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

OBJECTION TO COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I believe I ought to raise the question of the privilege of the Senate.

There has been consistent objection to having any committees whatsoever meet while the present action on the motion to consider section 14(b) is in progress.

I am advised that committees are meeting.

I believe I must make it clear on the record, in line with the statement made a year or two ago by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] who looked into the matter carefully, that a committee that in violation of the rule meets has no authority to pay any stenographic expenses whatsoever, and that they are properly chargeable to the chairman of the committee.

The rule on committees meeting when there is objection is very specific. I want that noted for the record now, because all the data or information developed when a committee is meeting when it has no right to meet are subject to a point of order if and when the matter comes to the floor of the Senate. In line with the position I felt I had to take, I thought I ought to make this statement as a matter of Senate privilege and place it in the RECORD at this point. I believe that all committees and all chairmen ought to be advised forthwith as to what the rule is and what could happen to anything that results from their deliberations.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand, the Senator's objection does not apply to committee meetings held prior to the time of the convening of the Senate, which recently has been 10 o'clock in the morning. Any business transacted prior to the convening of the Senate on any day, or after the Senate has adjourned or recessed on any day, as the case may be, would not come within the protest of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. The rule applies only when the Senate is in session.

Mr. President, I must insist on that rule. I cannot, helter-skelter, permit one committee to meet and not another. So I have taken a position that is consistent, and I have uniformly objected both formally and informally to committee meetings. I make that statement now so that it will be abundantly clear that these matters will have to be examined into whenever a committee communicates to the Senate itself anything that may be subject to a point of order, because such a point of order is very likely to be made.

THE RESIDUAL OIL PROBLEM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in view of the present concern for inflation in our national economy, I urge that the President direct the Council of Economic Advisers immediately to review the inflationary impact of the residual oil import quota program.

The problem of artificial restraints on the importation of residual oil continues to aggravate the economy of the Northern States, especially in times of bitter winter weather, as we are now experiencing.

Simply put, the present policy costs the national economy more money because of the artificial price structure resulting from quotas—and the costs increase as the weather gets worse.

According to statistics maintained by the Office of Emergency Planning, there is and in fact there has been since the program began, an artificial price inflation directly attributable to the control program. A barrel of oil sold in New York Harbor to a domestic consumer, depending on market conditions, costs anywhere from 20 to 50 cents per barrel more than an identical barrel sold to a ship in international commerce which is outside of the quota system. This is between a 10 and 20 percent price inflation. In the State of Rhode Island alone, in 1964—the last year for which Bureau of Mines statistics are available—8,218,000 barrels of residual oil were consumed. Considering the average inflationary premium due to the controls to be 32 cents per barrel, the price penalty paid by the consumers of Rhode Island was $2,629,000. Among the New England States, Rhode Island is the third largest consumer of residual oil. The price penalty for the New England States during the same year was $26,219,000.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that we can ill afford this needless inflationary pressure. In a letter to the President, I pointed out on December 8, 1965, the inflationary aspect of the residual oil program. I ask unanimous consent to reprint, as part of my remarks, my letter to the President and the response which I received from Secretary Udall.

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

DECEMBER 8, 1965.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In connection with your concern in preventing inflation and holding the line on prices, I take this opportunity to once again press the importance of lifting the quotas on residual fuel oil for our part of the country.

As you know, the present imposition of fuel oil quotas raise the cost of power to our northeastern part of the United States, already disadvantaged from a power viewpoint because of its geographical position and plagued with other economic ills.

But, of particular interest to you and our administration at this time would, I should think, be the fact that the continuation of these residual fuel oil quotas could well result in an inflation in fuel oil prices. You will soon be considering the report of Mr. Ellington as to whether or not the lifting of these quotas would have any adverse effect upon our military position and Mr. Udall's recommendations as to the action to be taken on this report. I do hope a further factor in your own decision will be that the lifting of these quotas would well result in a reduction of the inflationary forces in the United States.

In any case, as you know, we from New England believe that the continued imposition of these residual fuel oil quotas to be most unjust and unnecessary.

Warmest personal regards.

Ever sincerely,

CLAIBORNE PELL.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., January 21, 1966.

Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PELL: Your letter of December 8 addressed to President Johnson concerning the residual fuel oil portion of the mandatory oil import control program has been forwarded to us for reply.

On April 1, 1965, we requested the Office of Emergency Planning to investigate the national security aspects of the residual fuel oil program in accordance with section 6(a) of Presidential Proclamation 3279. By an interim report dated December 18, 1965, Mr. Buford Ellington, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, advised that his residual fuel oil investigation indicated that control of these imports could be relaxed without impairment to the national security. He recommended that the residual fuel oil import level be increased substantially for the remainder of the current fuel year.

Accordingly, we increased the maximum import level for residual fuel oil in PAD District I by 35 million barrels for the remainder

of the fuel year which terminates March 31, 1966. We believe the increase is consistent with the advice of the OEP and will be adequate to meet industrial and other requirements not foreseen when the current level was established and to permit an increase in stocks. Five million barrels of the increase will be made available to the Oil Import Appeals Board in order to eliminate any hardship situations.

We appreciate the opportunity to review your comments.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as this correspondence indicates, the letter from Secretary Udall was not responsive to the question of inflation but instead recited the facts on the Government's action last December in temporarily relaxing quotas—a move which prompted the Government of Venezuela to impose their own price controls to offset artificial manipulation of the American market. It seems to me that the only real solution can be complete removal of all artificial restrictions, and that the economy, not only of New England but of the whole Nation, would benefit accordingly.

In particular, it seems to me that the inflationary consequences of the program may be far greater than has heretofore been recognized and that this aspect of the problem therefore deserves far more consideration from the administration than was indicated by Secretary Udall's response.

With the great demand for increased military spending to meet our commitments in Vietnam, we are all deeply concerned with the possibilities of a renewed round of inflation which would weaken our commitment at this critical time. The President has affirmed this administration's dedication to prevent a further inflationary spiral. He has called upon industry and labor to stay within his administration's 3.2 percent wage and price guidelines. He has successfully prevented increased prices in basic raw materials like aluminum and copper and permitted only selective increases in steel. These threatened increases in raw material costs were in the range of 2 to 5 percent.

I urge the administration to apply these same standards to a raw material equally vital to the economy of New England—residual oil. The national interest demands, as the Director of OEP has responded after an objective examination, that residual oil control must be removed. I believe this to be a sound, logical, and consistent step in the President's fight to prevent inflation.

What is needed is an immediate review of the inflationary aspects of the problem by a higher and more comprehensive authority than the Interior Department, which is only concerned with fuel policy. I stress the point that it should be an immediate review and not a drawn-out study, because the situation calls for action now—and the only action that will solve the problem for New England and the Nation is complete removal of the quotas.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I appreciate the view of those in New England who would like to buy cheap and sell high, protected by the tariffs which this Nation has historically had. The Senator from Louisiana, as a member of the Committee on Finance, has helped those in New England to maintain the tariffs they have needed for their industries. They certainly are entitled to every consideration when they find that competition from Japan, Great Britain, and elsewhere creates problems for them.

Residual fuel oil is not the prime interest of those who produce oil; it is more the concern of those who produce coal. Nevertheless, this Nation needs to be self-sufficient for its own fuel requirements, particularly in times of emergency. Those in New England would be the first to complain if those who come from fuel-producing States were unable to produce and provide New England with fuel when it is unavailable from foreign sources.

This is a problem which must be considered somewhat in depth, because it involves the availability of fuel for the Nation, and the ability of the Nation to provide fuel in times of emergency to meet the needs of consumers.

Those in the fuel industry are not the only ones who receive some protection in one form or another from foreign competition. Most American industries have protection of one sort or another.

I urge those who oppose a program to preserve the domestic fuel industry to look homeward and check with their own manufacturers, to determine the extent to which their products are protected by tariff; and when they say it is inflationary to have tariff protection or quota protection for a domestic industry, let them suggest an overall proposal of removal of protective measures applicable to their industries, so that unnecessary protection exists for any industries.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I had no intention of speaking on the question of residual oil, but I am happy to do so. I happened to be on the floor when the Senator from Louisiana commented on the statement of my colleague, Senator PELL. At the time the quota was instituted, it was done by Presidential direction. It was never intended to assist the oil industry.

As a matter of fact, residual oil was left out of the quota deliberately, for the simple reason that residual oil is not in competition with the domestic product.

We have developed, through our science, a high octane, and most of the production in America is of the high octane quality. We do not produce enough residual oil to take care of our domestic needs. That fact is admitted by the oil industry.

Through an error, the quota was applied to residual oil. Those who are defending the system are not the oil companies in America, but the coal interests.

The coal interests are using the argument that, if New England is starved for residual oil, it may convert to coal. To me that is a ridiculous position to take. Furthermore coal producers are not producing enough coal to meet the demand. Even if we were to remove the quota entirely, it would not affect the situation. The coal industry has automated. It does not need so much manpower today.

I have been in this issue up to my neck for the past few years. I have taken the matter up with the administration. Assurance was given to us last year that the quota would be removed. However, there is a quota still in effect. We still have the fiction concerning the residual oil quota system in New England.

Quotas are actually helping the distributors. The procedures are wrong. Today, if one has a ticket, he can get the residual oil. If one does business with one distributor and then goes to another distributor, the distributor will block him and prevent him from getting his fuel. The effect has been to raise the prices to the consumers.

The junior Senator from Rhode Island was trying to show that, through an artificial method, we are raising the price for the consumers in New England. It is costing us $30 million a year more in New England than it would if the quota were removed.

The quota is not placed on residual fuel oil to protect the oil industry. The quota should be removed. It is being used as an argument by the coal industry. The coal industry says: "If you cut down the supply of residual oil in New England, perhaps they will have to convert to coal."

Do Senators realize what that would mean in New England? First, we do not have the coal bins. Second, we are not equipped to handle coal. We would be starved out entirely.

All we say is that this artificial control which has been imposed through an error ought to be removed. This idea that we are being protected by tariffs applies when a foreign product is in competition with an American product. That is not the case with residual oil.

The residual oil is being imported from Venezuela and is not in competition with any domestic oil from Louisiana, Florida, or Texas. Perhaps the Senator from Louisiana knows it better than I do.

We are not producing residual oil. The American oil producer does not care to produce it. The only way that we can obtain sufficient residual oil is by importing it. It is nonsense to say that we want tariffs only to protect certain of our industries. We want tariffs to protect our industries from an unreasonable influx of a foreign product which is in competition with them.

The argument of the Senator from Louisiana is all wrong. I repeat that it has been admitted that when President Eisenhower gave that directive he never intended to include residual oil. However, through some phony idea, residual oil was included, and they will not take it off. It is not the residual oil producers in America, but the coal producers who really support the quota. It does not make any sense to me. It is ridiculous. It ought to stop.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, with due deference to my friend the Senator from Rhode Island, residual oil is a fuel. It will fill some of the fuel needs of the Nation. The more residual oil we use, the less coal we use, coal which we are capable of producing in this Nation, or else the less natural gas we use, the less electricity we use for

heating purposes—if that is being produced by gas or coal. When considering our necessary fuel needs on a B.t.u. basis—to the extent that we have become dependent upon foreign sources we have less of a domestic fuel industry.

I concede that the oil industry is not nearly so much interested in the problem of residual imports as it is with the problem of crude imports and various other products. Lighter petroleum fuels are being produced. Nevertheless, there is a problem. The industry is affected. It is entitled to be considered and to have its side heard in the Congress, and in the White House.

Last year, the most far-reaching trade measure that we had before the Senate was a measure to seek to bring about a common market in Canada for new automobiles. We found that there was opposition from some in New England who feared that injury might occur to their industries.

When one advocates an expansion of trade which causes some industries to suffer severe injury, they should also recognize that it works both ways and they should be willing to accept the back side of the same coin.

THE 14TH INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Inter-American Bar Association held its 14th Conference at San Juan, Puerto Rico, in May 1965. Over 1,000 lawyers from all parts of this hemisphere attended the conference which celebrated the 25th anniversary of the association. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions adopted at the conference be printed in the RECORD:

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

XIV CONFERENCE—SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO—MAY 22–29, 1965 RESOLUTIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECLARATIONS

(Prepared by Carolyn Royall Just, Reporter General, Assisted by H. Hugo Pérez, Assistant Secretary)

COMMITTEE I. PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL LAW

Section A. General Problems

Topic 1.—Whereas 1. This Association, through its Permanent Committee on Uses of International Rivers in America, has paid special attention to the important problem of making use of the waters which cross or separate the territory of two or more States, with a view to having them yield the maximum use in the most reasonable form, according to the standards which govern the relations among the riparian states;

2. The permanent Committee on the Uses of International Rivers has submitted a new report which contains a detailed analysis of the international events relating to this subject and the studies and proposals made on it since the XIII Conference of this Association which shows the importance of the work of the Committee as well as any study thereof which it may undertake in the future for consideration during the XV Conference;

3. It is the true desire of the lawyers in the Americas that by means of international, bilateral, regional or general agreements the uses of international rivers become more beneficial so that these natural resources shall contribute in a greater measure to the common welfare;

4. The studies made by the Inter-American Juridical Committee and the Department of Legal Affairs of the Pan American Union, as well as the deliberations of the Fifth Meeting of the Inter-American Council of Jurists contain valuable precedents which may make possible the drafting of a general agreement on the use of the waters of international rivers and lakes;

5. Consideration has been given by the OAS to holding a specialized Conference on uses of waters of international rivers and lakes;

Resolves 1. To commend the work of the Permanent Committee on the Uses of International Rivers expressed in its report, and to approve publication of the report together with the present resolution.

2. To ask the committee to undertake the preparation of a new report regarding this subject to be presented for consideration at the 15th Conference.

3. To point out the importance of the studies and projects on the uses of the waters of international rivers and lakes, made on the initiative of the OAS, and to support the proposal to hold a specialized conference on the subject matter, as soon as possible.

4. To support the preparation, as soon as possible, of an Inter-American agreement which shall take into account the general rules for the uses of the waters of international rivers and lakes that shall assure their utilization for the common welfare of the people of the Americas, without prejudice to the bilateral or regional solutions which take into consideration specific and special aspects of riparian states.

NOTE.—The delegate from Paraguay filed a reservation with regard to paragraph No. 1 of the above resolution as he did not agree with some of the solutions and principles contained in the conclusions and recommendations of the report of the committee. The delegate from Bolivia concurred in this reservation.

Topic 2.—Whereas 1. This Association was organized to advance the science of jurisprudence in all its aspects and for the purpose of creating and maintaining a more perfect democratic society of equal justice under law;

2. The study and administration of Military Law is an integral part of the science of jurisprudence;

3. At the XIII Conference of the Association (Res. 2—Panama Conference Resolution) a Section on Military Law was authorized to encourage and support the full study and discussion of military law in the Western Hemisphere;

4. In July 1964 at Lima, Peru, the Military Law Section of Committee I was formally organized;

5. At the first meeting of the Military Law Section at the XIV Conference of the Association at Puerto Rico, summaries of the organization and procedure of military criminal law in several of the Western Hemisphere countries were presented; and

6. As a result of the study and discussion of these different systems of military justice, it was agreed by the Military Law Section that an examination and comparison of the organization and administration of the military criminal law of each member state, and a description of current problems in this field would be of great benefit to military lawyers and the bar generally throughout the Western Hemisphere;

Resolves 1. That it is desirable to have published appropriate studies of the military criminal laws and procedures of each of the American states.

2. That the Military Law Section of Committee I undertake to compile, publish, and distribute a "Compendium of Military Criminal Laws of the Americas." Any contract providing for publication of this material shall be subject to approval by the Executive Committee.

Topic 2.—Whereas 1. During the work done by the permanent Military Law Section there has been an awareness of the comparative study of the various systems of military justice today enforced in the American States, indicating that in some of them the participation of graduate lawyers is not sufficiently extensive and generalized as is desirable; and

2. In practice this results in many important functions, in the effective administration of justice in this branch of military law, being discharged by persons lacking in judicial qualifications;

Recommends to all the governments of the Americas that they facilitate greater participation by lawyers or experts in military law in the discharge of functions connected with military justice such as prosecution and defense, as well as military judgments, in order to thus assure the most exact and faithful application of the guarantees of the individual rights provided by the constitution and pertinent laws of each country.

Topic 3.—Declares that the Special Permanent Committee on Inter-American Air Law in the Americas shall be a permanent section of Committee I, Public International Law, under the name "Section C. Inter-American Air Law" in order to further the knowledge and unification of air law in the Americas.

Topic 3.—Recommends 1. That, under the proper guarantees, the special nature of commercial aircraft be recognized whenever rights in such aircraft are being adjudicated.

2. That the American states modify pertinent existing legislation so that rights in aircraft be adjudicated expeditiously in abbreviated procedures whenever such rights are in issue.

Free topic.—Whereas the historical mission of America is to offer to man a land of freedom and favorable conditions for the development of his personality and the fulfillment of his just aspirations, as proclaimed in the preamble of the Charter of the Organization of American states.

The solidarity of the hemisphere and the high aims pursued by it required a political organization of the American States based on the effective exercise of a representative democracy;

The protection of fundamental human rights can only be achieved through the strengthening of the jurisdictional bodies.

In view of the new means and forms of aggression, the instruments governing the regional organizations should be perfected so that their objectives are fulfilled without delay;

Declares 1. To ratify Resolution No. 4 adopted at the XII Conference of the Association held at Bogotá, Colombia, in 1961, the text of which is set forth below.[1]

2. To express its support to the regional organizations which contribute to the carrying out of the principles of the declaration contained in the above resolution, in the interest of self-defense and full exercise of the functions of the American institutions, which should be protected against open or subversive intervention that might affect their true nature.

3. To emphasize the urgency of strengthening the regional organizations giving them resource and means that will assure their prompt and efficient action, so that in the future it may be unnecessary to act according to criteria of mere opportunism for the effective preservation of the sovereignty of the states and the self-determination of peoples.

Declares 1. That the creation of the American nations was inspired by the most profound respect for democratic principles.

2. That it is indispensible that the nations of America assure that a representative republican form of government functions effectively as the political structure which affords the best guarantee of respect for the persons of its citizens, of government by the

[1] Res. 4, XII Conf., Bogotá, Colombia.

people, of the limitation, separation and independence of the powers of the state, of individual and social rights and guarantees, of the responsibility and the regularly elected character of government, of publicity regarding all action of government and, in summary, equality before the law, liberty with order and security with justice.

3. That all peoples and governments of America are earnestly besought that, overcoming passing differences and misunderstandings, and being guided only by the purest legal traditions of the continent, they find a means to establish, for the benefit of all, a vigorous, just and fraternal way of life which can include a productive economic interchange with the greatest freedom of commerce and which can express the indestructible virtues of the principles and rules of law.

4. That it manifests its support for those lawyers who in the American Continent are fighting for the establishment of juridical rules and principles, for respect of human rights and for liberty within their countries.

Section B. United Nations and Hemispheric Organizations

Topic 2.—Recommends that the Special Committee on Integral Law of the Americas be authorized, if it deems it advisable for the more efficient discharge of its work, to request the cooperation of the Judicial Conference of the Americas or of any other related group in order to complete the study initiated within the scope of its activities.

Topic 3.—Whereas 1. It is evident that there is Communist infiltration into this hemisphere through subversion, sabotage, revolutionary strikes, dynamiting attempts, kidnaping and guerrilla warfare, with the purpose of breaking the legal mechanism of the public order, and establishing under terror, forms of government repudiated by the free conscience of America;

2. The facts above set forth are of great concern to the Inter-American system, a clear example of which is the regime actually existing in Cuba;

Resolves 1. To support firmly the resolutions adopted by the Organization of American States at its Ninth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs that took place in Washington, D.C., in July 1964, and at the Tenth Meeting of Consultation of May 6, 1965, because the serious problems created in Cuba are against the principles of the Inter-American system and the solution thereof is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the regional organization.

2. To urge the Organization of American States to carry out the provisions of the last paragraph of clause five of the resolution approved by the Ninth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, of July 1964.

Topic 3.—Whereas 1. According to Article 52 of the Charter of the United Nations, members that are parties to the regional agreements, or that constitute regional organizations "will do everything possible to effect a peaceful settlement of controversies of a local nature, through such agreements or organizations, before submitting them to the Security Council";

2. The Organization of American States is the component regional organization to act collectively in the case of the Dominican Republic according to Articles 5, clause (d), 19, 25, 39, 43, 52, and related ones of the Charter of the OAS, and as such is actually taking collective action; and

3. The Organization of American States has not yet terminated its mission of conciliation in order to assure a peaceful settlement of the conflict in the Dominican Republic, nor has it submitted the case to the consideration of the Security Council (Article 52, par. 2, in fine U.N. Charter).

Declares that the OAS having original jurisdiction over the present case of the Dominican Republic and not having yet exhausted all efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement of the conflict, no other international organization has any competence to interfere in the case, until the OAS itself submits it to the Security Council of the United Nations.

(The delegation from Chile abstained from voting this Resolution.)

Topic 3.—Recommends to present to the Organization of American States the following Doctrine:

"Article 1. The recognition and the denial of recognition of the Governments of the American States is not a political matter for each American State to judge, independently, according to its own criteria and convenience.

"Article 2. The changes of government which do not interrupt the constitutional order of the republican system of the three equal powers of government are not a matter of collective action of recognition nor of rupture of diplomatic relations.

"Article 3. Any American State which in its internal political organization breaks this regional juridical structure, in violation of the American Constitutions, departing from the uniform system of representative democracy, even though temporarily, is out of the continental structure and of the American community.

"Article 4. It is the duty of the Organization of American States, according to a strict juridical and nonpolitical point of view, to determine if a change of government in an American State has departed from or has stayed within the obligatory standard of the American Constitutions."

Topic 3.—Resolves to study the projects presented and any proposals related to the creation of the Permanent Inter-American Court of Justice, with the view to having reports and resolutions presented at the XV Conference.

Topic 3.—Resolves that the Inter-American Committee for the Juridical Defense of Western Democracy, created at the X Conference of the Association held at Buenos Aires, Argentina, in 1957, will be governed according to the following By-Laws:

"Section 1. The Committee will have a Chairman and a Secretary elected by the Executive Committee, the latter one at the suggestion of the Chairman of the Committee.

"Section 2. The Chairman of the Committee is authorized to form national committees in the countries where they do not yet exist, obtaining for this purpose the necessary cooperation of the Presidents of the National Bar Associations of those countries.

"Section 3. The Chairman of the Committee is authorized to recruit new individual members and to carry on all activities towards the fulfillment of its functions.

"Section 4. The Chairmen of the national committees will have the same authority within their respective countries.

"Section 5. The Chairmen of the national committees will issue an annual report of their activities to the President of the Inter-American Committee who in turn will submit a full report every two years to the Conference of the Association.

"Section 6. The national committees may solicit sustaining dues from their members which will be authorized by the Inter-American Committee with previous approval of the Council of the Association. These national committees may also receive donations and contributions from public or private organizations. The national committees will keep the Inter-American Committee informed as to all income and disbursements, which, in turn, will render an annual statement to the Council of the Association."

Topic 4.—Resolves to reaffirm the principle of International Law that the law of the flag state governs all matters of the vessel's internal affairs, management and labor relations.

Topic 4.—Resolves to oppose the attempt of any state to discriminate against vessels of foreign registry by discriminatory quotas, charges or other similar devices.

COMMITTEE II. PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW

Topic 2.—Whereas 1. The Inter-American Council of Jurists has approved the 1952 Report of the Inter-American Juridical Committee which proposes eight Rules of Law for harmonizing civil law and common law procedures, and has recommended that the topic of international cooperation in judicial procedures be placed on the agenda of the XI Inter-American Conferences;

2. The United States has recently revised its Federal Rules of Procedure and Statutes governing assistance in all judicial proceedings to accord maximum assistance to foreign and international tribunals, and is preparing to embark on a program of drafting procedural treaties; and

3. Compliance with the recommendations of Resolution 8 adopted at the XIII Conference at Panama has been advanced by the papers of the members of the Permanent Committee on International Judicial Procedure at this Conference.

Recommends 1. To broaden the recommendation of Resolution 8, adopted at the XIII Conference at Panama referring to procedure in civil and commercial matters only to include procedure in all judicial proceedings, and to confirm such recommendations;

2. To request the Permanent Committee on International Procedure to draft a model bilateral procedural treaty establishing procedural norms in all forms of judicial proceedings for adherence by a country of the common law and a country of the civil law for presentation to the XV Conference; and

3. To invite the Inter-American Academy of International and Comparative Law with its seat in Lima to make a comparative study of the procedural systems of the United States, the countries of Latin America and Canada relating to Inter-American judicial cooperation.

COMMITTEE III. CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

Topic 1.—Recommends 1. To reaffirm resolutions adopted at previous conferences regarding the independence of the judiciary.

2. Distribution and publication by national member associations of all pertinent resolutions adopted in order that effect may be given to them.

3. That in the appointment and promotion of members of the judiciary and of the Department of Justice, there should be taken into account the educational and moral qualifications of the candidates as well as the opinion of the bar associations and of the judiciary itself, by means of a just and adequate system.

4. That, while in exercise of their duties, members of the judiciary should not be removed during good behavior, the constitutional limitation because of age not violating the principle of irremovability.

5. That the system of popular voting for nomination of judges should not be considered desirable and that the nomination for a fixed term, even with the possibility of reelection, be considered even less desirable.

6. To assure by constitutional provisions the financial independence and the initiative of the judiciary in matters of laws concerning organization, administration and judicial procedure.

7. That it should be considered indispensable that the compensation of members of the judiciary be in accord with their rank and be protected from inflationary trends, a principle which should extend to retired members of the judiciary.

8. That the remunerating of members of the highest tribunals of each country should not be less than that of members of other agencies, except that of the Chief of State.

9. The creation in each country of an institute to study the problems of the judicial system in order to improve the professional qualifications of its members and especially of those who desire to become members of the judiciary.

10. The creation of associations of members of the judiciary in order to promote a better administration of justice.

Topic 1.—Declares: 1. That the reorganization of the judiciary by order of the Executive power is a violation of the principle of irremovability of judges and an attempt against its independence.

2. That the appointment of a judge without tenure constitutes an irreversible act for the Executive Power.

3. That the bar associations must demand compliance with resolution 13 (IX Conference, Miami, 1959) once the constitutional authorities are restored, which provides for their immediate reinstatement and compensation for the time they were illegally removed.

4. That in the States where the Constitution provides that petitions for agreements concerning nomination of judges be filed when the next regular sessions of the legislative body are held, a constitutional amendment should be proposed to the effect that a special session be held and that a reasonable time be given for the handling of these petitions, before the termination of the regular sessions.

5. That if there is no constitutional obstacle, the judicial organic law shall contain regulations as to the time during which nominations for the appointment of judges are considered, as well as the procedure to be followed in the legislative body to determine the qualification of the nominees.

6. That it must be insisted in the public interest that the nominations for appointments shall not be secret.

7. That in parliamentary practice concerning appointment of judges, the preponderance of the senator from the State of the nominee or where the vacancy is to be filled, should be excluded.

Topic 1.—Recommends 1. That the bar associations report and inform the Special Permanent Committee on Judicial Power established by Resolution 14 (XI Conf., Miami, 1959) regarding attempts against the independence of the judiciary, the free exercise of the legal profession, and violation of the principle of irremovability of judges, so that the delegates of each country may make a report at the XV Conference, in accordance with the provisions of Resolution 9 of the XIII Conference at Panama, 1963.

2. That in view of the importance to the judiciary of the quality and efficiency of its members, the agenda for the XV Conference include topics concerning the system of recruiting, nomination, appointment and removal of judges.

Topic 1.—Whereas 1. The independence of the judicial power, the irremovability of judges and the free exercise of the functions delegated to lawyers are basic fundamental rights.

2. The violation of these fundamental rights affect all lawyers in their role as officers of the court.

Resolves to reaffirm its irrevocable decision to support the independence and irremovability of the judiciary and the free exercise of the legal profession.

Declares its solidarity with the judges and lawyers of Cuba engaged in this duty.

Topic 2.—Whereas 1. A project for a Convention on Human Rights and the Creation of a Court on Human Rights in America was submitted by Dr. Alfredo López Guevara and consideration was given to a project for the creation of a Central American Court of Human Rights prepared by Freedom Through Law, Inc.; and

2. Activities are being carried out by the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and the Charter of the OAS contains provisions referring to human rights;

Resolves 1. To express its appreciation to Dr. López Guevara and to Freedom Through Law, Inc., for their projects which are a contribution in the field of human rights.

2. To request the Secretary General to send copies of the above mentioned works to members of Committee III, as well as to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the OAS.

3. To suggest to the OAS that it charge the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights with the task of revising, in the light of progress achieved in the international field since 1959, the Draft Convention on Human Rights approved by the Inter-American Council of Jurists in 1959, in Santiago de Chile, with a view to convene, after all pertinent steps have been taken, an Inter-American Specialized Conference for a definite approval of a convention on this subject. Said convention must provide for the creation of a Commission and an Inter-American Court of Human Rights.

4. To express its support of the useful activities being developed by the said Inter-American Commission on Human Rights in spite of its limited competence; and to state that, in order to protect the fundamental rights which call for more urgent and effective international protection, the present Commission of the OAS must be given powers to receive and consider the communications addressed to it by any person or group of persons or by associations having legal existence in the respective countries in which a violation of fundamental rights and guarantees of the individual has been committed in the cases in which all internal recourses have been exhausted; the effective observance of what is prescribed by the pertinent articles of the Charter of the OAS and by the American Declaration of Rights and Duties of Man will be assured, in this way.

5. To recommend to the Committee on Creation of a Court of Human Rights that it proceed intensively with the studies on the subject of human rights, and present its observations and suggestions to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and to the XV Conference of this association.

Topic 3.—Whereas, the phenomenon of judicial delay is not a new one, nor is it circumscribed to one definite area of the continent, and in recognition of its damaging effects on the administration of justice;

Recommends 1. That in each country the respective bar associations denounce and combat judicial delay by every means within their powers, using for this purpose the various procedures and means used for this end and primarily, by controlling judicial statistics relative to cases pending in court and to be solved, and stimulating the exercise of the power of supervision and control of the superior organs of the administration of justice, with the special purpose of avoiding personal confrontations with the lawyers and judges intervening in trials and the unhappy results that might arise with prejudice to the parties.

2. That, in particular, the bar associations should insist on the application of procedures and penalties that have been established in each country to prevent and inhibit judicial delay and to promote, in serious cases, the application of the mechanism of removal of those judges who are notoriously and repeatedly guilty of delay.

3. That, in those cases in which delay in scheduling or solving them is caused primarily by congestion in the courts, the bar associations should promote the creation of new courts or tribunals and the corresponding allocation of personnel and funds.

4. That, in each country, according to the factors which cause delay, the appropriate measures which have been found to be effective, be applied to insure the relief of court congestion, such as the changes of procedural laws, the adoption of severe sanctions against obstructive or delaying procedures by the parties, the inactivity or lack of diligence of the judges and/or personnel of the courts, formal incompatibilities, the avoidance of overlapping of court schedules, the acceleration of removal procedures, etc., and especially the perfecting of the methods of recruitment and selection of judges, which will insure a sense of vocation, competence and dedication to their duties, without undervaluing any of these qualities, in view of the complexity and seriousness of the problem of delay and the damage that it might cause.

5. That the bar associations should take equal care in requiring compliance with the standards of professional ethics on the part of their members in those matters relating to their activities, to the nonobstruction of judicial process, and to the perfecting of procedural laws.

COMMITTEE IV. MUNICIPAL LAW

Topic 1.—Considering the great need for low- and moderate-cost housing and urban development in the Americas now and in the years ahead, which need has been recognized by the Alliance for Progress; and

Recognizing the activities of the Association's Special Committee on Housing and Urban Development Law including its program at this XIV Conference and its proposed Program of Legal Workshops on Housing Legislation and Procedures for the purpose of identifying and resolving the legal obstacles to housing construction and urban development in the Americas on a sound legal and constitutional basis;

Resolves to commend the direction and efforts of the Special Committee on Housing and Urban Development Law and to urge the committee to continue its good work to achieve the objectives of more adequate housing and urban development on a sound legal and constitutional basis in the Americas, including comparative studies, training, and action respecting the legal problems of land tenure, transfer of title, mortgage financing, and creditor security and insurance, inflationary adjustments, such as the use of convertible debentures and adjustable savings and loan accounts; planning and zoning, building codes and permits, rent control, import duties on housing materials, real estate taxes, homestead legislation, and other related legal problems.

Topic 2.—Whereas real estate promotion should be encouraged through special well-studied legislation, that will foresee its essential matters, tending to solve the permanent problems of municipal development, determinant factor in the housing crisis, and with the purpose of promoting real estate,

Recommends that the following topics be included in those to be considered at the XV Conference:

(1) The use of national and international credit, by American municipalities without interference by other spheres of government;

(2) The special standards that should regulate the restrictions of private ownership for esthetic, urbanistic, and other public reasons; and

(3) The problems presented to municipal authority by the establishment of the seat of superior spheres of government (national or State) in the respective districts.

COMMITTEE V. CIVIL LAW

Section A. Persons, family law and succession

Topic 1.—Whereas 1. This section has studied the differences between the forms of wills which are valid according to the laws of the civil law countries of Latin America and under the common law jurisdictions of North America.

2. The committee has found that there are problems affecting the validity of wills due to lack of knowledge of the laws of each

system by lawyers of the other, particularly with respect to wills executed outside the jurisdiction where the will eventually will be administered.

Resolves 1. That, subject to prior approval thereof by the Executive Committee, the Civil Law Committee be authorized to publish essential differenecs in the laws with respect to forms of wills, in civil law and common law jurisdictions of the Western Hemisphere with a view to minimizing the annulment of such wills.

2. That the Inter-American Academy of International and Comparative Law be requested to prepare a comparative study of Succession Laws, in the juridical systems of the United States and those of the most representative countries of Latin America, with special reference to the form of wills.

Section B. Intellectual and industrial property

Topic 1.—Whereas 1. The countries in Latin America need to continue expanding their program of industrialization; and

2. The countries that have adhered to the Paris Convention of 1883 have found it beneficial to their development.

Recommends 1. To the member associations and to individual members to obtain the adherence of their countries to the "International Union for the Protection of Industrial Property" of 1883, and its amendments; and

2. That the Special Committee on Intellectual and Industrial Property appoint representatives in each member country to obtain and coordinate the efforts herein recommended to further the adherence to the "International Union for the Protection of Industrial Property" and to present to the 15th Conference a comparative report of the present situation and that prevailing at the time of the Conference.

Free topic.—Whereas the Organization of American States has shown an increasing interest in the problems of industrial property as has been evidenced by the decision of the Inter-American Council of Jurists taken at its fifth meeting that took place in San Salvador, Republic of El Salvador, on January 25–February 5, 1965, to make a study of the laws of industrial property.

Recommends to the member associations and to individual members that they cooperate in the most effective way in the studies that the Organization of American States will conduct through its technical branches regarding laws relating to industrial property in the Americas.

COMMITTEE VI. CIVIL AND COMMERCIAL PROCEDURE

Topic 1.—Recommends approval of the study presented by Dr. Jaime Malamud in favor of the establishment of Arbitration Commissions composed of lawyers designated by regional chamber of commerce, which should previously prepare lists of these arbitrators. The procedure depends on making of such lists of impartial lawyers-arbitrators of recognized competence and sufficient experience in commercial matters; and in the establishment of a speedy procedure to which the parties would subject themselves; and further

Resolves, That awards made in accordance with standards established in any of the American Republics should be enforced in all of them.

(The delegate from Chile abstained from voting on this resolution.)

COMMITTEE VII. COMMERCIAL LAW

Section B. Banking laws and trusts

Topic 2.—Whereas 1. A modern code of commercial laws entitled "The Uniform Commercial Code" has been adopted in a majority of the States of the United States of America; and

2. That code sets forth rules of law in logical order suitable for orderly comparison with the corresponding rules of other nations; and

3. A comparison of all such rules of commercial law would serve three principal purposes:

(a) To provide a ready reference and index to the principal commercial laws of each nation of the hemisphere.

(b) To disclose areas of the laws of each nation which are inadequate or antiquated.

(c) To provide a basis from which the various nations may progress toward uniformity to an extent commensurate with the historical background of each nation's laws and with contemporary international business practices.

Resolve 1. That the Committee recommend the immediate translation of the Code into the Spanish language and the distribution of copies thereof to each member of the Association and to the law schools of each member nation for study of comparative law and comment; and

2. That the Chairman of the Committee be empowered to appoint members of a section for the special purpose of preparing a plan of implementation for this resolution and for the solicitation of funds for financing said translation and distribution and for the comparative study which is the objective of this resolution.

Section C. Transportation and communications

Topic 1.—Recognizing the importance of telecommunications to the national economic development of the countries of the Americas, the progress which has been made, and the plans which have been drawn up for creating adequate terrestrial communications systems throughout Latin America and preparing for the participation of the countries of the Americas in a global communications satellite system;

Recognizing the role which the lawyers of the Americas must play in the orderly development of communications systems, both terrestrial and space, for peaceful purposes.

Recommends 1. That the Secretary General inform organizations such as CITEL, the ITU and COMSAT of our interest in activities of those organizations, particularly as to the continuing development of terrestrial and space communications for the Americas and request such organizations to the extent feasible, to permit a representative or representatives of this Association to participate in an observer capacity in any conference of a public nature which may be held in the next 2 years, and to receive agenda and published reports thereof.

2. That Committee VII prepare for the XV Conference a report on the measures taken and planned to be taken toward solving the legal problems of organization, harmonization of laws, and participation in a global communications system, under existing agreements and under such new international agreements as may be entered into, all in the interest of fostering the orderly development of outer space communications.

Free topic—Recommends that the following topic be among those selected for the XV Conference:

"Juridical Aspects of an Economic Inter-American Community within the basic guidelines of the European Economic Community or Common Market as far as they may be applicable to the realities of the countries of the American Hemisphere and designed to include all the nations thereof or as many as may concur."

COMMITTEE VIII. CRIMINAL LAW AND PROCEDURE

No resolutions.

COMMITTEE IX. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW AND PROCEDURE

Section A. Food, drug, and cosmetic law

Topic 1.—Whereas: proposals have been made in some countries of the Western Hemisphere virtually to abrogate drug patents by requiring compulsory licensing of those patents, whether or not the product to which the patents relate is adequately marketed in the country concerned. If enacted such legislation will greatly diminish the significance of patent rights relating to pharmaceuticals. In consequence they will:

1. Reduce the value of patents in stimulating the discovery and marketing of future pharmaceuticals.

2. Curtail the influence of patents in encouraging local manufacture, local employment and the development of local skills and know-how.

3. Increase the emigration of scientists from such countries to those countries where their work will be better recognized and protected through patents.

The results are contrary to the well-being and continued economic progress of the countries of the Western Hemisphere. Additionally, these proposals involve an undesirable distinction between patents for pharmaceuticals and patents in other fields, which is contrary to the desirable state of the law.

Recommends that drug patents like all patents receive equal and effective protection.

Topic 1.—Believing that the public interest is best served by stimulating research and development and the discovery of new remedies for the diseases that afflict mankind, and that the sale of drug products at a reduced price, commonly referred to as "social medicines," should therefore be restricted to government institutions or organizations rendering free medical service, and that such products should meet the same standards of quality and purity as other products;

Recommends 1. That "social medicines" should bear the manufacturer's name; trademark, if any; code or batch number; and seal similar to that used on free samples; and that unauthorized sales should be prevented by appropriate prosecution; and

2. That at the present time the best way to maintain the safety of our most prized possession "health" is by maintaining and in some cases strengthening patent protection as a spur to industry to make bigger and more important discoveries.

Topic 5.—Whereas 1. The integration of the economies of the countries, signatories of the Treaty of Montevideo, which establishes the Latin American Free Trade Association, will only be achieved by the gradual elimination of the charges and restrictions of all sorts which hamper the importation of products that originate in territories of any of the contracting parties;

2. In the short term elapsed since the Montevideo Treaty was first enforced it has been observed that the diversity of sanitary and food legislation, in force in the different countries, has been an obstacle to the success of the negotiations or has reduced or annulled the advantages granted in the negotiations;

3. In the LAFTA organization as well as in specialized professional congresses a movement has been started to promote the adoption of only one legal text which will regulate the negotiations and it has been suggested that it is advisable to appoint a committee of experts to engage in this task on the basis of the Latin American Food Code; and

Notwithstanding the merits of the proposal made in the preceding paragraph the appointment of a committee of experts would constitute a duplication of the work performed for many years by the Latin American Food Code Drafting Committee and will give rise to delays;

Recommends that the Latin American Food Code be adopted as sole legal instrument to regulate the negotiations carried out among the member countries of the Latin American Free Trade Association.

Topic 7.—That article 4 of the bylaws of section A—Food, Drug and Cosmetic Law, Committee IX, be revised to read as follows:

"As the successful accomplishment of some of the tasks of the section may require the employment of salaried personnel on a full- or part-time basis, and the expenditure of funds for the purchase and translation of books, legal articles, papers and other text material, travel expenses, etc., it is suggested that the section be authorized to have its own separate funds which will be administered by a treasurer and an assistant treasurer. Such necessary funds shall be obtained from:

"(a) Annual dues from individual regular members in an amount as established from time to time by the executive committee of the section, subject to approval by Executive Committee of the Association.

"(b) Voluntary contributions from individuals, companies or associations who are interested in supporting and encouraging legal research work in this field.

"(c) Any other property belonging to the section."

COMMITTEE X. FISCAL LAW

Section A. Taxation

Topic 5.—Whereas 1. The problems of double taxation which exist between the countries of the American Continents constitute an impediment to the development of most of these countries;

2. Practice has shown that the solution cannot be found for the time being through the uniform adoption of a single basis for taxation;

3. Consequently, the practical solution is to be sought in the signing of international treaties;

4. The distribution of the right to tax between the various countries of the American Continents must be made taking into consideration the promotion of economical and social development, strengthening the bonds of Pan American solidarity, which would oblige to depart, under certain circumstances, from the strict application of the principle of reciprocity;

5. Notwithstanding that it has previously been stated that tax treaties should have preferably the form of multilateral conventions, practice counsels that bilateral treaties be prepared;

6. That the ideal of multilaterality may be attained by providing, in bilateral tax treaties, clauses allowing that other countries might adhere to them, except in those cases referring to problems specifically interesting only to the two contracting countries.

Recommends 1. That the countries of the Western Hemisphere attempt to enter into international treaties, conventions, or agreements which prevent double taxation to facilitate fuller cooperation between the capital exporting countries and those which need the investment of foreign capital are in the process of social and economic development.

2. That the international treaties, conventions, or agreements ought to be made in bilateral form and open to the subscription of third countries and without prejudice to the convention of multilateral treaties.

3. The international treaties, conventions, or agreements ought to contain clauses referring to the following aspects:

(a) Cover all or at least most of all taxes regardless of whether payable to national, federal, state, provincial or municipal governments.

(b) Provide tax credits equal to the amount of the taxes paid in those countries in which the investment is made.

(c) Provide the appropriate rules for recognizing a tax credit in the amount of the taxes exempted by the country receiving the investment within the conditions established in the laws of each country.

(d) Take into consideration other rules or provisions of fiscal treatment which stand to stimulate investment in countries which need them.

(e) In the international treaties, conventions, or agreements the contracting countries should determine, with the most precision possible and for the sole purpose of application, the treaties, conventions, or agreements in which country is the source of taxable income.

4. To effectively apply the treaties, conventions, or agreements there ought to be provided a full service of information between the contracting countries.

5. In order that the recommendations approved by this Conference may lead to practical results and recognizing that it is necessary to make such recommendations known to all national and international organizations which can contribute to giving practical effect to such recommendations, the Secretary of the Permanent Committee on Taxation shall bring this recommendation to the attention of the Organization of American States, the Inter-American Committee of the Alliance for Progress, the Economic and Social Committee for Latin America, the Inter-American Bank for Development, the Latin American Free Trade Association, the Central American Common Market, the Ministries or Departments of Foreign Affairs, and of Finance, of countries of America, as well as of the Latin American Institute of Taxation, the National Bar Associations, the National Societies dealing with the studies of this branch of law, and the National Institutes of Accountants.

COMMITTEE XI. SOCIAL ECONOMIC AND FOREIGN INVESTMENT

Topic 1.—Whereas 1. The Charter of Punta del Este encourages and supports the concept of regional integration with a view to the ultimate fulfillment of aspirations for a Latin American common market;

2. In moving toward the accomplishment of this objective the Central American countries have adopted a series of treaties looking toward the establishment of regional integration of their countries; and

3. Regional integration will lead to raising the standard of living of the population in the area as well as encourage social and economic stability in the Central American countries;

Resolves, To support appropriate measures taken at the national and international levels, leading to the accomplishment of regional integration of the Central American countries; and

To urge Central American bar associations, other legal organizations and individual lawyers to undertake programs designed to facilitate the adoption of legal measures to accomplish regional integration of their countries.

Topic 8.—Whereas 1. Realistic national and international antitrust policies are important to the economic development of countries within the framework of the rule of law; and

2. The rapid economic, social and political changes that are confronting the developing countries require not only correct and thoughtful appraisal but also immediate and practical responses.

Recommends 1. That continuing study be made of the issues and problems involved, and that the subject of governmental control of restrictive business practices be on the permanent agenda;

2. That in view of the importance, urgency and scope of the subject, a separate committee on restrictive business practices be established, to carry on a continuing program of studies and action, and that particular attention be devoted to:

(a) The prevention of monopolistic and other restrictive practices with detrimental effects on the national economy or on international trade or investment;

(b) The role of economic, social and institutional factors in developing enforceable and effective antitrust policies;

(c) The development of factfinding and legal procedures which will afford proper protection to private interests and will result in efficient antitrust administration in the public interest;

(d) The potentialities of preliminary investigation by expert administrative bodies, informal negotiation procedures and alternatives to a purely criminal and legalistic approach to the problem;

(e) The establishment of international machinery for the interchange of relevant information and the development of agreed on policies in areas beyond the competence of any single national state.

Free topic.—Whereas, 1. The importance of avoiding international double taxation in order to develop economic integration was recognized in the treaties of Tegucigalpa of June 10, 1958, and Managua of December 13, 1960, which constituted the Central American Common Market;

2. The existing Latin American Free Trade Association and the recently proposed Latin American Common Market have similar objectives; and

3. The Model Convention adopted on July 29, 1943, by a Regional Tax Congress under the auspices of Fiscal Committee of the League of Nations envisages such a convention on a multilateral basis, and the convention between Honduras and the United States signed on May 18, 1956, to encourage investments in Honduras could be expanded to apply multilaterally to these five countries of the Central American Common Market and adopted by all the countries of the Latin American Free Trade Association and eventually the Latin American Common Market,

Recommends, 1. To the competent authorities of the respective governments that appropriate steps be taken to conclude as soon as possible a multilateral convention for avoiding the double taxation of income and property; and

2. That the officers of the association transmit this resolution to said authorities and actively interest the association in the accomplishment of this objective.

Free topic.—Recommends that the cooperative is one of the avenues for a greater participation of the whole population in the social, political and economic life of the Americas.

Free topic.—Recommends the creation of a committee on labor law to prepare a report for consideration at the XV Conference.

COMMITTEES XII AND XIII. LEGAL EDUCATION AND DOCUMENTATION

Section A. Legal education

Topic 2—Resolves: 1. That a Permanent Committee consisting of Deans of Law Schools of the Western Hemisphere be established under the auspices of the Association to study ways and means of promoting the exchange of professors and students of law of the Western Hemisphere, as well as all aspects of legal education related thereto and that, until XV Conference, this Committee consist of the Dean of the Law School of the University of Puerto Rico, the Dean of the Law School of New York University, the Dean of the Faculty of Law and Social Sciences of the University of Buenos Aires, and the Dean of the School of Law of the University of Brazil (Rio de Janeiro).

2. That at all future Conferences of the Association there be held a Symposium of Deans and Professors of the Law Schools of the Western Hemisphere to exchange information and to study specific subjects of common concern to be determined by the above Committee of Deans.

3. That a center for the collection and dissemination of legal bibliographical material be established and that the above Committee of Deans explore ways and means for implementing this resolution.

COMMITTEE XIV. ACTIVITIES OF LAWYERS

Section B. Professional standards of conduct

Topic 1—Recommends that the proposed Code of Ethics include provisions reading as follows:

"Art.—. The professional privilege include statements made by the client, who may be a natural or juridical person, to the lawyer, not only under an express promise of secrecy, but also by the mere exposition of his case while seeking professional counsel.

"Art. —. The attorney-client privilege is a duty and a right; a duty which continues after the termination of the attorney-client relationship; and a right of a lawyer appearing before administrative agencies or courts, requesting statements of any nature of the lawyer respecting matters which are the subject of professional privilege.

"Art. —. The professional privilege does not include any proposal or consultation by a client regarding the commission of an offense punishable by law; but even in this instance the lawyer should refuse to divulge any information given to him by an unworthy client; and only in grave cases should the lawyer take measures which his best judgment requires him to take in order to avoid the consummation thereof and to protect possible victims, and endeavoring to avoid the accusation against the client.

"Art. —. The professional privilege protects and includes, in addition to the communications, documents, plans, drawings, photographs, and objects which the client may have entrusted to him for the study and defense of his case."

Section C. Assistance and social security for lawyers

Topic 1.—Considering: 1. The significance of social security benefit programs to the welfare of the countries of the Americas and their importance to the economic security of their peoples; and

2. The contribution made by the legal profession, as practicing attorneys and as citizens concerned with the public welfare, to the establishment, development and furtherance of such programs; and

3. The obligation and desirability of the legal profession continuing to be interested in and concerned with the further advancement of such programs and the need also for the profession being at all times fully informed of the directions taken by, and the modifications made in, such programs throughout the countries of the Americas,

Resolved, To enable the legal profession to readily exert its influence toward extending and improving quality and effectiveness of such programs, to appoint and establish at this Conference a Committee on the Social Security Programs of the Americas which shall arrange for the compilation, publication and distribution to the members of the Association comprehensive summaries and analysis of the social security laws of the various countries of the Americas.

COMMITTEE XV. NATURAL RESOURCES

Section B. Atomic energy laws

Topics 1 to 4.—Whereas: 1. The XI Conference of the Association aproved the recommendation of the Permanent Central Committee on the Legal Aspects of the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy that the association suggest to the Organization of American States that the latter give consideration to the preparation of an Inter-American Convention on Third Party Civil Liability in the field of nuclear energy to be submitted to the member states for consideration;

2. The Inter-American Nuclear Energy Commission, an entity of the OAS, considered this matter with the assistance of the Department of Legal Affairs of the General Secretariat of the OAS, which prepared basic studies on the problem, and that Commission decided to create a special Legal Committee, composed of five members and later increased it to seven, to study the matter further and, if considered convenient, to prepare a draft Inter-American Convention on the subject;

3. This special Legal Committee prepared a report and two alternative drafts of an Inter-American Convention on Civil Liability for Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy and submitted these drafts to the IANEC which at its fifth meeting held in Valparaiso, Chile, in March 1964, decided to transmit the drafts to the member states of the OAS for their comments and observations. The IANEC also recommended that, taking into account these observations and after additional studies and other steps had been accomplished, an Inter-American Specialize Conference be convened for the purpose of the final drafting and approving of an Inter-American Convention of this subject;

4. At the XIII Conference the hope was expressed that action would be taken to bring into force the Brussels Convention of May 25, 1962, on Liability of Operators of Nuclear Ships; and

5. There are other important matters to be studied in the field of the uses of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes;

Resolves, 1. To express once again its view that it is necessary and important that an Inter-American Convention on Civil Liability for Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy be adopted.

2. To commend the IANEC and the other offices of the OAS which have cooperated with it for the useful work accomplished and to express hope that the activities directed toward the adoption of such a convention will be brought to a successful conclusion.

3. To reaffirm its hope that the American states take steps to become parties to the Brussels Convention of May 25, 1962, on Liability of Operators of Nuclear Ships.

4. To recommend that the Permanent Central Committee on the Legal Aspects of the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy continue to study and report on other matters such as the disposal of radioactive waste in the high seas and international rivers and lakes, the provision of financial protection in cases of nuclear damage, and the problems connected with the operation of nuclear ships.

Topic 5.—Whereas 1. The Permanent Central Committee on the Legal Aspects of Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy in cooperation with the Inter-American Nuclear Energy Commission (IANEC), is currently engaged in a project which is designed to assist Latin American universities in preparing curriculums and teaching materials for use in courses and seminars on nuclear energy law;

2. The Inter-American Nuclear Energy Commission, an entity of the OAS, at its fifth meeting held in Valparaiso, Chile, in March 1964, recommended to the member states of the OAS that they stimulate and give assistance to universities and other centers of higher education in order to establish or expand courses of instruction or seminars on nuclear energy law;

Recommends that the Permanent Central Committee on the Legal Aspects of the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy continue its studies and efforts to assist the Latin American universities in the preparation of curriculums and teaching materials on nuclear energy law, and expresses the hope that the project will be brought to a successful conclusion.

Section C. Laws concerning agriculture

Topic 1.—Recommends that in the absence of the complete information necessary to make a statement regarding the results obtained from the various attempts at agrarian reforms or changes in the countries of this continent, in conformity with resolution No. 51 of the XIII Conference at Panama, the Special Committee appointed pursuant thereto, having heard the various papers presented and bearing in mind also the novelty and complexity of the subject, considers that it is not possible to arrive at definite conclusions regarding the fitness and effectiveness of such attempts; considering the ideals of and desires for a more or less complete change of the socioeconomic structures in the field of agriculture, the lawyers of the continent can no longer remain aloof from their disquieting effects and must see to it that such change is carried out without violence, in accordance with the particular situation in each country and with its respective constitutional rule, and respecting the right of private property and its traditional guarantees, observing in each case the prior payment in cash of the pertinent indemnization, where applicable, as well as the indisputable right of agriculturists not owners to become owners of the land they cultivate, in accordance with the eternal principles of justice and equity.

NOTE: The delegate of Mexico did not agree that the indemnization must necessarily be "prior," it being sufficient in his judgment that it read: "with payment," in order that his vote may be within the provisions of the constitution of the country he represents.

COMMITTEE XVI. INTERPLANETARY SPACE LAW

Topic 2.—Whereas 1. The Magna Carta of Space was duly approved by the XII Conference held in Bogotá, Colombia, on February 3, 1961, except as to article 7 (formerly designated article g);

2. It was likewise duly approved by the new Council on May 25, 1961, in meeting held after the Conference at Bogotá, Colombia; and

3. Article 7 (formerly article g) provides "that there shall be no nuclear experiments in outer space"; and

4. The failure of the governments who possess the greatest nuclear capacity to ban such nuclear tests in outer space between February 3, 1961, and September 25, 1963, resulted in much damage to the world in great fallout; and

5. The United States of America, the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain, on September 25, 1963, ratified a treaty to ban nuclear tests in outer space,

Resolves, To give full approval to Article 7 of the Magna Carta of Space which reads as follows:

"There shall be no nuclear experiments in outer space."

Miscellaneous Resolutions

Resolves, That the resolution and report of February 21, 1963, of the Colegio de Abogados de Puerto Rico be taken into consideration in the determination of the juridico-constitutional structure of the people of Puerto Rico.

Whereas the vital purposes of the association are set forth in its constitution, particularly those related to providing a forum for the exchange of views between associations of lawyers in the various countries of the Americas, and to advancing the science of jurisprudence, and to encouraging cordial intercourse among the lawyers of the Western Hemisphere,

Resolves, To appoint and establish at this conference a special Committee on the Future of the Inter-American Bar Association which shall submit to the council not later than October 31, 1966, its final report, with recommendations, covering and based upon a comprehensive study of the following matters:

(1) A definite description and evaluation of the law-related programs, projects and activities which have been or reasonably should be undertaken by the association in furtherance of its constitutional purposes and in support of the legal aspects and objectives of the Alliance for Progress, including the strengthening of the rule of law and viable, democratic legal institutions in the Americas, on a sound legal and constitutional basis; and

(2) A definitive review and survey of the organizational structure, executive responsibility, administrative control, procedures, and operations of the association at the present time in terms of their adequacy and efficiency in fully effectuating and accomplishing the present and proposed programs and activities stated in (1) above, with specific recommendations as to any changes relating to executive management, organization and administration, and financial resources or other pertinent matters which the committee may find necessary or proper in order to enable the association to accomplish fully, effectively and in a timely manner its legitimate functions and objectives, as suggested in (1) above.

Whereas the Inter-American Bar Association has for one of its purposes the advancement of legal learning, and

Whereas Prof. Manuel Rodríguez Ramos has made a significant contribution to the legal literature of the Americas; namely, the publication of "Casos y Notas de Derechos Reales" of which he is the author, and

Whereas on May 25, 1965, the council of the association, duly assembled at the Americana Hotel in San Juan, Puerto Rico, unanimously adopted a resolution proposed by the Honorable Stephen S. Chandler, chairman of its book award committee, that the 1965 award be conferred upon Prof. Manuel Rodríguez Ramos, for his significant and important contribution to the legal literature of the Western Hemisphere, and

Whereas said action of its council was duly ratified by the association at its general assembly on May 27, 1965, now,

Resolves, That a Book Award Certificate be issued as a testimonial of the admiration and respect of the Inter-American Bar Association for Don Manuel Rodríguez Ramos, lawyer, jurist, professor, illustrious master, and dean emeritus of the faculty of law of the University of Puerto Rico.

Whereas: 1. On April 13, 1865, in the city of Havana was born Antonio Sánchez de Bustamante y Sirven who died in that city in 1950;

2. The jurist Bustamante devoted his life to the service of the law as a lawyer since 1889 when he obtained his doctorate, occupying several times the position of president of the Colegio de Abogados de la Habana, as professor of public and private international law, and dean of the law school, and as a jurist and a judge of the International Court of Justice at the Hague, from 1922 to 1939;

3. The task of uniting the people of this hemisphere with the bonds of law is a principal objective of the association and no one has contributed in a personal way more than this distinguished jurist with the Code of International Private Law which now has the force of law in 16 Latin American countries;

Resolves, To render the warmest tribute to his memory during the 100th anniversary of the birth of the illustrious Cuban, Antonio Sánchez de Bustamante y Sirven.

Memorials

Whereas, 1. Since the time of the XIII Conference held at Panama in 1963 until the commencement of the present Conference in Puerto Rico, the following 26 members of the association departed this life:

W. Neal Baird, Atlanta, Ga.
T. J. Blackwell, Miami, Fla.
Arthur I. Bellin, Reading, Pa.
Forrest A. Betts, Los Angeles, Calif.
Henry F. Butler, Washington, D.C.
German Fernández del Castillo, Mexico.
Floyd H. Crews, New York, N.Y.
William M. Cushman, Washington, D.C.
Emma Dillon, Trenton, N.J.
William W. Dulles, New York, N.Y.
Alberto Fernández Medrano, Havana, Cuba.
A. Joseph Geist, New York, N.Y.
Thomas M. Goldsmith, Portland, Oreg.
Harry J. Green, Baltimore, Md.
Charles E. Lane, Cheyenne, Wyo.
John Marshall, Newport News, Va.
Samuel A. McCain, New York, N.Y.
James M. McInerney, Washington, D.C.
Arnold C. Otto, Milwaukee, Wis.
Harlan S. Parkinson, Kansas
Julius Jay Perlmutter, Miami, Fla.
Nestor Pineda, Bogotá, Colombia
Carl B. Rix, Milwaukee, Wis.
Enrique Sayaguez Laso, Montevideo, Uruguay.
Harry E. Watkins, Fairmont, W. Va.

2. Even since this meeting commenced, here in beautiful San Juan, two other members, Angel Días García, of Puerto Rico, on May 25, and Maurice Brooks Gatlin, of New Orleans, La., on May 29, added to the number of deceased;

Resolves, That there be spread upon the records of this association an expression of our sympathy in the loss of these valued members and that the secretary general send an appropriate letter to the families of the deceased conveying these sentiments.

Whereas, 1. The symposium on legal education, which was included in the program of this conference, fulfilled its objectives by uniting schools of law of the continent in order to deal with the problem of better legal education;

2. For the fulfillment of its work the symposium has had the support and assistance of the School of Law of the University of Puerto Rico which has provided its cooperation and facilities for this purpose,

Resolves, To extend to the University of Puerto Rico and particularly to the school of law its thanks and appreciation for the support given to this symposium on legal education.

Vote of Thanks Declares

Its thankfulness to all those persons who made possible the success of the Conference with their efficient collaboration and especially to:

1. The Honorable Roberto Sánchez Vilella, Governor of Puerto Rico, and the Honorable Secretary of Justice, Hiram Cancio.
2. Hon. Luis Negrón Fernández, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico, and other members of the Supreme Court.
3. Members of Congress.
4. Hon. Mayoress Felisa Rincón de Gautier.
5. President Manuel Abreu Castilo, and Chairman of the Organizing Committee, Antonio J. Bennazar.
6. The School of Law of the University of Puerto Rico.
7. The President of the Colegio de Abogados de Puerto Rico, Lic. Noel Colón Martínez, and the Directors of the Colegio.
8. The Puerto Rican lawyers and their wives.
9. The Bishop of San Juan, His Excellency Monseignor Luis Aponte Martínez, and the Bishop of Ponce, His Excellency Monseignor Fremiot Torres Oliver.
10. The Press in general.
11. The translators, interpreters and other employees.
12. The Directors, General Managers and employees of the hotels that were headquarters of the Conference at which Committees met or other functions took place.

All of whom provided the facilities and made it possible to hold the Conference with such a successful result.

The Association awarded its Gold Medal to the Secretary General, William Roy Vallance, and its Silver Medal to Lic. Antonio J. Bennazar, Chairman of the Organizing Committee.

Judicial Conference of the Americas

The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico, Hon. Luis Negrón Fernández, presented the following statement, resolution, and declaration which were approved by the Assembly:

"To the Council and to the Plenary Session of the XIV Conference of the Inter-American Bar Association:

"As President of the Judicial Conference of the Americas, I have the honor to inform this XIV Conference of the Inter-American Bar Association of the adoption on the part of the Judicial Conference of the Americas, of the Resolution which I attach herewith, regarding the constitution of said Conference as a body of a permanent character, adopted in this city the 26th day of May 1965.

"San Juan, Puerto Rico, on the 28th day of May 1965."

"First Judicial Conference of the Americas

"The First Judicial Conference of the Americas, organized in this city of San Juan Bautista of Puerto Rico, during the days of the 24th through the 26th of May 1965, composed of Chief Justices and Justices of the Supreme Courts of most of the nations of the Americas, in accordance with point 6 of the 'Declaration of San Juan de Puerto Rico' pertaining to the convenience of creating organizations which contribute to insure the enforcement of the principles set forth in that Declaration,

"*Resolves,* 1. That the Judicial Conference of the Americas is organized on a permanent basis with these goals, and meet periodically as it may be deemed necessary.

"2. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico, Hon. Luis Negrón Fernández is designated Chairman of the Conference, and is fully authorized to make all arrangements relative to the establishment of this organization, to draw up its Charter and By-Laws and to take all steps to obtain the necessary means to fulfill its noble objectives.

"Executed in the city of San Juan Bautista de Puerto Rico, on the 26th day of May, 1965.

"(Signed by Chief Justice Luis Negrón Fernández and 13 Justices whose names appear as signatories to the 'Declaration of San Juan.')

"Declaration of Principles of the First Judicial Conference of the Americas

"The First Judicial Conference of the Americas, assembled in the City of San Juan Bautista de Puerto Rico from May 24 through 26, 1965, consisting of Chief Justices and Justices of the Supreme Courts of most of the nations of America, being aware that a stable judiciary, free from interference and pressure of any nature, is of paramount importance for the Rule of Law in a representative democracy, assumes its historic responsibility in the strengthening of democracy and solemnly "Declares;

"First. A vigorous and independent judiciary is a fundamental requisite, a basic element for the very existence of any society that respects the Rule of Law. Judicial independence should be secured by means of legal and constitutional guarantees that render impossible any interference or pressure of any nature with the judicial function.

"Second. The judges and other judicial officers should be selected on the basis of their ability and integrity; political or partisan criteria should not be used in the selection of the members of the judiciary. For the attainment of these goals, taking into consideration the particular judicial structure of each state, adequate mechanisms are needed to make the principles necessary for judicial independence a reality.

"Third. Security in office is an essential element for the achievement of true judicial independence. Judges should not be removed from office except for constitutionally established reasons and by due process of law.

"Fourth. The economic autonomy of the judicial power, based on resources that permit the fulfillment of its high mission,

should be constitutionally recognized. Judges should receive adequate compensation in order to free them from the pressures of economic insecurity. This compensation should not be altered to their detriment.

"Fifth. It primarily behooves the lawyers, as auxiliaries of the judiciary, to make sure that the principles contained in this declaration are truly achieved and maintained.

"Sixth. Judicial independence in America will be greatly strengthened by the creation and development of permanent professional organizations and by the interchange of ideas and experiences through international congresses and conferences.

"This declaration of principles shall be known as the Declaration of San Juan de Puerto Rico.

"Signed in the city of San Juan Bautista de Puerto Rico on this 26th day of May in the year 1965."

Luis Negrón Fernández, President of the Conference, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico; Amílcar Mercader, Magistrate of the Supreme Court of Justice of Argentine; Samuel Barrientos Restrepo, Magistrate of the Supreme Court of Justice of Colombia; Evelio Ramírez Chaverri, Magistrate of the Supreme Court of Justice of Costa Rica; Osvaldo Illanes Benítez, Minister of the Supreme Court of Justice of Chile; Alejandro Montiel Arguello, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Justice of Nicaragua; Luis Martínez Miltos, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Justice of Paraguay; Francisco Paez Romero, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Justice of Ecuador; William O. Douglas, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States of America; Romeo Augusto de León, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Justice of Guatemala; Gustavo Acosta Mejía, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Justice of Honduras; Alredo Maguiña Suero, Dean of the Supreme Court of Justice of Perú; Dr. Hamlet Reyes, Minister of the Supreme Court of Justice of Uruguay; José Gabriel Sarmiento, Nuñez, Magistrate of the Supreme Court of Justice of Venezuela.

ED MERDES OF FAIRBANKS, ALASKA, WORLD PRESIDENT OF INTERNATIONAL JAYCEES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last century an English schoolteacher named Anna helped the King of Siam and his countrymen learn more about the rest of the world.

Today, the efforts to get to know one another better include the work of great international organizations like Junior Chamber International founded in 1944.

Alaska has been honored by the election of Ed Merdes, of Fairbanks, as world president of Junior Chamber International. He was selected this past November when more than 1,500 members of JCI met for the international organization's 20th world congress in Sydney, Australia.

Ed Merdes brings to his new office considerable experience in junior chamber of commerce work. He has been past U.S. Jaycee vice president and, when elected, was the general legal counsel of Junior Chamber International.

A graduate of Cornell University of Law, Ed is a partner in the law firm of McNealy & Merdes, in Fairbanks. He is also general legal counsel to the president and regents of the University of Alaska, and has been city attorney of Fairbanks, past president of the Alaska Junior Bar Conference, and charter member and initial president of the Juneau, Alaska, Jaycees. He was the first president of the Alaska Jaycees. His work in other groups includes the Knights of Columbus, and the Alaska National Guard Officers Association.

He is married and the father of six children.

The January 1966 issue of the U.S. Jaycees Future and JCI World contains Ed Merdes' president's platform entitled "Mainstream of Life" in which he discusses freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, freedom from discriminations, volunteerism, and better communications. I ask unanimous consent that his perspicacious essay be printed in full at the close of my remarks.

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

MAINSTREAM OF LIFE

Fifty years ago there was born a young man's organization dedicated to community and individual development and to furthering understanding, good will, and cooperation among all peoples. These goals of junior chamber were drafted into our constitution. This confers an awesome responsibility on each of us, in our own special way, to work to reach these vital objectives in a most troubled and confused world.

The theme of the 20th World Congress was "Better Leadership for a Better Tomorrow." How can young men throughout the world obtain better leadership and thereby become involved in the mainstream of meaningful activity? By joining the ranks of junior chamber and becoming conversant with its philosophy and involved in its activities.

We, as young men born and reared in free countries, have an obligation to insure the perpetuation of this freedom to our children and our children's children. A strong and vigorous junior chamber organization is surely the most effective means for insuring the passing on of this legacy of freedom. Thus, we must leave no stone unturned to strengthen junior chamber and to extend its benefits to areas where it does not presently exist. To do this we must be prepared to work diligently and incur personal sacrifices.

We have all heard, or given, speeches that we are a leadership training organization dedicated to community development and world peace. But do we really have an understanding of leadership and its consequent responsibilities? Is it chairing a meeting, organizing a committee, successfully completing a project? It is far more than all these. Leadership means more than good public speaking, more than good parliamentary procedure. It means having a sense of values, sense of purpose, and sense of direction.

How can we as an organization insure the proper development and this sense of values? We must first agree on certain fundamental principles of human conduct all men must live by. These are:

Freedom of conscience: Each human being has the inalienable right to worship the architect of our universe in the manner he deems best. It is with deep conviction that I state to you we must be prepared to fight for the right of our fellow man, regardless of race or creed, to exercise this freedom even though we do not share his beliefs.

Freedom of speech: A person also has an inalienable right to hold and publicly state political, religious, or economic opinions. This right exists even though you and I may violently disagree with the opinion. You and I must again be prepared to fight for the right of even our enemy to disagree with us. Failure to accept this philosophy of freedom will surely result in the loss of our own freedom. We must learn to separate the opinion from the person who gives it. Once that is done we have an absolute right to try to peaceably change or modify any opinion with which we disagree.

Freedom from discrimination: The mere accident of birth, which brings us all into this world with a different color of skin, background and resulting customs, must not be the basis for depriving a fellow human being of (1) his equal right to justice under the law, and (2) equal opportunity to share the resources of this world in accordance with his own ability and willingness to work.

Volunteerism: Is the energy and hard work of young men in our 78 member nations and 7,500 chambers throughout the world who are willing to solve our community's problems without pay. This dynamic force which serves our communities can be, and must be, further tapped, thereby releasing the limited resources of government now being expended for local needs, for a nation's productive purposes. This program will bring junior chamber to the attention of responsible government and industrial officials as a truly meaningful group in our society. The organization will then become a vigorous challenge to the imagination of young men of this world not yet in our ranks because of our failure to motivate them.

Better Communications—Our potential enemies, like you and me, have a home, wife and children. They want to live a life free from terror but ignorance and misunderstanding sow the seeds of hate. The friendships and understanding obtained at international conferences, and especially at World Congresses, I predict, will become a great force in the future for abolishing this ignorance and creating an atmosphere of understanding.

Each of us would have a far greater peace of mind and a more confident view of the future if the men and women in the higher positions of government and industry lived by these values. If each of us live by them, and become actively involved in the mainstream of community life, we will insure, more effectively than any other way, peace, understanding, and the perpetuation of these ideals of freedom we all cherish.

I would like to share with you the words of an unknown poet who beautifully conceived what freedom should really mean to you and me:

"Because freedom is old, not young, yet it is born anew in the first cry of a free man's son;
It is not a living thing, yet it dies if we do not love it;
It is not weak, yet it must be defended;
It is light, yet it weighs heavy on him who is without it;
It is without price, yet it dearly costs the one who sells it;
It is not small, but great;
Yet once lost, it is never found again.
Yes, to be born free is an accident;
To live free is a responsibility;
But, to die free is an obligation."

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO INCLUDE RADIOLOGISTS, ANESTHESIOLOGISTS, PATHOLOGISTS, AND PHYSIATRISTS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, for the benefit of my colleagues in the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a resolution adopted at the October conven-

tion of the New York State League of Senior Citizens, Inc.

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

Whereas the members of the New York State League of Senior Citizens, Inc., and their friends both in and out of our Legislative Chambers have worked hard and diligently to help get H.R. 6675 enacted into law, and also get enacted into law the largest benefits in social security coverage in the history of the Social Security Act: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates of the various clubs in the New York State League of Senior Citizens, Inc. in convention assembled in the city of Syracuse, N.Y., on October 2 and 3, 1965, do hereby wish to express our heartfelt thanks for their help.

Whereas we are in agreement with Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS that it was a mistake for the Federal Government to interfere with the usual relationship between the medical specialists and our hospitals, which relationships are customary: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, do hereby urge Senator DOUGLAS, if possible, or some other lawmaker friendly to this attitude, to introduce an amendment to H.R. 6675 to include the services of radiologists, anesthesiologists, pathologists, and physiatrists in plan A of the hospital bill.

ALABAMA VFW CALLS FOR ENACTMENT OF A NEW GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, while we hear occasional grouching from a few sources that a new GI education bill would be too costly, the overwhelming majority of Americans favor it, because without it the unquestioned intellectual abilities of hundreds of thousands of cold war veterans are being wasted and a rich resource in American brainpower goes untapped and neglected. An editorial published in the November 8, 1965, issue of the Department of Alabama VFW News, points to the irrefutable investment features of a new GI bill of rights, and expresses in clear terms the need for enactment during this session of the Congress of a bill unfettered by the petty fears of false economy and the bonds of unequal and unjust coverage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the VFW News editorial of November 8, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FOR WHAT REASON THE DEBATE

Not too long ago, the U.S. Senate passed, by a substantial majority, Senate bill No. 9, which provides educational and vocational training assistance and guaranteed loans for homes, farms, and farmlands.

The educational assistance provides for education or training ranging up to 36 months at the rate of $110 per month, depending upon the length of the veterans' service during the so-called cold war period.

However, when the cold war bill on the House side came under debate in the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, there seemed to be large pockets of resistance, stemming from a determined policy on that part of the executive branch to discourage any such proposal.

According to information that is available, the main reason the administration is against a GI bill for cold war veterans is that they feel its enactment would empty the service of their personnel.

This, in spite of the fact that most cold war veterans are obligated for certain periods of service by contract, and few others are in a position to desert the battlefield immediately to take up their textbooks. Other opponents continue to rant and rave about the great cost of such a venture, forgetting completely about the eloquent record following World War II, which sent millions of veterans back to college and enabled over 7 million to purchase homes.

Of the several million who received education and training after World War II, over 450,000 became engineers, 180,000 became doctors and nurses, another 130,000 became scientists, 107,000 followed law, nearly 300,000 learned the metals trade, 711,000 became mechanics, 138,000 are now electricians, 36,000 chose the ministry, and over 17,000 became writers and journalists.

All of these veterans who went back to school to learn trades and professions are now contributing an indispensable quality to our current prosperity that adds up to success and happiness in community life. They have paid higher income tax because of their increased skills and are buying millions of homes that would not otherwise have had a market. As a result of this, the Nation is stronger and better than ever equipped to handle the present day dangers of renewed hostilities. In short, it could be said that because of the GI bill following World War II and the Korean conflict, the Nation has prospered and become stronger.

Does it not follow that the same results would be forthcoming if the Congress were to adopt the cold war GI bill? It's hard to find a logical argument that proves the same results would not be achieved. Another side to the question is what's the difference between war in Vietnam, war in Korea, or war throughout the world as we knew it in World War II? Are not the bullets just as deadly, the blood spilled just as red, and the wives and the mothers just as grieved? Can we say that a life lost in Vietnam is less valuable or less a tribute to this Nation than one lost in the wars of the past? This brings another logical question. What for is all of the debate? Why not just do what is right and fair and let the record speak for itself in the years to come.

COLLECTED NOTES AND COMMENTS ON U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, Associate Editor John Griffin, of the Honolulu Advertiser recently attended an American Press Institute seminar at Columbia University.

His comments on some of the discussions at the seminar are well worth reading, and I particularly commend the following article to the attention of my distinguished colleagues.

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

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

BY THE WAY: COLLECTED NOTES AND COMMENT

(By John Griffin)

NEW YORK.—Americans view the Berlin wall as a symbol of the horror and tactics of Communist police states—and possibly of our failure to do something about them.

This view may be valid, as far as it goes.

But there are those who now go beyond this and see a positive significance in the Berlin wall. They picture it as a vital factor in improved U.S. relations with Russia and eastern Europe.

The theory, advanced by some highly regarded students of Communist affairs here, goes like this:

The Hungarian rebellion of 1956, and the U.S. failure to help the rebels, marked the end of the Dulles policy of "liberating" the east European satellites.

Erection of the Berlin wall in 1961 relieved another massive problem of the European Communists, the manpower drain to the West through Berlin. This drain was one of quality manpower as well as quantity. It also had vast psychological implications.

The 1962 Cuban missile crisis was another major turning point—in the other direction. It was a time when the United States stood up, drew a nuclear line, and Russia backed off from the horror of atomic war.

The resulting standoff has led to a relaxation of tensions that is one of the two biggest facts of life about Europe today.

The other big fact is the effect of the bitter dispute between Communist China and the Soviet Union which had led to relaxing Russian control—and even a loss of influence—over its former satellites.

This change and relaxation varies considerably from country to country. And complicating things even further, experts warn that "desatellization" is proceeding at a different rate than "de-Stalinization," another important trend.

Vietnam has clouded the picture of improved U.S. relations with Russia and Eastern Europe. It could, in fact, eventually alter or even destroy that picture.

But Communist affairs specialists say it's still possible, in fact even necessary, to think in positive terms about our relations with Eastern Europe.

And there are those who think U.S. policy in Europe is still based mostly on outmoded ideas stemming from a preoccupation with NATO and a lingering Dulles-like philosophy. Says one specialist in European matters:

"I would like to see a more imaginative and creative policy in Eastern Europe. The problem of Europe is no longer security against attack. So the answer is not just a better NATO. That's the kind of situation that gives General De Gaulle such a field day.

"U.S. policy of building 'bridges' between us and the satellites in order to separate them from Russia won't work because the situation has gone far beyond the black-or-white, communism-or-freedom stage.

"More than that, it's a dangerous policy to rely on the forces of nationalism in this region. The result could be a Balkanization of the kind that helped cause two world wars."

The need, as spelled out by critics of past U.S. policy, is for thinking about a situation that would not be built on hostility and tearing nations away from one bloc or the other.

They see the need for a Europe built on agreement between the United States and Russia on one hand, and between Western and Eastern Europe on the other.

Some hopeful signs of new directions in U.S. European policy are seen: One is the President's state of the Union message which mentioned increased trade with Eastern Europe, an important step.

Another dates back to last May when the President said that the reunification of Germany will follow the reunification of Europe. Previously U.S. policy had put this the other way around.

But the debate on U.S. policy in Europe is still very much alive in Washington.

Like everything else, it may well be influenced by the turn of events in Vietnam.

But, like everything else, it also has the potential to be important in Asia. For a positive U.S. policy in Europe would show some Asian Communists that this country does not have to be an enemy.

And along the way maybe the whole world is learning something about the danger of promoting revolutions.

"It's more than just interesting," says one student of such matters, "that the Communist policy favoring wars of national liberation (internal revolutions) is the same as the Dulles policy which the United States had to abandon in the Hungarian showdown of 1956."

But if some lessons about revolution and power have been learned by both sides in Europe, Vietnam can only underscore the painful distance still to be traveled in Asia.

PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL DISTRICT HARD HIT BY CUT IN SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, for many days now I have given a multitude of reasons why the withholding of $3 million appropriated by Congress from the special milk program for school children is foolish and, in the last analysis, an economy that saves no money. I have emphasized the fact that the milk that ordinarily would be purchased with the help of the withdrawn Federal funds will find its way into Commodity Credit Corporation stockpiles at Government expense. I have pointed out the impact this cutback will have on local school budgets which are already strained to the breaking point. Time and time again I have criticized this cutback as one which will most hurt the poorest children who can least afford to pick up the added costs at the local level resulting from a withdrawal of Federal funds.

Today I would like to call to my colleagues' attention a letter from the Ridley Township School District in Folsom, Pa., which tells in plain dollars and cents language that we can all understand what this means to a local school district. The letter is from Robert V. Donato, the district superintendent of schools.

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

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

RIDLEY TOWNSHIP SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Folsom, Pa., January 25, 1966.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Mrs. Catherine B. Nichols, legislative chairman for the Pennsylvania School Food Service Association, called our food service director today to inform her that there will be an additional reduction in the amount of the cash subsidy for the milk served in connection with the special milk program.

Since July 1, 1964, the subsidy has been reduced by 5 percent. According to the information received today the subsidy will be reduced by 10 percent effective February 1, 1966, in Pennsylvania.

Our junior and senior high schools participate in the national school lunch program and, in addition serve an average of 1,512 half pints of milk daily as a separate item on the special milk program. In the remaining 90 days of this school year, the 10 percent subsidy reduction would materially reduce our total income for the year by approximately $550.

We also have eight elementary schools that participate in the special milk program only. An average of approximately 1,400 half pints are served daily in the elementary schools. The 10 percent subsidy reduction will result in less income to the extent of $378 for the second half of the school year for the milk program in the elementary schools of the Ridley Township School District.

Our food service programs are currently operating at a loss. There has been a marked increase in the prices paid for foods, labor, and paper and cleaning supplies. There has been a substantial decrease in the value of foods received from the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

We do not feel that we can afford the loss of income from an additional reduction in the subsidy of milk. We would be most appreciative of your support to promote an appropriation for the special milk program that would be sufficient to provide the subsidy originally established for the special milk program.

Very sincerely,

ROBERT V. DONATO,
Superintendent.

SECRETARY UDALL'S REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OUTSIDE THE NATIONAL DOMAIN

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Members of the Senate will recall that in 1962 the Congress approved S. 981, 87th Congress, a bill sponsored by my senior colleague from the State of Washington and myself to authorize the Geological Survey to make scientific examinations outside of the national domain where determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be in the national interest. Section 2 of the bill, which became Public Law 87-626, directs the Secretary to submit to Congress semiannual reports of all actions taken pursuant to the act.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Secretary Udall's report on the activities of the Geological Survey outside of the national domain for the period of July 1 to December 31, 1965, appear in the RECORD at this point.

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., January 21, 1966.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Pursuant to section 2 of the act of September 5, 1962, "To amend the authority of the Secretary of the Interior exercised through the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior to areas outside the national domain" (Public Law 87-626), the following activities were carried on by the Geological Survey during the reporting period July 1 to December 31, 1965.

1. Dr. Raymond M. Turner, a botanist headquartered in Tucson, Ariz., was in the State of Sonora, Mexico, during the period October 1 to 30 to continue his studies of changes in vegetation in the Southwest as such changes might be related to climate and to the distribution of water resources. The trip was the fourth in a series which Dr. Turner has undertaken as part of this investigation. The purpose of the October trip was to collect plant specimens, obtain plant distribution data, examine Mexican weather stations, and reoccupy and rephotograph old sites.

2. Dr. Donald G. Jordan, the engineer in charge of the Geological Survey's water-resources investigations in the Virgin Islands, spent August 9 to 11 on the island of Tortola, British Virgin Islands, conducting a limited reconnaissance of ground-water conditions. The survey's basic knowledge of these conditions was broadened thereby, and the survey's efforts in the U.S. Virgin Islands should be more effective as a result. A dividend in international good will in the Antilles was also achieved by the short trip. Governor Paiewonsky asked Mr. Jordan to give whatever technical assistance he could to the government of the British Virgin Islands while on Tortola. The trip was financed cooperatively by the Federal Government and the government of the U.S. Virgin Islands.

3. Dr. K. Norman Sachs, a geologist, at the invitation of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, participated aboard the vessel *Thomas E. Washington* in its research cruise to the equatorial Atlantic during the period November 5 to December 25, 1965. The purpose of the trip was to collect plankton samples, to check the distribution of recent radiolaria in the Atlantic Ocean, and to determine stratigraphic relationship in the sediments recovered. The experience is particularly valuable to Dr. Sachs' program of research on recent and tertiary radiolaria.

4. Dr. Robert M. Moxham, a geophysicist, traveled to the Philippines during the period October 16 to November 13 to make infrared surveys of Taal, the volcano which erupted on September 28, 1965. The surveys were made in cooperation with the U.S. Air Force at the site of the eruption to evaluate the volcanological significance of the phenomenon. Mr. Moxham's wide experience in conducting original and fundamental research in geological and geophysical investigations of volcanoes was thus enhanced.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

LONG-TERM AUTHORIZATIONS IN U.S. FOREIGN AID

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the President has asked us for authority to plan U.S foreign aid programs on a 5-year basis. He has not asked us to appropriate the money that far ahead, but simply to give the Agency for International Development permission to do more meaningful long-range planning.

I think it is time the Congress gave the President this authorization.

For a long time now, we in the Congress have insisted that U.S. foreign aid go principally to those countries which make—and stick to—sound long-range plans for their own development. Yet, because the Congress has equally insisted that aid programs be authorized for only 1 year at a time, we have in effect said to those we help: "You must make long-range plans, but we will make short-range plans to help you. Do not do as we do; do as we say." This is a custom that can only help to defeat the very efficiency we ask of others in administering U.S. foreign aid programs.

What is needed in the foreign aid program is not an annual fight over whether there shall be an aid program in the first place. The time that Members of this Congress and the senior officials of the Agency for International Development spend each year plowing the same old authorization ground could better be spent by getting on with doing the job. The annual cliff-hanging authorization debate is, furthermore, a deterrent to AID's recruiting the top quality people it so badly needs. I am sure, that Members of Congress could well use time freed from an authorization wrangle to the benefit of other pressing matters—in-

cluding the ways in which AID actually operates.

We Americans pride ourselves, as we should, on the realism and the efficiency with which we conduct large business enterprises. If we accept, as we must, that long-range planning is equally an imperative for large public enterprise, we shall not hesitate to confer a measure of it on something so vital as foreign aid.

We should support President Johnson's request for long-range planning in the field of foreign aid.

BIG BROTHER

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure held hearings last year on IRS tactics in the Boston IRS district. At that time Mr. Alvin M. Kelley was district director.

We found that IRS had used lock picks to break and enter, had used illegal wiretaps and bugs, and had even resorted to the use of Army sniperscopes.

Although Mr. Kelley disclaimed both knowledge of and responsibility for such activity, he seemed far from repentant.

His lack of repentance is apparently still with him. He was recently promoted to regional commissioner in Chicago. In his acceptance speech he gave every indication of continued use of eavesdropping devices "when necessary."

Will the IRS never be reformed?

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a clipping from the Chicago Daily News of January 21, 1966, on this subject.

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

IRS CHIEF HERE VOWS USE OF "BUG"

Alvin M. Kelley, new regional commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, has pledged a war against organized crime with the use of electronic eavesdropping devices when necessary.

"I would not like to give comfort to those who think we will not continue our use of intensive surveillance techniques," Kelley said.

Kelley said the Intelligence Division of the IRS, which works on criminal violations, has made progress against crime syndicate figures.

In 1965, while he was district director of Boston, Kelley appeared before a Senate subcommittee probing the use of electronic listening devices by Government agents.

Kelley, 50, was sworn in Thursday by U.S. District Court Chief Judge William J. Campbell at ceremonies attended by about 80 Federal employees.

THE RESUMPTION OF BOMBING IN VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, yesterday's decision by President Johnson to resume the bombing of military targets and supply lines in North Vietnam to the same extent as before the pause—based as it is on urgent military considerations—deserves the support of the American people.

At the same time, I approve of the President's determination to continue the peace offensive on a high-priority basis, by his new initiative in the United Nations, based on Pope Paul's suggestions. By the President's action, he is giving the people of the United States and the world every reason for confidence in the determination of the United States to act as a servant of freedom and justice.

I also believe that it is now more urgent than ever that Congress launch a full-scale debate on Vietnam in order to bring congressional and Presidential policy into complete accord.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY REFORM

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, for several years, experts on international economic problems have stressed the need for monetary reform. Many of them devised plans for such reform. But the discussion stayed in the wings, a theoretical problem debated by specialists.

Last fall, monetary reform moved to the center of the stage, as a result of the bold initiatives undertaken by the President. Secretary of the Treasury Fowler carried to all the European capitals the President's plea to get things moving. As a result, intensive work has begun to develop agreement among the major industrial countries on international monetary policy.

Later this year, we expect these negotiations to move into a second stage where other nations of the free world will also be represented. Before long, the world should be able to free its monetary system from domination by the pace of gold mining in South Africa, and the willingness of the Russians to part with their gold. As the President says, we can look forward to "an agreement that will make creation of new reserve assets a deliberate decision of the community of nations to serve the economic welfare of all."

Progress on this front is urgent. The Council of Economic Advisers' report shows how far world monetary reserves are lagging behind world trade, and it explains the threat to the growth of trade that can arise unless funds for international payments begin to grow more rapidly.

The Council's report also describes a promising road to new reserve creation in a two-pronged approach that creates a brandnew reserve unit and simultaneously expands the important automatic lines of credit at the International Monetary Fund. Such a program will give new life and new vigor to world trade and the world's economy. This is a complicated technical area—many countries and many views have to be heard. But it is an issue that is central to the economic welfare of the whole world.

The administration deserves congratulations for fulfilling so clearly America's role of world leadership on this important issue.

THE BOMBING: BEFORE AND AFTER

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, last week I joined with 14 other Senators—all Democrats—in a letter to the President, in which we expressed our collective judgment against the resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam.

The President has now made his decision to resume the bombing. He has given his reasons, and the issue is settled.

However, two editorials have come to my attention that I think should be made a part of this RECORD. The first, appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on January 27, summed up the case against a renewal of the bombings at this time. It was written prior to the announcement of the President's decision. The second editorial appeared in this morning's edition of the New York Times. It is an appraisal after-the-fact which deserves thoughtful reflection.

I ask that both editorials may be published at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Jan. 27, 1966]

CLOSER TO A TRAGIC MISTAKE

By every sign, the psychological buildup is underway for a resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam and for another escalation of the American military commitment. We believe President Johnson will make a tragic mistake if he adopts this course.

He will be doing what the responsible leaders of Britain, France, Japan, and the United Nations, among others, have explicitly urged him not to do. He will be rejecting the counsel of many of the wisest Senators in his own party, and defying the opinion of large numbers of his countrymen. Having projected himself before the world as a champion of peace in Vietnam, he will be creating a situation that not only makes peace improbable, but greatly increases the risks of Chinese intervention.

The President is said to believe that his peace offensive has fully convinced all well-disposed people around the world that only Hanoi stands in the way of negotiations for an honorable settlement. He should beware of becoming the captive of his own propaganda. Even those who accept the sincerity of his desire for negotiations would not necessarily agree that the way to obtain them is to escalate the war once more. And it is impossible for the most favorably disposed friends to ignore the inconsistency between his generally admirable 14 points and his refusal, at the critical point, to make the one concession most obviously necessary to bring about negotiations.

The critical point is the role of the Vietcong, which controls two-thirds of South Vietnam's territory, in both the peace talks and the political future of South Vietnam. So far as his own words go, Mr. Johnson has adopted the ambiguous stance that the Vietcong might be represented in negotiations by Hanoi, and that their views would be considered. But at the level of Secretary Rusk there is no ambiguity. Mr. Rusk repeatedly states that any peace talks must exclude participation by those who have been doing most of the actual fighting, and that there is no place for them in the political future of the country.

Since Mr. Rusk would not hold the position he does if he were not carrying out Mr. Johnson's policy, the conclusion is inescapable that the policy is to seek at the conference table what we have been unable to obtain by armed force—a South Vietnam controlled by a Saigon military government which has no popular base whatever. In a situation of military stalemate, any political settlement must be based on compromise reflecting the military situation, which means that both Communists and non-Communists must participate in the peace and in the interim government responsible for keeping the peace

until free elections could be held. By rejecting this crucial principle the President has in effect surrounded his offer of unconditional negotiations with an obviously unacceptable condition.

The case for renewed expansion of the war is attributed in part to top secret messages from military commanders warning that during the bombing pause Hanoi has continued infiltration of troops and supplies to the south. Yet, according to Secretary McNamara, the infiltration continued, at a steadily increasing rate, throughout all the 11 months of air attack. If the bombing did not stop it, there is no special significance in the fact that the cessation of bombing did not stop it. To make this an excuse for resumed bombing is specious and deceptive. The United States did not halt its own buildup during the bombing pause—we landed 7,000 troops only 10 days ago—and so has no ground to demand that the North Vietnamese should have halted theirs.

The President also can site an urgent dispatch from Ambassador Lodge alleging that the bombing was really a great thing after all—that if it did not halt the infiltration, still it hurt the Communists' morale, to such effect that a lot of them are getting beriberi. This looks like the same shabby self-deception that has been pressed upon our people at every stage of this dismal war. At every stage, the people have been told that the military effort which produced such minimal results in retrospect was about to score exciting victories in the future; and at every succeeding stage the people have painfully learned that the new promises did not fulfill themselves any more than the old ones.

The reason is quite clear. The United States occupies the position in Vietnam of a foreign, white, Western, rich intervener in a domestic revolution, and in such a situation all our awesome military power is simply ineffective against the desire of the Vietnamese people to run their own lives.

The illusion that by waging war in Vietnam we are saving the world from communism can best be dispelled by consulting those we profess to be saving. The clear and overwhelming counsel of the non-Communist nations that matter is for curtailment of the war and a peaceful settlement. If the United States now expands the war instead, and so makes a peaceful settlement more difficult if not impossible, we shall earn not the world's gratitude, but moral isolation.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Feb. 1, 1966]

PEACE AND WAR

In a dramatic move timed immediately to follow resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam, President Johnson has asked the Security Council of the United Nations to intervene in the Vietnam conflict by calling for an international conference and a cease-fire. This is an important if long-delayed gesture by the United States that holds the possibility of opening the way to peace and only emphasizes the sincerity of President Johnson's desire to put an end to the war in Vietnam.

It is unfortunate that the resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam was not deferred at least until there was some evidence of the success or failure of the American move in the United Nations. In fact the good effect of the appeal to the U.N. was in part vitiated by the prior order to resume the bombing. Continuation of the bombing pause would have been a far more effective complement to the U.N. resolution than the renewed bombing attacks on North Vietnamese targets, which will almost certainly lead to further escalation of the war. More men, more planes, more ships, more money, more materiel, more wounded, more dead—these are the unmentioned but probable sequals to the resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam. The course the war took during the previous bombing raids proved that even if the attacks slowed down infiltration from North Vietnam, they did not prevent it. North Vietnamese solders and materiel had been going south in quantity long before the bombing pause.

There is no reason to believe that renewed bombing can bring a different result. The United States could bomb Hanoi and Haiphong and even destroy all of North Vietnam without wiping out the threat posed by China. In fact, the danger of a ground war with Communist China, and perhaps a nuclear world war, would thereby be brought considerably closer.

President Johnson argued that "if continued immunity" were given to North Vietnam, "the cost in lives—Vietnamese, American, and allied—will be greatly increased." But if 100,000 or even 500,000 more American troops are sent to Vietnam, as is predicted, many more lives are surely going to be lost. What was a morass is becoming a bottomless pit.

President Johnson said that "the end of the pause does not mean the end of our pursuit for peace." In this he is, of course, completely sincere. The great conflict over Vietnam that has arisen in the United States is precisely over the meaning of "the pursuit for peace." A number of respected and informed Senators and Representatives; military men like Generals Gavin and Ridgway; academic specialists, teachers, and clerics; and a great many friendly foreign statesmen and commentators, all believed and said that the bombing of North Vietnam ought not be resumed. They all felt that peace had not been given a full and fair chance. They all fear the consequences of the United States getting more and more deeply involved in Vietnam.

So far as the bombing of North Vietnam is concerned, the decision has now been made. American troops in the field must be supported; but so must American efforts—inside the United Nations and outside it—to reach an honorable settlement in order to restore peace and self-determination in Vietnam.

TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I was encouraged to receive recently from the Chicago District Council of the Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks a resolution expressing its strong support for my truth-in-lending bill.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution signed by Mr. William G. Denison, president, and Mr. Kenneth A. Stone, secretary-treasurer, of the Brotherhood be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION ON TRUTH IN LENDING BILL

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY &
STEAMSHIP CLERKS,
THE CHICAGO DISTRICT COUNCIL,
January 19, 1966.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Whereas the consumer is many times gouged by carefully camouflaged sky-high interest rates and hidden finance charges on so-called easy credit dealings with merchants and lending institutions; and

Whereas consumers need and deserve more Federal protection in order to receive full value for every dollar that they spend to feed, clothe, and house themselves and their families; and

Whereas consumers today are particularly subject to lack of information on the terms of costs of credit and are too often unaware of the full cost of a credit transaction, and therefore unable to compare financing costs because of nonstandard ways of reporting interest charges; and

Whereas disclosures of all finance charges in borrowing or credit-buying arrangements is essential to help consumers protect themselves against abnormally high interest rates and excessive credit charges. Such protection would be required by truth-in-lending legislation before Congress. It would simply require the lenders to disclose the total amount of the loan cost and finance charges expressed in dollars and cents and as simple annual interest rate on the unpaid balance: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Chicago District Council wholeheartedly supports the truth-in-lending measure now pending in Congress.

This resolution was unanimously adopted by the Chicago District Council at its regular meeting held on Friday, December 17, 1965. Copies to be sent to Senators DOUGLAS and DIRKSEN, Representatives in Congress and Grand President C. L. Dennis.

KENNETH A. STONE,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Attest:

WILLIAM G. DENISON,
President.

THE IMPORTANCE OF HELPING DEVELOPING NATIONS TO IMPROVE THEIR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, President Johnson sent to Congress today his annual request for foreign aid authorization. The President has emphasized the importance of helping developing nations to improve their educational systems.

It is not surprising that education is, almost without exception, the first major goal of developing nations.

To millions of people in the less-developed parts of the world, progress is a schoolhouse.

For that reason, many countries are asking for—and getting—more help with education than any other field of technical assistance. In fiscal 1965, one out of every five AID-financed experts overseas was working in some aspect of education.

Most of these technicians—four out of every five—are staff members of American colleges and universities at work in specialized training programs—training doctors, nurses, public health officers, farm experts, engineers, and public administrators.

Coming the other way, to study in our universities and colleges, are thousands of foreign technicians and professionals who return to their countries to take over the supervision of public education in multiple fields. Since point 4 began in 1949, the United States has financed the training of 94,000 foreign specialists in U.S. institutions, and 19,000 more in the educational institutions of other countries.

In addition, the United States has helped to finance national construction of: colleges and universities serving 430,000 students; vocational, technical, and normal schools enrolling 715,000 students; classrooms—in just 3 years alone—accommodating 6.7 million pupils at all levels of education.

These figures provide dramatic evidence of the impact of our foreign aid program.

The impact is equally impressive, if less visible, in other aspects of educational

improvement, such as the efforts now being made to modernize systems of teaching, broaden the subjects of study, and relate them to national requirements for trained manpower.

With this kind of evidence of the progress being made in education, I applaud President Johnson's plans to increase the foreign assistance program on all fronts—to help these developing nations strike, as he puts it, "at the root causes of misery and despair." I think that the $225 million being asked for that program in the coming fiscal year is a relatively modest price to pay for such progress.

A REPORT ON VIETNAM TO THE CITIZENS OF LOS ANGELES BY MAYOR SAM YORTY

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the attention of our Nation—and indeed the world—is centered on Vietnam and the problems we face in helping achieve self-determination for the people of South Vietnam.

Many Government leaders, including several of my colleagues in the Senate, personally visited Vietnam during the past several months for firsthand observation and information.

I am pleased that Mayor Samuel Yorty, the mayor of one of the Nation's largest cities, Los Angeles, also visited Vietnam. California makes a great contribution to America's defense preparation—and in time of war, to our country's ability to meet the challenge. Not only do we supply manpower, but we supply vast amounts of military equipment and technical know-how. Further, the port of Los Angeles is a major port of embarkation of men and equipment to points throughout the Pacific frontier.

Following his visit, Mayor Yorty reported to the citizens of Los Angeles December 13 in an address to the Council for International Visitors and Sister Cities. His remarks, in my judgment, provide an interesting, thought-provoking, and informative analysis of the problems we are confronted with in Vietnam. His observations give us insight into the personality of this war.

He was kind enough to respectfully and sincerely submit a number of suggestions to the President which, I am sure, were carefully reviewed by the administration.

Mayor Yorty, who is incidentally a registered Democrat, has provided a service to his people, to my State, and to our country in contributing to the discussions about Vietnam and in making knowledgeable and helpful suggestions.

I think his remarks are worthy of study. I think they are worthy of being included in the RECORD of this Congress during these difficult days of discussion and analysis on our role in southeast Asia, and I ask unanimous consent that they be made a part of the RECORD.

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

A REPORT TO THE CITIZENS BY MAYOR SAM YORTY, DELIVERED DECEMBER 13, 1965, AT LOS ANGELES, TO THE MAYOR'S COUNCIL FOR INTERNATIONAL VISITORS AND SISTER CITIES

Mrs. Jackson, Mr. Lederer, distinguished guests, and especially, the members of the Consular Corps representing the various governments, I would like to first of all thank everyone for coming. I was a bit overwhelmed when I walked in and saw the size of the audience here today. It certainly evidences your great interest in the subject matter of my report to you, and it also indicates that you believe that I was doing something more than socializing in Asia during my visit there.

For your convenience I have tried to divide this report into several parts. First, itinerary, and second, the background facts—about South Vietnam, some of the military problems, some of the political problems, and some possible policy changes.

First of all, I might say that on the way out to Asia I stopped in Honolulu and had about 3 or 4 days of rest. I got some of the vacation that I didn't get last summer after the riots, although I had one planned at the time. In Honolulu I went to the CINPAC (Commander in Chief of Pacific Forces) Headquarters, and had a long conference and a briefing with Admiral Sharp, who, as you know, is our commander of all the forces in the Pacific—everything we have there and not just in Vietnam—all the forces in the Pacific * * * a very great military leader, and a very sound thinker, and a very wonderful inspirational leader of our military forces.

I went to have that briefing at the suggestion of the Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Greene, who said to me: "On the way out, I think you ought to stop and see Admiral Sharp and have a briefing. Then, you think about what he tells you on the way to Vietnam."

Well, I can assure you that after the briefing by Admiral Sharp I couldn't think about anything else on my way out to Vietnam, and, I might also add to this point, although it is not important, that because the Los Angeles Times had published an editorial when they found out I might go to Vietnam, saying that Governors should go but mayors shouldn't, and indicating that it would be a hardship on the Armed Forces for the mayor of the third largest city of the United States to visit the area. I asked Admiral Sharp if this were true, and he said, "I want you to go and see what is happening in South Vietnam, so you can report back to your people."

Now, the next stop was Korea, and there, I think, we set an all-time precedent because the mayor of the city of Los Angeles was given an official presidential dinner in the Blue House by President Park. I don't know of any other occasion when the mayor of our city has been so honored. I take it not as a personal honor to me, but as a growing recognition of the importance of Los Angeles, and I was so pleased to have the opportunity to visit again and renew the friendship with President Park which started when he was our guest in Los Angeles. We were also given an official luncheon by the Minister of Defense, Mr. Kim, to which all the military leaders of Korea were invited.

The great surprise was when I went to Chung-Ang University where Dr. Louise Yim, who is an alumnus of USC, is the head of this university—8,000 students there—a very great university at Seoul.

They kept their surprise from me. I had no idea when I walked into the big assemblage that they were going to present me with a doctor of laws degree; so during the rest of the trip the others in the party all referred to me as "Doc."

I also had very interesting conversations there with the very learned mayor of Seoul.

We discussed there, also, the possibility of forming a sister-city relationship with the city of Pusan, the name of which will bring back memories to all Americans who followed the Korean fighting. We also had a chance to discuss the Japanese-Korean Treaty which I think makes all of the friends of these two great nations very happy. It's taken a long time. There were many obstacles, emotional blocks, and other reasons and factors that entered into this matter. At long last these two friends of ours have arrived at a rapprochment and have a treaty and I think this bodes very well for the free world. This is indicated by the fact that the Communists so violently opposed the final rapprochment between Korea and Japan. Pursuant to this treaty some of the outstanding problems will now be settled, and in addition to that, a large grant will be given by Japan to South Korea and also short-term and long-term loans. This, of course, removes some of the burden from us because we have had to give Korea substantial help as you know, and they have used it well to defend their freedom.

Then we went on to Tokyo where, as you know, we met with the Japanese business people who do so much business with our harbor. We had a most successful reception there, and I like to always point out to our Americans that they must realize that Japan is the second best customer of the United States and a large purchaser of our products, and also the best customer of the Los Angeles Harbor. We enjoyed a most successful reception. The Governor of Tokyo came to the reception along with many top business people. Then we went to Nagoya, which to me is a second home. You know we have had a sister-city relationship with Nagoya for a long time. Mayor Sugito and I have exchanged visits, and I think it is more or less an example of what sister-city relationships can be when they are at their very best.

From there we went to Hong Kong, where I stayed only briefly, and had a visit with Sir David Trench, who is the British Governor in Hong Kong. As you know, it is a Crown Colony and is completely under his control. We discussed the situation in that area. The others stayed in Hong Kong and went on to Bangkok; I went to Vietnam, but from Vietnam I also went to Bangkok where I met with the mayor and discussed the project that I will talk to you about in a minute, and also met with our military leader there, Gen. Richard Stillwell, who has been in that area a very long time—in Vietnam, in Thailand, in southeast Asia, and who knows a great deal about that area.

Then on the way home, after Vietnam, I again stopped in Honolulu, just between planes, and had another visit with Admiral Sharp so we could compare notes as to the difference in any opinion I might have had on the way out compared with my opinion on the way back.

Of course, South Vietnam was by far the most challenging part of the journey. When I got off the plane there, I was met by Major Hayden, the security officer, and by Mr. Ralph Earl, representing the State Department. I want to say that they could not have been more kind, more considerate, more respectful. Also present was the reporter from the Times, Mr. Salazar who was there to meet the plane.

From there we went almost directly to a hospital in Saigon where I visited with some of the hospitalized soldiers, and also visited the malaria ward where we're having a problem, as you know, by the fact that there seems to be some kind of new strain of malaria which the normal pills that we use to prevent malaria are not reaching. You always run into this where our people are new to the area and are not immune to some of the infections and diseases that the people in the area may find entirely tolerable. I remember going through this in New Guinea where we had the same thing happen on several occasions. Our doctors with their ingenuity and our research scientists are always able eventually to come up with an answer, but there's lots of pain and suffering in the meantime.

It was at that hospital that I first heard about the "dust-offs." You know, it's a wonderful thing about the fighting men out

in the fighting area, each one thinks that his place is fairly secure and brags about his fellow fightingmen who are doing something that they think is more brave. And this boy that I talked to in the hospital; he's a boy to me * * * he is actually a fightingman, but they seem so young that they seem like boys. He was telling me about walking along with his buddy when he ran into one of these boobytrap mines that are set all over the jungle there, and one of these mines went off and blew both legs off of his buddy, and also, of course, injured the man that I met in the hospital. He said that in the midst of all this firing and with bullets flying all around his helicopter the pilot came right on down to rescue them. They call these fellows "dust-offs." And he said, "they don't care about anything; they just go in and get you." He said, "It's a great feeling of comfort to us that these fellows are so brave." Within 20 minutes this boy with his legs blown off was in the hospital under care and is now in New York recovering, and will have artificial legs which is very little consolation, but at least it is something, and it's a great consolation to these fellows to know that these brave "dust-offs" will go in and get them. This is about all he could talk about; he was so proud of the bravery of these fellow soldiers.

* * * * *

Now, my next stop was to go early in the morning to Da Nang. Da Nang is our base closest to the 17th parallel which divides South Vietnam from North Vietnam, and it isn't only one base. We have satellite bases north and south. They are really part of this same complex; this is a marine base. General Greene had suggested that he would like me to see it because he wanted me also to see the civic action program of the marines in the area. We are engaged, not only in military operations in South Vietnam, but we are engaged in another activity to establish the means of carrying on sound government, and in winning the confidence of the people. So the marines in Da Nang are not only fightingmen, they are public relations men. They are helping these people to better their way of life, and to have some stake in freedom and in the victory of the free forces.

We also looked over some of the civil action programs where the marines have helped the people build roads. They have helped them build schools, and they have done many things to let them know that we are their friends, so that on the basis of friendship they can understand us and feel confidence in us.

We returned that night to Saigon and the next morning, early again, we went off for the carrier, *Kittyhawk*. I had a fine chance to talk with Admiral Reedy who was departing after we had lunch to go over and see Mr. McNamara, who was in Saigon at the time. Captain Carmody was in charge of the *Kittyhawk*. He's a famous football player from San Jose State and a very wonderful military man. They told me that on their closed circuit television, they had announced in advance that I would be there, and told the fellows on the ship. And so I had to go to every deck on that ship and make sure that I visited every department. You know that *Kittyhawk* is 18 levels? You can't believe it, what a massive ship that is. With 5,000 Americans housed in what really amounts to a city, 15,000 meals a day to be served, all that laundry, all the equipment, supplies. I watched the *Kittyhawk* in operation. Planes were being catapulted off the bow of the ship and they were coming in from aft on the slanted deck, and at the same time, they were taking on supplies from another ammunition ship on the side.

It was the busiest place I've ever seen. So many dedicated Americans working awfully hard. Believe me, these fellows were hauling around these big bombs and ammunition and other supplies and the sea was rough and they were having a very hard time. Captain Carmody was pacing the deck up there, worried about the fellows on the ammo ship, afraid they might get hurt because of the rough seas and wondering whether he should discontinue and try again later, and all of this is going on, these fellows are working around the clock. There isn't any 8-hour day, 5-day week there. They just work all the time.

And the pilots * * * these pilots are flying more than you could ever imagine. These missions are taking off regularly all the time. They're just constantly pounding. It's a terrific job that they are doing from these carriers. I went down to a briefing of the pilots and this seemed especially interesting to me because this used to be my job, only I did the intelligence briefing and this was the operations briefing and, of all things, the pilot leading this particular mission was an Air Force pilot on an exchange program with the Navy. We didn't used to do this; I think it's a great idea and we had a lot of fun kidding about it. But to hear the complications of these flights today, the things that these young men have to keep in mind and the instructions; it really is staggering to someone who hasn't heard anything like this for 20 years.

Now, here again, I ran into the same phenomenon, the fightingman always talking about somebody else's bravery. These fellows, these pilots, were all praise for what they called the forward air controller. The subject came up because I asked them exactly what their mission was, and while they had a mission, it was not a definite mission until they reached the target area. There, they meet the forward air controller. And they didn't seem to think what they were doing was heroic at all. They were worried about the forward air controller because they said he goes along right over the ground in a flimsy little airplane. The enemy shoots at him but he marks the target for the pilots, and they said, "Why, the other day we were searching for the Vietcong (they say the VC), who were in the bushes around there some place.

"They had our troops pinned down. The troops couldn't move, because every time they started to move they shot at them. We couldn't find where the VC were from up at our altitude, so the forward air controller flew right down over them until he drew their fire and then when they fired on him, we dropped a smoke bomb on them and we went in and let them have it." They said, "there's really the brave guy. Our job is easy compared with his." And so it is with the real fightingmen.

They made me lift their gear, which I tell you, must weigh 50 pounds, all the instruments that these young men wear when they're up in these supersonic jets.

Well, after that, of course, back that same night to Saigon, and then the next morning we had a breakfast engagement with USOM people, that's U.S. Operation Mission, and these are the people who are trying to recruit administrators here in Los Angeles right now to help train the South Vietnamese to govern. This was a very interesting discussion because it gave me quite a bit of information about the problem of reestablishing government in an area like this and teaching the people how to govern and giving them confidence in themselves to do the job.

And I might say that people who are good administrators who have a talent for getting along with people who know something about government and getting things done, if they would like to do a job in South Vietnam, not in a combat capacity and not especially dangerous but with some danger, they would be welcome, if they would want to apply to the U.S. Mission. It's a job that has to be done.

At that point, I got an urgent cable from the State Department asking me to visit one of the USOM projects and take some pictures and make a statement, if I would, about recruiting people.

That morning, we flew up in a helicopter to an area north of Saigon to a little place where the infantry division is located. This division is called the Big Red 1. It's the 1st Infantry Division and these people are in extremely heavy combat in that area. They were taking part in the fight at the Michelin plantation where another unit of the South Vietnam forces was really slaughtered by the Vietcong. We had to go in there with the South Vietnamese and the 1st Infantry Division was engaged in that action.

I asked the commanding general if there was any difference between the draftees and the volunteers in his division. "No difference at all." He said, "When these young men get out here, in our unit, you can't tell which ones are volunteers and which ones were drafted."

I think this is extremely important to you American citizens to realize that these young men did not ask to go there. You sent them there, and in sending them there, you have to accept some responsibilities too. We have to remember that at home.

This is an area, which has been for a long time, under Vietcong control. And so the people in the area are accustomed to having the Vietcong there either all the time or to disappear when the Government forces come in, and then come back. There are fortifications underground all over this area. They are completely camouflaged.

You cannot find these underground fortifications * * * some bases capable of holding some 2,000 soldiers, Vietcong soldiers, Communist soldiers * * * and you can't find them. They can simply disappear under the ground; the only way you can find them is to stumble over them, in the thick jungle. The general there in command of this division, told me that one of his lieutenants was out on the forward patrol and stumbled on something that was only this high above the ground, completely camouflaged. (About 6 inches.)

He stirred around there in the grass in the camouflage and found that it was just a small opening into one of these underground labyrinths. He didn't want, of course, to go in there so he took a smoke bomb that he had and threw it in there. But the smoke started to come back out, so in order to make the smoke go down, he took his pancho off and put it over the opening so the smoke would go down. In the meantime, a Vietcong came up from another hole behind him and shot him in the back.

So this is the kind of warfare they employed. They used to hide down in those underground fortifications, then come out and strike the government forces or raid the villages and take the young men away, take the rice and then they go back and disappear.

When the Government came they couldn't find them. They may not even go back to the same underground position which they left. They may go to another one. The area is honeycombed with them. It is a most difficult job just to find these underground fortifications and then to deal with them when you find them.

It's a very difficult type of war. We don't have the type of weapons or we haven't had in the past the type of training to deal with this sort of thing.

At this particular camp, the fellows were waiting for me at their noncommissioned officers club. They found out I was coming and they wanted to make me the first honorary member of the noncommissioned officers club, of the 1st Infantry Division. Well, you should see the club. They had a tent and about six chairs in the tent. But they did have beer and they got some ice and they are going to open the club. I'm the first member of that noncommissioned officers club and somehow I'm going to get them a

refrigerator and a generator as a gift and get it over there.

Now, we went into the little town of Di An, with John Van who is the liaison of the civil action program of this division. I visited the school with the little South Vietnamese children in it and met the teacher. This school was built by the people in the village but with materials furnished by the U.S. Army there. This is part of our program. John Van is a lieutenant colonel who resigned in protest against some of our past policies in South Vietnam. After they found out that he was right about a lot of things, they called him back as a civilian to help out and he's more or less like a provincial governor or village head. He runs around there unprotected working with the villagers and seems to be so popular that the VC who are known to be among the villagers (the Vietcong) do not bother him. Perhaps, because the citizens wouldn't stand for it, since they've grown to have such respect for John Van, who does so much for them.

We took some pictures there, for the benefit of the State Department, and I must say that you get a different idea of what this is all about when you look at those little children because part of the question is, Are they going to grow up educated to appreciate freedom or are they going to be hauled away by the Communists, conscripted into the service, be brainwashed, and sent back to fight against their own best interest. I think we are doing a tremendous job there in trying to help the people get schools, get teachers, build the schools they need.

Also, along the road there, I saw the Korean engineers. They were sent there a long time ago, before the Korean combat units. They thought that they were a noncombat unit. But if you'd see the fortification around their camp they had to build to protect themselves, you wouldn't consider them exactly noncombat. They've built roads. They've built drainage ditches. They're doing a wonderful job. They're great allies.

I had to return fairly soon that day because I had a conference with the Ambassador, Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge. Mr. Salazar referred to this as a brief appointment with the idea of discrediting the recognition that Mr. Lodge gave to me as mayor of our city. But I can tell you it was far from being brief. It lasted 45 minutes to an hour and I myself, had to leave in order to keep another luncheon engagement with the U.S. Operation Mission people to talk about the recruiting back here.

I must say that this is the first time I have had a chance to talk to Ambassador Lodge in a very long time and I came away with renewed faith in this man, in the soundness of his judgment, and the determination that he has to bring about peace in this area, an honorable peace.

I think you can rest comfortably that President Johnson's representation in Saigon is of the very highest order.

Next, I kept my commitment to President Park of Korea and visited the command headquarters of the Koreans in Saigon. Then over to the Air Force, where I had a briefing. I had visited the Navy, Marines, and Army, but I hadn't been at the Air Force yet. Being Air Force myself I wanted to go by the Air Force and have a briefing, and a visit again with General Schinz of the shirt fame.

Now, this was the end of the journey, and then on back to Honolulu, as I said, to meet again with Admiral Sharp and back here.

I think at this point, I would like to just give you a little background of this South Vietnam problem, because it's a great puzzle and many people don't understand that the division at the 17th parallel goes way back to the closing final phases of the second war.

When Lord Mountbatten was liberating this area through here [southeast Asia] he went into French Indochina, part of which is now North and South Vietnam. Lord Mountbatten was in administrative control of what is now South Vietnam. But President Roosevelt insisted that Chiang Kai-shek be given administrative control north of the 17th parallel and although Lord Mountbatten had a division to place in North Vietnam, he didn't get in there. And it was extremely difficult for Chiang Kai-shek, because he had too many other problems. He couldn't effectively administer it and a sort of vacuum was left there, in which the Communists were able to take full advantage. Now, I didn't know about this until Lord Mountbatten came to Los Angeles one day and told me about it. I checked it later with General Lemnitzer at our Supreme Allied Headquarters in Europe and he said yes, that was correct and he had talked with Lord Mountbatten about it himself. He had never even seen it in print but this is the long-term background of that division at the 17th parallel.

Now, this war, believe me, is a big nasty dirty war. But it's different, I think, from any kind of war that we've ever had to fight. I actually could see from my hotel window in Saigon the flares being dropped right on the edge of the city to try and light up the area where a village was being attacked by the Communists during the night, right on the edge of Saigon. Those people out there attacking the village, no doubt, looked like ordinary citizens in the daytime * * * all Vietnamese look like Vietnamese, whether they are Communist or not. But yet at night, they are capable of forming into these units and carrying out an attack.

Now, I want to preface the rest of my remarks by saying that the situation as it is today has to be dealt with as it is today.

It doesn't do any good to talk about the past of Vietnam and I think myself some mistakes were made there, but that doesn't do us any good now and it doesn't do President Johnson any good. When he took over the helm as President, it was a situation with which he had to deal. And he couldn't go back and undo anything that had been done before. He has to deal with it now.

The question of whether it was wise to undermine Diem and destroy the only father figure they had in South Vietnam and whether you could have gotten rid of Mr. Nhu (and everybody seems to agree that he had to be removed), whether you could have gotten rid of him without also getting rid of President Diem, whom we have called the George Washington of South Vietnam, is a question that historians will have to settle.

But the fact of the matter is that Diem is not there, and we have had a series of governments, and you know all of that story, and President Johnson inherited this situation.

Now our policy relative to Diem was not universally popular in South Vietnam. There's a park in Saigon called Kennedy Park where they expected to put up a monument and they weren't able to do it because of protests from some of the Catholic groups and others who were for President Diem and regarded Diem as a great hero.

Skipping to the division of 1954, as you know, the Communists agreed to withdraw all their military forces and all their agents from South Vietnam. Instead of that they left their agents, their trained agents, in South Vietnam and did not withdraw them. Not only that, they murdered—and I think that this is awfully important for us to understand—they murdered 2,000 village chiefs and leaders in order to destroy the ability of the South Vietnamese to govern themselves. They literally murdered them.

In one case, as a good example, they went in and got the village chief. They gave him some order that he didn't carry out. They killed him, put his head on a pole, and paraded it around through the village so the rest of the villagers would understand that when the Vietcong tell you to do something you do it. And so, that's the kind of terror that these people have had to live under. This has been going on and on and on till you can understand why they are very confused about whether we will protect them or whether we will stay.

Now our staying is very important to them and it has some implications that are extremely important. If they feel that we are going to stay and that we are going to protect them, then they will be inclined to give us the intelligence we need. In other words, they will tell us who the Vietcong are in the villages because the villagers know. But if they are going to identify the Vietcong for us and the Vietcong find it out, which they surely will, and then we leave, then they will be slaughtered and murdered.

So it is extremely important that they have faith in us, faith in our staying power, and faith in our ability to defend them and our loyalty to them. Now this then gets back to another point that intelligence is so important because we can win the fight much sooner if we can identify the Vietcong and get them out of these villages and get them under our control. But under the circumstances, you can't expect these people for quite a long time to be willing to really have the faith in us that we are going to stay and to give us the information that we need to help win this war.

This gets down, of course, to the matter of Da Nang. I think all of you must have read some time ago, a few months ago, where the Communists at night infiltrated through the perimeter at Da Nang and blew up a number of our airplanes and helicopters. Our information is that they gathered in one of the villages that night. Now, if those villagers had had complete faith in us, as we think they have now, this couldn't have happened at Da Nang. It might, but I doubt it. If they had complete faith in us, they would have told us and we would have been warned about the attack. So this is the difference. It is extremely important for us to win their confidence and shorten the time needed for victory. When we have the confidence of these people and are able to take advantage of their intelligence, this will be a great help to us.

This is where these demonstrations at home enter into this whole picture. In 1954 when the French were in Indochina there were demonstrations in France against the Government. As you know, there has always been a strong Communist Party in France and there were great demonstrations against the French Government. These people know that and they know that the French got out. And now the Communists are using the demonstrations here in the United States to relate them with what happened with the French and to warn these people that they had better be careful because the Americans are not going to stay. They tell them we are going to get out, that the war is unpopular in the United States, and that the demonstrations prove it. They can show pictures and they can show documents and even use our own press to show that these protests against the war are going on here at home.

So these demonstrations are prolonging the time necessary for us to win the confidence of the people, to get the intelligence we need to beat the Vietcong, to beat the North Vietnamese and to shorten the war.

And for that reason, if for no other, these demonstrations are a disgrace to the United States and a disservice to our fightingmen.

Furthermore, the demonstrations have other aspects. To the Communists, they are a sign of weakness. These kinds of demonstrations are not permitted in Communist countries and they can't understand why

such demonstrations would be permitted here if we were able to stop them. To them, it is a sign of weakness of the United States.

Now, I might say to you that every place I went, one of the first things the fighting fellows said to me was: "How about those demonstrations?" They are very confused about them, they don't understand it, they are out there risking their lives, they are doing a job in this nasty, dirty war and yet there is all this marching around at home that they are reading about.

I think that we should all write all the letters we can to our servicemen there and tell them the truth, that we are all back of them, that we understand their sacrifices, that we do appreciate them.

One of the other problems in the background is the fact that this country is 80-percent rural and that the rural people have very little allegiance to the Central Government in Saigon. They have been more or less on their own and they would just like to be left alone at this time.

They actually have what they call the five evils—fire, famine, flood, plague, and the Central Government. You can see what a problem you have from the standpoint of reestablishing the Government in this situation, and, of course, the Central Government has always placed too much emphasis upon Saigon.

Now I have to stop here because time is going to run out and I want to talk briefly about some of the military problems. One of them is to try to identify the enemy. I saw sentries standing duty on a road, at an intersection, near Di An. These men have to stand there while Vietnamese come down the road with guns and they don't know whether they are friendly or whether they are Communists. So they can't shoot till they are shot at, and that's kind of a difficult situation to be in.

It's difficult to fight a war where you can't identify the enemy. Even in the hard fighting in Korea we were fighting against organized units, but here we are trying to fight against people that may look like farmers in the daytime and go down into one of their underground fortifications at night, organize, and come out and attack you. And, of course, even at our base at Da Nang and at all of our bases, the Vietnamese are working around there, no doubt among them are Vietcong passing intelligence on to the enemy, looking over the area and studying how we operate and how later to infiltrate.

Then there is the problem of weapons restrictions. The United States is not using all of the weapons that we are able to fashion to help our boys save their lives. This is a handicap under which they are working in spite of the fact that we have superior weapons to probably anybody in the world.

It just seems to me that if we are going to send young men into a horrible nasty war and ask them to risk their lives to defend freedom they're entitled to the best weapons that we have in our arsenal to save their lives. I think where you have a weapon that is suitable to accomplish a certain objective in a proper way that they're entitled to use that weapon.

Then you have the problem of these sanctuaries. Hanoi itself, which is the capital city, is being given a very wide berth by our aircraft and, of course, not bombed. We are not even going close to Hanoi. Haiphong, the great supply center, is also another sanctuary. The munitions are pouring through Haiphong. These are the weapons that will kill our men if they are allowed to keep on supplying through Haiphong.

Down in Da Nang they are beginning to run into, for the first time, some .50 caliber weapons. These .50 caliber weapons will be effective against our helicopters where the small arms fire have not been nearly as effective.

Each day that these weapons increase in their size, their magnitude and the number that come through Haiphong, more Americans are going to lose their lives because those weapons poured through there. Haiphong itself is also given a wide berth, not quite as much as Hanoi, but a wide berth by our aircraft. Not only does this give them a supply sanctuary into the country, but it creates a very serious problem for our aircraft passing beyond Haiphong and Hanoi to strike targets in the northernmost part of North Vietnam.

Instead of being able to choose any route they want to get to the target, they have to run a narrow gauntlet in order to avoid Haiphong and Hanoi, and this means that the enemy aircraft defenses can be set up more effectively. So I would say that that sanctuary has to go.

I don't see how we can continue to permit the supplies to be brought in there completely immune from any kind of attack. I think they ought to at least start narrowing down the corridor, and if I had the power, I would use airpower to shut off the supplies to Haiphong now.

Then you also have the problem of the sanctuary in Laos and in Cambodia * * * the Ho Chi Minh trail. This jungle country goes through mostly uninhabited country but it is out of bounds to us. And yet these Communists from North Vietnam and also the Vietcong from South Vietnam can strike us, strike our forces, strike our allied forces, and then dash back into Laos and Cambodia and rest, get resupplied in their sanctuary and then come back out and hit us again. If the Communists in Laos and Sihnouk in Cambodia want to associate themselves with our enemies in this war, let them suffer the consequences. I think we should consider them enemies and take on those sanctuaries as soon as possible and stop this business of letting our enemies run and hide. Now, as you know, Laos is divided. An agreement was made between the Communists, the neutralists, and the free forces. We have a government in there, the only legitimate government that is on the side of freedom. I am sure that in time they will see the wisdom of letting us attack this Ho Chi Minh trail in whatever way it seems necessary to shut off the supplies and stop them from coming down the trail almost completely protected.

Of course, our military, in assessing this whole problem, have to think of other areas. They have to keep in mind Berlin; they have to keep in mind what the Chinese might do, what the Russians might do, and we also have a very serious supply problem.

This country is, by our standards, very backward in the things you need logistically. They only have one great harbor. They don't have the airfields we need. All these things have to be built in order to put the number of troops in that we will need to actually accomplish this job. The enemy is very tough and very canny. You can drive over a road a dozen times and think it's safe, and then suddenly a truck blows up. They told me about some incidents near Di An where they found that a mine had been planted 8 months before. The paving had been dug up, the mine put in, and the road repaved. They waited 8 months till the time the supply column was coming along that they wanted. So they're very patient; a patience that we Americans don't always have, and, they are very tough.

Also, there's the problem that we're only advisers. When a Vietnamese unit recently was overrun in a plantation, I am told that they had not listened to our advisers; they had not sent out their forward patrols and scouts to protect themselves from surprise attack. Unfortunately, the advisers who gave them the good advice which was ignored, were also killed.

Then there's the problem of our piecemeal commitment. We keep committing our strength only enough to offset the strength of the enemy. I think if we're going to send our men in there, we should send enough of them to do the job and to protect each other.

There's also another serious problem to consider, and that is that no Chinese Communists are being killed in Vietnam and no Russian Communists are being killed in Vietnam. They are sending the supplies in there; they're encouraging the war, particularly the Chinese, but they are not being killed, and it's said over in the area, "The Chinese Communists will fight to the last Vietnamese." But it's a very serious matter that we have this drain on American manpower at the same time that there is no drain on the manpower of our two principal enemies, and I think this is something that American people should think about.

The mayor of Saigon, a city of 2 million people with many problems is a medical doctor, a lieutenant colonel in the army, appointed to do the job. He told me: "I don't belong here, I don't want this job." He'd like to get out of it, but he's doing the best he can under the circumstances, having had no background in government, but a very fine man.

They have, of course, a military dictatorship and need to move toward some kind of civilian representation. One suggestion that has been made is that those people elected in the recent elections in the provinces, where some provinces did hold elections, should be brought to the Central Government as delegates and given some power by President Ky to indicate the government's desire to give the people more voice in their affairs.

We are wrestling with this matter of world opinion. We keep being afraid of doing something that will alienate world opinion and we, as of now, are being criticized by many of our friends for our efforts in South Vietnam. I think in some cases they don't understand the importance of it, nevertheless, they are criticizing, and for that reason I think we have hesitated to end the sanctuary in Laos and Cambodia.

We have a problem over in Thailand. Thailand here has a common border with Laos, and the Communists are already trying to infiltrate. The Thai call this the Chou En-lai plan, after the leader of Communist China, and they are very concerned about the fact that he has announced that they are next on the list. So, if we were to suffer a catastrophe in South Vietnam, I think it is not any stretch of the imagination to say that Thailand would be next. And, I believe now that we have reached the point where unless we win in South Vietnam, southeast Asia will fall completely within the Communist orbit. The Chou En-lai plan is talked about every day in Thailand as a current fact.

Another problem, we lack sufficient help from our allies. We are in a position where, of course, I think you recognize there is no alternative to victory. We must win this war in South Vietnam. Any talk of pulling out would have to have been a long time ago, and maybe at that point we could have stayed in with some kind of commitment that would have been better for us; a commitment from the South Vietnamese. We didn't get the commitment. We're in there, it's a fact now, and we have to go all out and win.

And I think that one thing that has to be done is that we have got to quit worrying about what other people in the world are thinking about, for instance, our attacking the Ho Chi Minh trail in Cambodia and Laos. This is not a popularity contest. Our men are out there risking their lives, risking their health and all their futures, and I think what somebody else in some remote part of the world may think of our effort must be less important than the safeguarding of the lives of our own men.

And now a few of the changes that I think could be made, but first let me say that having seen our military commanders and our men in the field, I think you would feel inspired if you could see firsthand the caliber of the military leadership of the United States and the great regard these officers have for their men; for the soldiers, the sailors, the airmen, and the marines; and their desire to do this job with a minimum of sacrifice. They are terrific fellows, these military leaders. They know, of course, how to solve the military problems involved in this area, but they are restrained by some of the political considerations that I have pointed out to you.

So, we're not saying that "this is a war, you fellows win it," we're saying, "this is a war but certain political considerations must restrain your actions" and this creates a pretty hard problem for the military men.

Now some other things I think could be changed. One, I would like to see much fuller information given to the citizens of the United States. I think they need to appreciate the fact that this really is a big war, fraught with extremely serious consequences; one which we are in and which we have to win. I think that we should give recognition here to the scope; that this is not some little police action, this is a tremendously big undertaking. It involves a lot of costs, and any decision we make involves risk, and I don't think that we should unfairly restrain fighting men that we have sent into this area to risk their lives. I don't think our decisions should be based upon risking only their lives and taking no risk that might involve us.

I think we're in this with them, and we had better let them understand that we are with them, and if some of the risk they have to take might endanger us, so be it. It will have to be because we're all Americans, and we have as much reason to take a risk as those men we send out to the front.

We can divorce our foreign policy from considerations based upon fear. I mean we should be neither rash nor overly timid, but somewhere in between there is a position based not on fear but on courage. I am tired of seeing us plead with the Communists for unconditional negotiations. I think we have to understand that in a fight it's the fellow who is getting beat who wants to throw in the towel to stop the fight, and I think as we continue to plead for negotiations to please some parts of the world's opinion, that we continue to build up the ego of Red China and the Communists in North Vietnam, and to convince them that we must be losing or we wouldn't be pleading with them to stop the fighting.

And so I think we have done enough of that. The time now is to stop the pleading, and get on with showing them that we do have the power to beat them. If we don't beat them, this type of "war of liberation" will be all over the world, even in Latin America.

I think we ought to do everything we can at home to control the demonstrations, to stop building them up, to stop giving them so much free publicity, and I think the hard core Communist background behind these demonstrations should be thoroughly exposed, and we should stop excusing them as some kind of an act of inexperienced youth. It has become too serious for that when it interferes with the war effort and costs the lives of the men who are out in the fighting front.

Now, I would say that we should also, in addition to stopping the pleading for negotiation, offer some kind of a clear ultimatum to let the Communists understand exactly what we are going to do, that we intend to cut off their supplies. I think that this is probably one of the most important decisions that we have to make. The President has shown great courage in the past. He's the one that ended the sanctuary in North Vietnam. He had to take the risks involved in doing that, and he did.

Because of the great risks that our men are taking at the frontline, we have to take the risk of putting aside our fear, stop worrying about warnings from Red China of what they'll do if we do what we have to do, and start telling them what we are going to do and that they had just better not interfere.

"I AM THE NATION"—AN OUTSTANDING WORK AND APPROPRIATE IN THIS TIME OF TRIAL

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Andrew Jackson once said:

Every good citizen makes his country's honor his own, and cherishes it not only as precious but as sacred. He is willing to risk his life in its defense and is conscious that he gains protection while he gives it.

Recently, I again read the article, "I Am the Nation," in the newspaper column of my good friend and able writer, Walter L. "Bill" Hart, editor of the Morgantown, W. Va., Dominion-News.

The message contained in this excellent story may provide hope and comfort for the families of our fighting men now in Vietnam. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed as follows:

IT MAY INTEREST YOU

(By Bill Hart and staff)

(NOTE.—One of the best articles we have ever read—and certainly right now one of the most timely in the history of our Nation—when so many seem to believe Uncle Sam is some mysterious person and America is some vague monster with unlimited resources, is "I Am the Nation." In the public interest the Norfolk & Western Railway bought full page advertisements to present this article to the public. With a bow to the unidentified author and another to the railway and because there are so many homes in this area where there are vacant chairs these evenings—the article follows:)

I was born on July 4, 1776, and the Declaration of Independence is my birth certificate The bloodlines of the world run in my veins, because I offered freedom to the oppressed. I am many things, and many people. I am the Nation.

I am 195 million living souls—and the ghost of millions who have lived and died for me.

I am Nathan Hale and Paul Revere. I stood at Lexington and fired the shot heard around the world. I am Washington, Jefferson, and Patrick Henry. I am John Paul Jones, the Green Mountain Boys, and Davy Crockett. I am Lee and Grant, and Abe Lincoln.

I remember the Alamo, the *Maine*, and Pearl Harbor. When freedom called I answered and stayed until it was over, over there. I left my heroic dead in Flanders Fields, on the rock of Corregidor, on the bleak slopes of Korea, and in the steaming jungle of Vietnam.

I am the Brooklyn Bridge, the wheatlands of Kansas and the granite hills of Vermont. I am the coalfields of the Virginias and Pennsylvania, the fertile lands of the West, the Golden Gate, and the Grand Canyon. I am Independence Hall, the *Monitor* and the *Merrimac*.

I am big. I sprawl from the Atlantic to the Pacific—my arms reach out to embrace Alaska and Hawaii—3 million square miles throbbing with industry. I am more than 5 million farms. I am forest, field, mountain and desert. I am quiet villages—and cities that never sleep.

You can look at me and see Ben Franklin walking down the streets of Philadelphia with his breadloaf under his arm. You can see Betsy Ross with her needle. You can see the lights of Christmas, and hear the strains of "Auld Lang Syne" as the calendar turns.

I am a ballot dropped in a box, the roar of a crowd in a stadium and the voice of a choir in a cathedral. I am an editorial in a newspaper and a letter to a Congressman.

I am Eli Whitney and Stephen Foster. I am Tom Edison, Albert Einstein and Billy Graham. I am Horace Greely, Will Rogers and the Wright brothers. I am George Washington Carver, Daniel Webster and Jonas Salk.

I am Babe Ruth and the World Series. I am 130,000 schools and colleges, and 320,000 churches where my people worship God as they think best.

I am Longfellow, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Walt Whitman and Thomas Paine.

Yes, I am the Nation and these are the things that I am. I was conceived in freedom and, God willing, in freedom I will spend the rest of my days.

May I possess always the integrity, the courage and the strength to keep myself unshackled, to remain a citadel of freedom and a beacon of hope to the world.

This is my wish, my goal, my prayer in this year of 1966—190 years after I was born.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the pending question, which is the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703 (b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 21 Leg.]

Aiken	Hayden	Montoya
Anderson	Holland	Muskie
Bartlett	Inouye	Nelson
Bass	Jackson	Pastore
Bible	Jordan, Idaho	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy, Mass.	Proxmire
Church	Long, Mo.	Ribicoff
Cooper	Long, La.	Russell, S.C.
Dirksen	Magnuson	Smith
Douglas	Mansfield	Sparkman
Ervin	McIntyre	Thurmond
Hart	Metcalf	

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], are necessarily absent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG of Louisiana in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Bayh	Gruening	Murphy
Bennett	Harris	Pearson
Boggs	Hartke	Prouty
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Randolph
Cannon	Hill	Robertson
Case	Hruska	Saltonstall
Clark	Javits	Scott
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Simpson
Curtis	Kennedy, N.Y.	Stennis
Dodd	Lausche	Symington
Dominick	McCarthy	Tydings
Eastland	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	McGee	Williams, Del.
Fannin	McGovern	Yarborough
Fong	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Morse	Young, Ohio
Gore	Mundt	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). A quorum is present.

WE AID CRIMINALS—WHY NOT THE VICTIMS?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, all over the country awareness is growing of the need for laws to compensate victims of crimes.

Since interest is spreading at such a rapid rate it might seem that this is a new idea. Actually, as the lead editorial in the Washington, D.C., Sunday Star for January 30, 1966, points out, "it has merely been rediscovered." The code of Hammurabi, ruler of Babylon 36 centuries ago, set the precedent, which subsequently spread to Syrian, Roman, and Mohammedan law. Within the past 2 years, New Zealand and Great Britain have enacted compensation laws.

In this country California passed a limited compensation statute last year, and the idea is being discussed in many other States. I introduced a bill, S. 2155, last July which would provide compensation in areas of Federal jurisdiction, such as the District of Columbia. As the Star editorial points out:

> It is time that the richest nation on earth showed a little compassion for victims in these crimes.

It further points out that the criminal is given all sorts of protection in the way of lawyers, psychiatrists, and other protections, without any expense involved on his part; but the victim is carried off in an ambulance and society does nothing for the victim at the same time that it is throwing all kinds of protection around the criminal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the January 30 Washington Sunday Star be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WE AID CRIMINALS—WHY NOT THE VICTIMS?

It was 11 years ago that a British spinster and reformer, Margery Fry, began a campaign to make her country reimburse victims of criminal violence. Since then the United Kingdom and New Zealand both have enacted laws providing such aid. A few months ago California followed suit with its own version. Special committees in New York and Illinois are studying the problem, and the New Jersey attorney general has legislation on the drawing board. And now a move is afoot in Congress to protect District residents in similar fashion. This undertaking now has the strong support of Commissioner Tobriner.

The theory can be stated briefly in the form of two questions: If society assumes responsibility for protecting citizens from criminals, should it not help innocent victims when that law-enforcement fails? If the criminal is fed and sheltered at State expense while serving his prison sentence, shouldn't the object of his assault receive aid too?

The idea, which has been ably advanced in several speeches by former Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg, seems novel. Actually, it has merely been rediscovered. The English philosopher, Jeremy Bentham, observed nearly two centuries ago that satisfaction for a victim in such cases should come from the assailant's property. But what if the criminal has no money to pay? Then, said Bentham, "it ought to be furnished out of the public treasury, because it is an object of public good and the security of all is interested in it."

History, in fact, is full of precedents for the concept of compensating victims of crime. The code of Hammurabi, ruler of Babylon 36 centuries ago, offers an example. Not only were fines against criminals the most common penalty, but the money went directly to the victim. The Babylonians spelled out such laws in astonishing detail. Where an assault was proven unintentional, for instance, the defendant still had to pay the victim's doctor bill.

The code spread its benificent influence to other subsequent cultures, influencing Syrian, Roman, and Mohammedan law. A more or less direct line in aid-to-victim philosophy can be traced in Greek, Roman, and British penal codes up to the 18th century, when the idea for some reason languished.

Now it is gathering momentum again, and none too soon. At a time when our society leans over backward in its solicitude for the legal rights of the criminal suspect—sometimes even turning a deaf ear on his confessions—it is high time to reconsider the welfare of his victim.

Senator YARBOROUGH, of Texas, has introduced a bill which would provide a basis for hearings on the subject. His measure would apply specifically to the District of Columbia, plus special Federal territorial and maritime jurisdictions.

A good deal more generous than the California law, the Yarborough bill proposes to reimburse each victim (or his survivors) up to $25,000 for injury or death in a crime. A list of 14 offenses is spelled out, including assault, rape, and murder. Claims would be administered by a special three-member Commission appointed by the President. No property damage would be covered.

The Senator's proposal contains some obvious loopholes. Unlike the California law, for example, awards would not take into consideration the element of need; a millionaire might collect as much as a pauper. The Yarborough bill also is vague as to the size of the staff the Commission would need to establish the validity of claims brought to it.

In addition, some critics feel such laws may be difficult to administer fairly. A New York criminologist recently warned that victims often invite violence by their behavior, particular busybodies and wealthy persons careless with valuables.

But the spirit of the Yarborough bill deserves commendation, and his proposal, of course, would not apply to stolen valuables. A similar measure has been introduced in the House, and Congress should schedule hearings in this session to iron out imperfections.

As a corollary, a number of States are also looking into a so-called good Samaritan law enacted by California. This takes the unusual step of indemnifying a citizen who has been injured while trying to prevent a crime. A bill introduced in Massachusetts would not only reimburse such persons but make it a misdemeanor not to come to the aid of a victim. New York City already has passed a bill authorizing pensions to families of citizens killed while seeking to enforce the law. Clearly, these measures indicate a belated awakening of conscience by authorities and a public revulsion against the ever-increasing violence of our times.

Here in the District, crime has become a national scandal. According to the FBI, serious crime rose 15 percent in the first half of 1965 over the preceding 6 months. In Federal buildings, strict precautions are necessary to protect workers, especially women. Last July, a police report showed 92 crimes were being committed here every 24 hours.

"If a person is murdered, raped, maimed, or feloniously assaulted," Senator YARBOROUGH declares, "we give the person accused of the crime protection in every way, at government expense, if need be. The government furnishes him an attorney, psychiatrists, and other sanity experts, medical attention if he is injured in his crime or becomes ill in jail.

"But what of the family of the murdered person? What of a person feloniously assaulted, maimed, or raped and left with a broken body because of the criminal action?"

The question answers itself. It is time the richest nation on earth showed a little compassion for victims in these crimes.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as

amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

COMPULSORY UNIONISM: A DENIAL OF FREEDOM

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act empowers the States to ban compulsory unionism. Nineteen of them have done so by right-to-work laws which vest in every man the freedom to stand erect on his own two feet and decide for himself with his own God-given faculties whether he will join or refrain from joining a labor union.

Acting upon the demands of certain union labor leaders, the administration is urging Congress to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, and thus nullify these State right-to-work laws. The administration justifies its request for repeal by the single unconvincing argument that such action would make the laws of all 50 States uniform. I respectfully submit that if it shares the administration's view that uniformity of law is desirable in this field, Congress can best secure such uniformity and at the same time manifest its character as the legislature of a free country by enacting a national right-to-work law, which will restore to Americans in the other 31 States the right to carry their own sovereignty under their own hats.

The demand for the repeal of section 14(b) brings to mind the ancient saying in Ecclesiastes: "There is no new thing under the sun."

The doctrine prevailed in France at the time French kings possessed virtually absolute power over the lives of their subjects that "the right of working is a royal right which the prince can sell and the subjects must buy." The demand for repeal of section 14(b) is a call for compulsory unionism, and compulsory unionism is based upon this adaptation of the doctrine prevalent in France in despotic days: The right to work is a labor union right, which the labor union can sell and the individual worker must buy if he is to be allowed to earn a livelihood for himself and his loved ones with his own hands and talents.

Mr. President, during a previous generation, labor unions rightly condemned so-called "yellow dog contracts" whereby employees were required to agree either to join a union selected by their employer or to abstain from joining any union whatever. To free employees from such coercion and secure for them the freedom of choice now embodied in the right-to-work laws of the 19 States, these "yellow dog contracts" were wisely outlawed by Federal and State statutes.

The demand of certain union labor leaders for the repeal of section 14(b) is really a demand that another kind of "yellow dog contract"; that is, the union shop agreement, be given legal sanction throughout the United States.

The union shop agreement is an anomaly in law. Such an agreement is made by an employer operating a shop or industry and a particular union without the participation of the employees whose compensation or terms of employment are concluded by it. By the term "a particular union," I mean the union which is recognized in any way by the National Labor Relations Board as the bargaining agent for such employees.

Under a union shop agreement, every employee, old or new, is forced to become and remain a member, pay dues, and submit to the discipline of the particular union, or else lose his job. It is wholly immaterial whether the particular union is good or bad, or whether the individual employee has sound reasons for not wishing to be affiliated with it.

It is appropriate to note in passing that since the Supreme Court has adjudged the act of Congress barring Communists from union offices to be an unconstitutional bill of attainder, a union shop agreement may compel loyal Americans to become involuntary members of a Communist-controlled union, which is disloyal to them and to their country.

An unbiased analysis readily demonstrates that the union shop agreement is repugnant to the freedom of those who labor.

The union shop agreement is a coercive instrument desiged to draft into unions as dues-paying members employees who will not voluntarily join them. It operates by economic intimidation. Few men are so situated that they can afford to lose their jobs. This is particularly true of those who have acquired wives and children and thus given hostages to fortune.

Union shop agreements are often detrimental to employees because of the way in which they are negotiated. The employer wishes to obtain an employment contract favorable to him rather than his employees, and the labor union wishes to secure a compulsory unionism agreement which will enable it to avoid the task rightly resting upon it as a voluntary association; that is, the task of procuring its members by voluntary persuasion. They, that is, the employer and the union negotiators, succumb to the temptations stimulated by these wishes and enter into a "sweetheart contract" in which the union grants to the employer terms of employment advantageous to him and detrimental to the employees in exchange for a compulsory unionism agreement whereby the employer forces all his employees to join the union contrary to the desires of many of them.

By outlawing union shop agreements, right-to-work laws remove the motive of the union to subordinate the interests of the employees to its wish, and thus leave it free to conduct negotiations for the sole purpose of obtaining an employment contract advantageous to the employees.

Note has been taken of the fact that compulsory unionism robs workers of freedom of choice and compels them to join particular unions regardless of whether such unions be good or bad unions.

Those who demand compulsory unionism apparently assume that all unions are good unions. To be sure, most unions merit this description. Unfortunately, however, any assumption that all unions are good is certainly ill founded.

I had the rather melancholy experience of serving on the Senate Select Committee headed by an able and courageous Senator, JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, which spent more than 2 years investigating activities in the labor-management field. The committee investigated some 20 unions which had acquired the power in one way or another to represent several million supposedly free Americans. The facts showing how this power had been exercised by these unions proved conclusively the truth of Lord Acton's aphorism: Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

Despite thousands of fifth amendment pleas by scores of officers and agents of the unions investigated, the McClellan committee took 20,432 pages of testimony, which made it manifest that the unions investigated were unworthy to receive either the voluntary or the coerced support of freemen.

I can summarize with accuracy what the investigation revealed by quoting a statement made by me at the conclusion of the McClellan committee's work. I quote:

> The testimony taken by the committee has shocked the conscience of the Nation.
>
> This is true because the testimony has made it crystal clear that some or all of the following things have occurred upon frequent occasions in some of the unions investigated:
>
> First, union moneys in enormous amounts have been converted to their own use, or that of their cronies, by union officers whose duty it was to safeguard them.
>
> Second, union officers committing such raids upon union treasuries have destroyed union records to conceal their financial misdeeds from union members, income tax authorities, law enforcement officers, and investigating committees.
>
> Third, union members have been deprived of any real voice in the election of union officers or the management of union affairs by dictatorial activities of union officers, undemocratic regulations, wanton abuse of the trustee process, and even, on occasion, sheer terrorism.
>
> Fourth, persons convicted and sentenced to prison for armed robbery, burglary, extortion, and other infamous crimes have been placed in positions of authority over honest and law-abiding union members shortly after their release from prison and before they had brought forth fruits meet for repentence.
>
> Fifth, union charters have been granted to known racketeers and their associates who have used them as devices to prey upon the public and helpless workers compelled to earn their bread in the sweat of their brows.
>
> Sixth, union officers and agents of employers have entered into conspiracies resulting in "sweetheart contracts" or other arrangements which constitute betrayal of the union members such officers were supposed to represent.

On an occasion 2 years earlier, Mr. George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, made some illuminating comments upon the facts revealed by evidence presented to the McClellan committee during the first months of its investigation. Mr. Meany's comments corroborate in substantial part the accuracy of my statement. I quote his comments as set out in an article

headlined "Meany Is Shocked by Rackets' Scope," which appeared in the New York Times for November 2, 1957:

When the AFL and the CIO merged nearly 2 years ago, he said, the concern of labor leaders about corruption was written into the constitution. "We thought we knew a few things about trade union corruption," he said, "but we didn't know the half of it, one-tenth of it, or the one-hundredth part of it. We did not know, for instance, that we had unions where a criminal record was almost a prerequisite to holding office under the national union. We didn't know that we had top trade union leaders who made it a practice to secretly borrow the funds of their union. We didn't know that there were top trade union leaders who used the funds for phony real estate deals in which the victims of the fraud were their own members. And we didn't know that there were trade union leaders who charged to the union treasury such items as speedboats, perfume, silk stockings, brassieres, color TV, refrigerators, and everything else under the sun." Mr. Meany asserted that "some of these things are still going on." "Of course," he remarked, "you can't get much cooperation from a national union the officers of which are practicing the same sort of larceny on a national scale as is being practiced by their so-called local representatives on a local scale."

This ends the quotation from the article in the New York Times, whose writer stated that Mr. Meany was commenting on the conduct of leaders of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

Some of those who demand compulsory unionism assert, however, that the McClellan committee ended its work in March 1960, and that in consequence the American people ought to presume that the evils revealed by its investigation no longer exist anywhere in the labor movement.

It is not likely that the American people will be so naive as to indulge such a presumption as long as irresponsible labor unions call jurisdictional strikes at Cape Kennedy in contempt of the national security, or James R. Hoffa remains the president of the country's most numerous and powerful union, or the officials of a supposedly respectable union miscount 25,509 of the 133,000 ballots cast in an election for a national president in order to thwart the will of the members and make it appear that the incumbent was reelected by a majority of 2,193, when he was actually defeated by a majority of 23,316.

The vast preponderance of corruption, denial of member rights, and maladministration discovered by the McClellan committee in unions was in unions which depended upon the coercive provisions of union shop agreements to obtain and retain their members. It is not surprising that this was so.

The tragic truth is that union shop agreements are calculated to make union members unable to secure their rights against dictatorial union leaders or to prevent corruption or maladministration by corrupt leaders.

This is so because union shop agreements permit dictatorial control of workers by union leaders. The workers are compelled to become and remain dues-paying union members under penalty of losing their means of livelihood.

As Wallace Turner, who acquired expert knowledge of the subject while working as a reporter for the Portland Oregonian, testified before the McClellan committee, members of unions are reluctant "to get out of line" for fear "that their union cards will be taken up and they will be out of employment."

Sylvester Petro, professor of labor law in the New York University School of Law, and author of the wise commentary on the McClellan investigation entitled "Power Unlimited: The Corruption of Union Leadership," declares:

The 40-odd volumes of the McClellan record may accurately be summed up as an overwhelming documentation of Mr. Turner's point.

He adds, in substance, that "union officers would not be so highly tempted to abuse members and thugs and racketeers would not find unions so attractive" if members "were free at any time simply to quit paying dues"—page 139.

I share in full measure Professor Petro's views. No amount of sophistry can erase the truth that those who work for their daily bread must have the right to belong or refrain from belonging to a union if they are to be really free.

The recognition of this fundamental freedom does not impair any privilege rightly belonging to labor unions. Each union is left free to number among its dues-paying members all those it can induce by voluntary persuasion to join it. Surely, it is no injustice to require labor unions to obtain their members in the same way in which churches and all other voluntary associations secure theirs.

When all is said, "yellow dog contracts" are simply not acceptable in a free country, regardless of whether they are imposed upon workers at the employer's behest or the union's demand. In either case, they rob the workers of a basic freedom—the right to make their own choice in a matter of crucial import to them.

The proposal to repeal section 14(b) raises once again an ever-recurring and age-old issue—the issue of tyranny versus freedom.

I urge Senators to read and ponder a great poem—Rudyard Kipling's "The Old Issue"—before the Senate votes upon the question of repeal.

In "The Old Issue," Kipling tells us in eloquent and truthful words how freedom was bought for us by our fathers at great cost long ago, and how it will be lost by us unless we resist the unceasing attempts of government, which he calls the king, to take it from us bit by bit. I quote a few lines from this great poem:

All we have of freedom, all we use or know,
This our fathers bought us long and long ago.
Ancient right unnoticed as the breath we draw,
Leave to live by no man's leave, underneath the law.
Lance and torch and tumult, steel and grey-goose wing,
Wrenched it, inch and ell and all, slowly from the king.
So they bought us freedom, not at little cost,
Wherefore must we watch the king, lest our gain be lost.

Right-to-work laws enforce, and union shop agreements nullify, the ancient right which Kipling calls leave to live by no man's leave. One does not have "leave to live by no man's leave" if he is compelled to pay a labor union for leave to earn his livelihood.

During the delivery of Mr. ERVIN's speech,

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield for some questions?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the able and distinguished Senator from Ohio for questions or observations or statements, under the following conditions: First, that by so yielding I will not lose or impair in any way my right to the floor; second, that by so yielding I will not have any subsequent remarks which I may make on this occasion be counted as a second speech on the pending motion under any rules of the Senate; and third, that such questions and my answers thereto, and such observation and statements, may appear in the body of the RECORD immediately after my remarks.

I make this last request solely for the purpose of preserving the continuity of my remarks in the RECORD.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am sure that the Senator from North Carolina undoubtedly understands that I do not contemplate making either a statement or failing to place a question in order to deprive the Senator from North Carolina of his right to the floor.

Mr. ERVIN. I understand perfectly that the Senator from Ohio has no such purpose or intention. I made the unanimous consent request to prevent any Senator from raising the point.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With that understanding, I should like to explore for a moment, by means of a few questions, the subject of individual rights vested in the members of a labor union. In pursuing those interrogatories, I wish to discuss with the Senator from North Carolina certain actions and decisions taken by the officers and members of a union, subsequently confirmed by the courts which, in my opinion, demonstrate to what extent the member of a union becomes shackled, in certain circumstances, and is denied his individual liberties.

Mr. ERVIN. I am delighted to have those questions put to me by the Senator from Ohio. I have given a great deal of study to the Taft-Hartley Act, and I have come to the conclusion that the fundamental purpose of Congress in enacting that law was to secure to American workers their right to be free, to join or not to join a union, their right to participate or to refrain from participating in the concerted activities of a union. I am compelled to say that, in my honest judgement, the interpretation placed upon that act by the National Labor Relations Board has, in many cases, totally defeated the obvious intention of Congress and has, to a very large extent, robbed the union member of his right to be a free American.

I say this because he is not only compelled to pay dues where compulsory unionism prevails, but he is also placed

in the position where he does not dare "to get out of line," as Wallace Turner stated; and, furthermore, he is under subjection to the unions with respect to even his thoughts and his every act under union regulations which are utterly incompatible with the clear intent of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from North Carolina very much. Is the Senator from North Carolina familiar with the several cases which I shall now identify: First, the case dealing with the right of members to pursue a course of action that would procure the decertification of a given union of its right to represent the members.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Second, the case involving the right of a worker to produce in accordance with his capacity and allegedly in violation of limitations placed upon him by union regulations.

Mr. ERVIN. I am familiar with those cases. The last case——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let me proceed with the third case: That dealing with the right of a member of a union to cross a picket line in violation of regulations.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Four, the case in which the union held that a member had to attend a union meeting on a Sunday morning even though that meeting deprived the member of his ability to go to church.

Mr. ERVIN. I am not sure that I am familiar with the last mentioned case, but I am familiar with the other cases to which the Senator has alluded. In fact, I expect to discuss them later in my remarks, provided I have sufficient time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to ask the Senator to give us his understanding of what impact those actions of the union had on the individual liberties of the members.

Mr. ERVIN. Those decisions deprived them of the right to be free Americans, to put it succinctly.

Section 7 of the Taft-Hartley Act declares, in some of the plainest words to be found in any act of Congress, that employees shall have the right to join or not to join a union; that they shall have a right to participate in concerted activities or refrain from participating in concerted activities.

I do not know of any plainer language that could be found than is used in section 7 of the Taft-Hartley Act to secure those rights to all Americans as freemen. Section 8(b)(1)(A), which is included under the section which deals with unfair labor practices on the part of the union, declares in the simplest language which a draftsman could conjure up in his mind that a union shall not restrain or coerce any employee—it does not say any employee who is a union member or a nonunion member—but any employee in the exercise of his rights under section 7.

Then there is a little proviso which states that this will not deprive the union of the power to adopt regulations about retaining or not retaining membership in the union.

The National Labor Relations Board seized on the little proviso and has used it to defeat absolutely the rights of employees as freemen. The Board has done it by handing down decisions such as those the Senator from Ohio has mentioned, until the employees have been absolutely deprived not only of their rights as freemen, but also of the rights which the Taft-Hartley Act itself expressly gives them.

Now let me go back to the cases to which I had referred.

I have been in public life for some time, and it is difficult for me to be surprised by any demands of men who seek power; but I was quite surprised to receive a circular issued by the American Federation of Labor–CIO which states that to compel people to pay dues to support unions is just as American as it is to compel people to pay taxes for the support of government.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that the original argument made about requiring a person to join a union after he was on the job for 30 days was that he would otherwise be a free rider, and if services are rendered which benefit him he ought to pay for those services?

Mr. ERVIN. That is so. I expect to discuss that subject, but the investigation of the McClellan committee into activities of some unions shows that such a person is not a free rider, but that he is taken for a ride by a union which he does not wish to join, by a driver in whose skill he has no confidence. So he is taken for a ride, instead of being a free rider, in many cases.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact, therefore, that the member must abide by the decision of the union as to what is good or bad for him?

Mr. ERVIN. That is correct. In the first place he is drafted into a union, in many cases against his will, by a union shop agreement. In the second place, after he has been drafted into it he is virtually deprived of the freedom of thought. At least he is not allowed to express his thoughts and to be guided by his own action.

In the case of Local 285, United Automobile Workers, which was decided by the National Labor Relations Board on January 17, 1964, the National Labor Relations Board held that under the proviso of section 8(b)(1)(A) a union has the power to adopt a regulation telling a man just exactly how much work he may be paid for doing. Therefore, it can place a limitation upon his production and can deny him the right to draw the money he earns for his extra work when it violates the union regulation. This is so regardless of how necessitous may be the conditions of that union member or how necessitous may be the condition of his family. He can not only be deprived of the right to receive compensation for his extra work when due, but can also be tried and fined by the union.

A while ago I mentioned a statement contained in a circular which compared compulsory union dues to taxes paid by all Americans. I do not know of another single voluntary association in the United States that has a right to punish a man for disobeying its regulations, just as the United States punishes a criminal for violating the criminal laws of the Nation.

In the case to which I have alluded, the person was drafted into the union by the compulsory unionism agreement. Then, after he was drafted into the union, he was forbidden by the union regulations to do more than a certain amount of work, even to earn extra pay; and when he violated the union regulation he was fined by a board established as a court of the union itself—which, to my mind, is a violation of the spirit, if not the letter of the old common law, which holds that no one may be the judge in his own case. In other words, the union itself tries the man for producing more goods than the union regulation permits him to do.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. ERVIN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio for a question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the union has the right to fix a maximum that a worker may produce, does it not follow, rationally, that the union likewise has the right to fix a minimum?

Mr. ERVIN. Oh, yes. If the power exists, the power can be exercised either way. The National Labor Relations Board has held that the power to limit the amount that a man may produce does exist.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What about the constitutional right of Congress to enact a law imposing upon a worker a minimum of production? I have not thought out the question, but I should like to hear what the Senator from North Carolina has to say, with his wide knowledge of constitutional law.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I appreciate the compliment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio. I have spent a great deal of time studying law. However, I regret to say that a large part of what I learned has been reversed, and I have been left more or less in a state of ignorance on that subject. When the Founding Fathers wrote into the fifth amendment the provision that no man shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law by the Federal Government, they wrote into the Constitution the guarantee that a man shall have the right, even against the Congress, to better his condition in life by working in the occupation that he wished to pursue, and to do as much in that occupation as would enable him to accumulate property.

Undoubtedly that was the intent of the Founding Fathers when they adopted the fifth amendment and wrote the due process clause into it, providing that no man shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

I believe that such a law would not only deprive a man of his liberty, but also of his right to accumulate property.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ERVIN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio for a question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact, then, that the unions are exercising a power which at least doubtfully resides in the Congress of the United States?

Mr. ERVIN. I would certainly say that the unions, in many respects, under the decisions of the National Labor Relations Board, have been judged to have more power than the United States possesses.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator, if he will yield further, what his recollection is of the discussion that we had several years ago in connection with the enactment of the Landrum-Griffin bill, dealing with a bill of rights for members of a union, which delineated the fact that there shall be a prohibition on the powers of unions involving certain inalienable rights of workers in the United States.

Mr. ERVIN. As long as I retain my mental faculties and my power of recollection, I will treasure in my memory the great speech which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] delivered in favor of inserting in that bill a bill of rights for those who labor.

We wrote that into the bill with the aid of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], who spoke in a masterly fashion on that occasion for freedom.

The Senate originally wrote that provision into the bill. Subsequently, certain modifications were made to attempt to water it down. But in a recent decision, the title of which I do not now recall, the National Labor Relations Board handed down a ruling which seems to me to negate even that bill of rights that Congress granted, by holding that the union, in adopting regulations can negate those rights.

This is another illustration of what I said before. Congress tries to do something to secure basic rights for those who work, and then the National Labor Relations Board, by its decisions, in all too many cases, negates action taken by the Congress.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Pursuing this particular case further, what would be the situation under the existing rule of the National Labor Relations Board and the courts if a worker, knowing that he has a featherbedding job, decides that his conscience will not allow him to abide by it and wishes to produce more than the featherbedding will allow?

Mr. ERVIN. He can be punished by fine if he does not sleep in his featherbedding job, but on the contrary does constructive work. He actually can be fined by his union by not taking it easy in his featherbedding job.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I would like to hear the views of the Senator from North Carolina dealing with the rights of a member of a union, after it is once made known that the union can adopt regulations imposing a penalty on the members, if he appeals to the National Labor Relations Board to have the union of which he is a member decertified because of his conviction that it is not properly representing him.

Mr. ERVIN. There are two kinds of petitions which the Taft-Hartley Act declares that the members of the union can file. One of these petitions is what is known as a decertification petition. That is provided for by section 9(c)(1)(A)(ii) under which any employee or any group of employees may file a decertification petition. This is a petition calling for a determination as to whether a union which has once been established as the bargaining agent in their bargaining unit still represents a majority of the employees in that unit. The Congress said that an employee or a group of employees can file such a decertification petition.

The National Labor Relations Board thereafter adopted a regulation which amends and to a large extent nullifies the words of the act of Congress. Although Congress provided that a single employee may file a petition, under their regulation they will not recognize the petition if it is filed by less than 30 percent of the employees in the bargaining unit.

With respect to deauthorization petitions, the National Labor Relations Board held in the case of Tawas Tube Products, which was handed down February 15, 1965, and again in the case of Richard C. Price, which was handed down August 25, 1965, that a union may fine a member and, in addition to the fine, also suspend his right to attend union meetings or to participate in activities of the union if he exercises a right which Congress gave him to file a decertification petition asking that an election be had to ascertain, in conformity with the terms of the Taft-Hartley Act, whether that union still represents a majority of the employees of the particular bargaining unit. In other words, the purpose of Congress is thwarted by the regulation which provides that the Board shall not entertain such a petition unless it is signed by 30 percent of the union members who are in the bargaining unit. Furthermore, if the employees do exercise the right given them by an act of Congress, in the plainest language possible, they can be punished or fined by the union for exercising a right given them by law.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does not that mean that when an individual, honestly believing that his rights are being violated, attempts to procure a remedy for that violation, the union is vested with the power to punish the member?

Mr. ERVIN. It means, in the plainest language, that the National Labor Relations Board has repealed, nullified, and thrown out the window an act of Congress; and Congress does not seem to have enough spunk or backbone to resent it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from North Carolina was a judge for how long?

Mr. ERVIN. I judged my fellow travelers, to the tomb—in the words of Walter Malone—for a total of 15 years, in three different judicial capacities: 2 years as a judge of the county criminal court, 7 years as a judge of the State superior court, and a little more than 6 years as a member of the supreme court of my State.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not know whether the Senator from North Carolina knows—and I ask him the question—that I was a judge for 10 years.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes; I am aware of the very distinguished service which the able Senator from Ohio had on the bench, and also as a member of the bar prior to his elevation to the bench.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator from North Carolina know of any instance, decision or law in which a citizen, believing he has the right to sue another, can be penalized for bringing such a suit, except that he is required to pay the costs that are incident to the suit if he loses it?

Mr. ERVIN. I agree with the Senator from Ohio. So far as I know, there is no law in existence under which a man can be punished by fine for attempting to exercise a legal right.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have not searched the question, but I am quite positive that the right to assert one's concept of what his obligations, duties, and rights are does not give any court the power to fine him if he does not succeed in his suit.

Mr. ERVIN. None whatever that I am aware of. But as to the decertification petition, there is a different state of affairs. Congress provided that from time to time the employees in a factory which has been unionized should have a right to hold an election to determine whether they still want to be represented by that union. Congress has said that a single employee can file a petition asking for such an election, and that when such a petition is filed, there can be such an election, conducted under the auspices of the National Labor Relations Board. That is what Congress provided with respect to decertification petitions.

But what does the National Labor Relations Board say in its interpretation of the law enacted by Congress? The Board says, first, that one cannot do it, or that a group cannot do it; that the Board will not recognize a petition at all unless 30 percent of the members in a bargaining unit sign the petition. Then the Board says that if a union member signs a petition to find out whether the majority still wants to be represented by that union, the union can punish him by fine and by his suspension from union membership.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does not that mean that if the law of the land is that a person who brings an action and fails in it cannot be penalized, but that the union has the power to penalize a member if he asserts his rights, the union has greater power than the law now gives to the individual?

Mr. ERVIN. There is no doubt about it. Congress could not enact a law to penalize a person for exercising a legal right to call for an election when the law authorizes an election, or a legal right to vote in an election, or a legal right to select a candidate of his choice; but under this rule the union has power superior to Congress, and it can absolutely punish a man in a way that is analogous to criminal punishment if he dares to exercise a right given him by the Congress which sits in this Capitol in what is supposed to be a free country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not true that it is one step removed from putting a person

in jail for asserting what he believes to be his honest rights?

Mr. ERVIN. That is true, except that instead of being put in jail, he can be fined. Not only can the union do that, but it can ostracize him for all union activities except that of paying dues.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Moving to the third case, the picket line case——

Mr. ERVIN. Let me go back to another case. Section 9(e)(1) of the Taft-Hartley Act authorizes 30 percent or more of the employees in a bargaining unit to file what is called a deauthorization petition, by which they ask that the employees in that bargaining unit vote on the question of whether they want a union to have power to make a union shop agreement. Congress gave that power to 30 percent or more in about the plainest English to be found in any of the Federal statutes.

Yet under the holding of the National Labor Relations Board in the Richard E. Price case, to which I alluded a moment ago, the National Labor Relations Board adjudged that a union may punish a union member by fine for exercising his legal right to file a deauthorization petition.

In other words, there is a union shop agreement that drafts people into membership; and when it is desired to have the people who are drafted into membership vote as Congress said they could vote on the question whether they want a union shop agreement, the union can punish those members by fine in a way that is analogous to the way in which the Federal Government punishes a person for violation of a criminal law.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from North Carolina for that supplementation.

Now I should like to discuss the third case; that is, the right to adopt regulations prohibiting certain activities. I should like to ask the Senator for his views on that point, insofar as such action invades the individual rights of the citizen and is separated from the original purpose of merely wanting to charge a member of a union for the services which the union renders him.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I am glad to have the Senator from Ohio direct the attention of the Senate to this matter.

To my mind, this is a situation in which the National Labor Relations Board holds, and the courts hold in following their rulings, that the unions have more power than does either a State government or the Federal Government.

The courts have ruled on many occasions, and rightly so, that people have a right of freedom of speech. Some judges go so far as to say that it is an absolute right. The courts have also held that people have a right to picket as a part of the exercise of their freedom of speech. The courts have held that people have a right to associate with others to accomplish a lawful purpose. Yet, we find that the National Labor Relations Board held in the case of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune Company that a union may fine a member for not attending a union meeting and for not performing picket duty.

The Supreme Court of the United States has held in many cases that I have a right to go out and picket for any cause I wish. If I do not resort to violence, I can picket against others who are picketing, if I disagree with them. Such counterpicketing occurred outside the White House on several occasions during the past year.

That is a right that the Supreme Court of the United States affirms that people have under the first amendment to our Constitution. Yet, the National Labor Relations Board held in this case that notwithstanding the fact that a man's views were totally inconsistent with those who were picketing for the union, and notwithstanding the fact that the man might think that the strike was a wrongful strike and was wholly unjustified, he can be punished by the union in a way analogous to the way in which the Federal and State Governments punish a criminal, and that is by fine. If he does not go out against his will and perform picket duty in behalf of some cause in which he does not believe, then he may be fined.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would it follow then, in the New York strike about which we have heard so much, that if a group of union members said: "This strike is wrong. We have no right to paralyze the movement and the economy of the many people and businesses in New York. It is morally wrong. It is not helpful to the union or to the Nation, and therefore we will not picket," that the union under the present rules and the present decisions would have the power to fine that man?

Mr. ERVIN. Under the Minneapolis Star & Tribune case, the union would undoubtedly have such power. That is the reason why I say that the interpretation placed on the law by the National Labor Relations Board—and I regret to say, in at least one case, by the court—allows the union to deny a man a right which the Federal Government could not deny him under the provisions of the first amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What would be the situation if certain union members, while the New York transit strike was in progress, feeling that the union leaders were not serving the best interests of labor, decided to file a petition to deauthorize or decertify the union, and the union then imposed a fine on them?

Mr. ERVIN. Under these decisions, until they are overruled, a union would be acting perfectly within its rights in so doing. These decisions give the unions more power than the United States is given under the Constitution.

I regret to say that the decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, in the Allis-Chalmers Company case, which was handed down on September 13, 1965, held that a union may fine members for crossing picket lines during a strike called by the union.

In other words, if a man belongs to a union and needs food, medicine, or clothing for his family, and dares to cross a picket line in order to work, he can be fined by the union for so doing in a way analogous to the way in which the Federal and State Governments punish a criminal for the violation of a law, and that is by means of a fine.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On the basis of the decisions which we have discussed thus far, if a group of members of the New York Transit Union, during the brazen defiance of the court's order and the paralysis of the economy and the freedom of movement of practically 10 million people, decided to disregard the order of the union and said: "We want to go back to work," and if they filed a petition to decertify, under the decisions, would they be subject to whatever penalties the union decided to impose upon them?

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator is undoubtedly correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What would become of justice and the rights of the individual union members if that union has greater power than does the Congress of the United States?

Mr. ERVIN. They would have no rights that they could assert. The reason given for this ruling by the National Labor Relations Board in several of the decisions is very strange. The Board says that if a union member is permitted to exercise his legal right to file a decertification petition, he places in jeopardy the power of the union to continue to be his agent and the agent of the other people who work in the plant and he thus threatens a destruction of the union. The Board holds, therefore, that the union's right to demand continued allegiance from those who seek to decertify it is such that the rights of the individual employees must be destroyed in those circumstances.

I have mentioned in my previous remarks that under the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, authorizing the union which is chosen by a majority vote to be the agent both of the majority of the workers, who voted for them, and also the minority, who did not vote for it, the minority are denied the right to participate in the making of a contract which affects their livelihood. The act allows the union to act as agent for those workers who are not willing for the union to be their agent.

If any one of the 190 million citizens in the United States should appoint an agent, he could revoke the authority of that agent at any time he saw fit to do so. Yet, as a result of these decisions respecting a decertification petition, a man can be punished if he suggests discharging his agent by filing a decertification petition. The effect is that those who vote for a union and those who vote against it cannot escape from the union, and they cannot even have the privilege of holding an election. That is so because for some strange reason they do not have the right to question the power of a union to continue to exist in the plant, or to be their bargaining agent.

That is a peculiar situation. It is peculiar indeed that men do not have the right to discharge an agent—in this case a union—once they have established it as their agent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The question I am about to ask is rather elementary. However, it is a fundamental question. Is it not a fact that when the framers of our Constitution drafted that document they

had in mind protecting the individual liberties of the people within our country, and therefore, although the body of the Constitution had some language which gave protection to the individual, they felt that that was not adequate, and required the adoption of the Bill of Rights?

Mr. ERVIN. They adopted the Bill of Rights in order to do something that was done for the first time in human history; namely, to protect the individual in the exercise of his basic rights against the Government itself. That is the reason why the founders adopted the Bill of Rights. We have a strange system indeed in the United States today, which exists nowhere else except in the field of unionism.

There is a basic right which a man can claim against the Government of the United States, such as the right to picket, the right of freedom of speech, or the right to work or not to work; but those same persons, if they happen to be union members, are denied the same rights against a union which, under compulsory unionism, drafts them into membership against their will.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, as I understand, the summary of the whole subject is that in certain instances that have been discussed the union has greater power than the Government itself. Is that correct?

Mr. ERVIN. There is no question about it under these decisions. One of the greatest legal authorities, one of the greatest students of law that the North American Continent ever produced, Dean Pound, said that under the system that prevails in the United States today a union may be likened unto a king, in that it has as much power as a king had in the days of absolute monarchies.

These decisions indicate that to be the fact.

Mr. President, I was astounded that such decisions could be handed down when they were handed down. I am astounded by the fact that Congress sits supinely by and sees an agency created by Congress nullify the acts of Congress. This indicates the great political power which the unions have in the United States.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Now, the Senator indicated——

Mr. ERVIN. In other words, the agent, the creature, has become more powerful than the creator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator has indicated that he is not familiar with the case discussed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and myself, in which a union fined a woman member because on a Sunday morning, in violation of the rules, she went to church instead of attending a union meeting. The Senator is not familiar with that?

Mr. ERVIN. That would indicate that the Good Lord is like the Government: He is going to have to take a back seat on these matters.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. ERVIN. I am not familiar with the case, but if it holds that, it would indicate that the Lord must also yield, as the Government does, and as does the poor individual American who is supposed to live in a free country.

I might add as a part of the colloquy with the Senator from Ohio that I have copies of the decisions to which I have alluded, and if this debate continues long enough to afford me the time to do so, I shall read them to the Senate, because I am certain that many other Senators would be as shocked by them as I was when I first read them.

I repeat that no amount of sophistry can erase the truth that those who work for their daily bread must have the right to belong or refrain from belonging to a union, if they are to be really free.

Mr. LAUSCHE subsequently said: Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ERVIN. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio for a question with the understanding that by so doing it will not impair any of my rights to the floor and with the further understanding that any remarks I may make following the questions will not be counted as a second speech on the motion now pending before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator further ask unanimous consent that the questions I now ask be appended to the dialog the Senator from North Carolina and I previously had?

Mr. ERVIN. I ask unanimous consent to that effect.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Earlier in the dialog the discussion revolved about fines made against union members by a union, first for crossing picket lines; second, for objecting to attempts for certification of the union; third, for exceeding the quota fixed by the union.

Earlier in the day I made mention to the Senator from North Carolina about a union member in Wisconsin who was fined by the union for her failure to attend a union meeting when she felt her primary obligation was to go to church on a Sunday morning. I should like to ask the Senator whether, since our dialog earlier, there has come to him information dealing with that particular case.

Mr. ERVIN. I have been supplied by my good friend from Ohio with a copy of a United Press dispatch which appeared in the Lima, Ohio, News for May 5, 1962, and which is headlined as follows:

[From the Lima (Ohio) News, May 5, 1962]

COURT FINES WOMAN FOR GOING TO CHURCH, MISSING UNION MEETS

MILWAUKEE, WIS.—Mrs. Mary Ellen Benson said Friday she wanted to find "someone who cares" about her right to worship instead of attend union meetings on Sunday mornings.

"I thought the Constitution gave us the right of freedom of worship," she said. "I just wish I could find someone who cares, who is willing to stand up and be counted in this."

Mrs. Benson paid $10.40 in county court Thursday for going to church instead of union meetings.

In a pretrial hearing, Judge Robert Miech decreed she must pay a $5 fine to the union and $5.40 in court costs for admittedly not complying with union bylaws that provided any member that misses three of five meetings be fined. The union brought suit against Mrs. Benson when she balked at paying the fine.

"The union meetings come on Sunday morning exactly at my church time," she said. "I've told them (the union) over and over again that I will never go to their meetings as long as they are on Sunday," she said.

"And I still won't."

Judge Miech said her reason for missing the meetings was praiseworthy. But he said past court decisions, made it clear that the United Papermakers & Paperworkers Local 356 had the power to assess the fines.

This would indicate to me that although Congress is forbidden by the first amendment to pass a law to keep anybody from going to church on Sunday morning, the unions now have the power to accomplish that result by a union regulation.

It is a perfect illustration of how absurd we have become in respect to certain aspects of union activities. It indicates that Roscoe Pound may have been right when he said, in substance, that unions have been granted special privileges similar to those once enjoyed by kings.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I correct in this instance? This lady had decided she would consider it more important as far as she is concerned to go to church on Sunday morning than attend the meeting of the union at a time when the church services were held. She was told that under the union regulations she had to forgo going to church and attend the union meeting.

Mr. ERVIN. She was told by the union bylaws that she had to refrain from worshiping Almighty God according to the dictates of her conscience on Sunday morning in order to attend a union meeting.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What would be the opinion of the Senator on the validity of an act passed by Congress which contemplated the achievement of a certain economic goal and provided that church attendance which interfered with the achievement of that economic goal was not valid?

Mr. ERVIN. It would be absolutely unconstitutional under the provision of the first amendment which says that Congress shall make no law prohibiting the free exercise of religion.

Mr. LAUSCHE. While Congress would not have the right to impose that fine, the union does have it according to that decision rendered by the court.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator is correct. The woman paid $10.40 as a fine because she saw fit to go and worship Almighty God on Sunday morning instead of attending a meeting of the local union held at the same time.

That is one of the reasons why I am standing on the floor of the Senate and fighting for freedom for Americans. I do not believe that people ought to be drafted into organizations which can deny them the privilege of worshiping Almighty God according to the dictates of their conscience, especially on the Sabbath Day, the day set aside for such worship.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am deeply impressed by this lady who said:

I want to find someone who cares about my right to worship instead of attending union meetings on Sunday mornings.

Will Congress be caring for rights of this type in the event of the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act?

Mr. ERVIN. I think the lady could find some people who would answer her prayer. She would find people who care if she would look upon some of us who are standing on the floor of the Senate against great odds demanding that Americans be free to worship Almighty God on the Sabbath Day, any and all regulations of unions to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If section 14(b) is repealed will her position, which already has been shown to be helpless, be improved or weakened?

Mr. ERVIN. If section 14(b) is repealed every person in the United States, in all 50 of the States, who is compelled in the words of Genesis to eat bread in the sweat of his face, can be denied by union regulation the right to worship Almighty God on the Sabbath Day if the union sees fit to require him to attend a union meeting conducted at the same time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish the Senator from North Carolina would make comment on this statement. This is Mrs. Mary Ellen Benson speaking:

The union meetings come on Sunday morning exactly at my church time. I've told them (the union) over and over again that I will never go to their meetings as long as they are on Sunday.

What is the comment of the Senator about the purity, morality, and the goodness of that statement and the suggestion of going to church, and finding one's self incapable of doing so without paying a fine to a union, and that she cannot enjoy the sacred right of attending church.

Mr. ERVIN. My good friend from Ohio will recall on one occasion the Master said, in effect, render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's.

In this instance she was required to render unto Caesar things belonging to God. Instead of being permitted to render homage to God she was required to pay tribute to the union on the Sabbath Day by attending a union meeting at the time she wished to attend church.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It sounds unbelievable to me that in our system of government, where individual liberty is supposed to be the torch of dignity and decency, that Congress can countenance this indefensible situation.

I am ashamed to think that we can tell the world that we allow a condition of this type to exist.

Mr. ERVIN. There are some other strange things happening in this area of our national life, and even stranger things will occur if compulsory unionism is established in all 50 States.

I hold in my hand an instruction sheet apparently issued by the AFL–CIO to its members to tell them what arguments they must make in urging repeal of section 14(b). I read this question and answer from it:

But isn't it un-American to force a worker to join a union if he doesn't want to?

The answer is: It isn't any more un-American than taxes. A homeowner may be opposed to a plan to build a new firehouse in town. But if he is outvoted, he still has to pay his share of the cost in taxes.

This is a claim on the part of unionism that it has the same power as the Government to levy taxes. In other words, unionism claims the power to make every worker choose between paying taxes in the form of union dues or being denied the privilege of eating his bread in the sweat of his face.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator for answering my questions.

Mr. ERVIN. During the course of my remarks, I stated that those who advocate compulsory unionism apparently act upon the assumption that all unions are good unions, and no unions are bad unions.

I am glad to be able to say that the overwhelming majority of unions are good unions. However, I am compelled to say, as a result of 2 years' service on the McClellan committee, that some of the biggest unions in the United States cannot be rightly called good unions. I do not mean to infer by that statement that the rank-and-file members of those unions are not good men. The rank-and-file members are victimized by tyrannical leaders acting under compulsory unionism. They become members of those unions and then must remain as members of those unions in order to be permitted to earn their daily bread for themselves and their families in the vocations which they are capable of performing.

What I mean by characterizing some unions as bad unions is the fact that, as I have heretofore stated, it was shown by the investigations made by members of the McClellan committee, that more than 20 unions representing several millions of supposedly free American men and women were dominated and controlled by union officers who were, in many instances, denying their members the right to cast free ballots and to have those ballots counted as cast.

There were union leaders who were using their power as union officers to shake down employers and practice extortion—leaders who had served prison sentences for armed robbery, arson, burglary, or other infamous crimes before holding union office, and who had embezzled for their own use, or for the use of their cronies, literally hundreds of thousands of dollars of union funds which they had a fiduciary duty to protect.

I have always believed that the most precious value of civilization is freedom. It was for this reason that I stated a while ago, in referring to my service on the McClellan committee, that I had had a melancholy experience when I discovered that acts were current in America which were unbelievable. Some of those acts were being perpetrated by men who had acquired power as union officers; other acts were being committed or tolerated by law enforcement officers who had been corrupted by corrupt leaders of some of the unions which we had investigated.

At first, I could not believe the testimony. It indicated, however, how union democratic principles set out in their constitutions and bylaws were ignored and nullified by the very leaders whose duty it was to enforce them.

We discovered that one of the largest unions in the United States, the Operating Engineers, were actually engaged in practices under which more than 50 percent of all the dues-paying members were being denied the right to cast their votes in any election in the locals of that union.

We discovered in one case that in a local union in Philadelphia there had been an election for the officers of the local, that there had been two opposing slates of candidates, and that after their victory, the winning slate would not permit those on the losing slate to pay their union dues. In consequence, of course, they were denied their union cards and, being under a union shop agreement, they lost their jobs.

We discovered that in one case, a local of the Teamsters Union in Kansas City protested to the president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters against what was called a sweetheart contract, which had been entered into on their behalf with an employer, and that they were punished for their protests by tyrannical action on the part of the president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters; namely, they had their membership in the Teamsters Union transferred from the Kansas City local to the Teamsters local in Detroit, Mich., hundreds of miles away.

After passage of the Landrum-Griffin Act, which would never have been placed upon the statute books had it not been for the irregularities revealed by the investigation of the McClellan committee, I received scores and scores of letters from my constituents who drove trucks and who happened to be—in some cases willingly and in other cases by reason of compulsion—members of the Teamsters Union. They wrote me that although they resided in Charlotte, N.C., they were required to hold membership in the Teamsters Union in the Chicago local, and, therefore, that it was physically impossible by reason of the great distance between Charlotte, N.C., and Chicago, Ill., to attend any meetings of the Chicago local and, consequently, to have any voice in the affairs conducted by the Teamsters Union, supposedly in their behalf.

Mr. President, in the course of my remarks, I mentioned an interview which the president of the AFL–CIO, Mr. George Meany, gave to a reporter for the New York Times a few months after the McClellan committee began its investigations.

I have a high respect for Mr. George Meany. I am compelled to admit, however, that, like so many in high positions, he desires more power than he now has.

One of the strange phenomena about human nature is that the more power we have, the more power we seek.

When I spoke some time ago about Mr. Meany's comments, I did not quote the entire interview contained in the New

York Times of November 2, 1957, I quoted only that portion which was most relevant to my observations concerning what the McClellan investigation had revealed.

In order to make it clear that I am not lifting anything out of context, I desire at this time to read the interview in full. It is headlined, "Meany Is Shocked by Rackets' Scope."

It contains a smaller headline, "Asserts Labor Will Clean Up—Favors Some Corrective Law, If Not Antiunion."

The body of the interview reads as follows:

George Meany acknowledged today that the dimensions of corruption in the labor movement had shocked him.

The president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations declared that the united labor movement would cleanse itself, not because of any law, but because that would be the only way unions could serve their membership.

Mr. Meany spoke to a convention of the federation's Industrial Union Department, headed by Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers.

He uttered a rhetorical threat to quit as president if the federation blinked at his constitution to favor any corruptly led unions.

CURB ON CORRUPTION SOUGHT

Mr. Meany said labor was willing to accept reasonable corrective legislation from Congress to protect workers against larceny, thievery and embezzlement. But, he said, the "trade union movement is going to rally as one man" to fight against any move to "fasten antiunion legislation on us, in the guise of eliminating corruption."

Without naming the leaders of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Mr. Meany scolded them for a quarter-hour or more.

When the AFL and the CIO merged nearly 2 years ago, he said, the concern of labor leaders about corruption was written into the constitution.

"We thought we knew a few things about trade union corruption," he said, "but we didn't know the half of it, one-tenth of it, or the one-hundredth part of it.

"We didn't know, for instance, that we had unions where a criminal record was almost a prerequisite to holding office under the national union.

"We didn't know that we had top trade union leaders who made it a practice to secretly borrow the funds of their union.

"We didn't know that there were top trade union leaders who used the funds for phony real estate deals in which the victims of the fraud were their own members.

"And we didn't know that there were trade union leaders who charged to the union treasury such items as speedboats, perfume, silk stockings, brassieres, color TV, refrigerators, and everything else under the sun."

Mr. Meany asserted that "some of these things are still going on." As an example, he cited what he called the exploitation of Puerto Rican workers in New York by employers acting in collusion with certain unions.

"What a shocking thing it is," he said, "to get a report from the Puerto Rican labor office in New York City that the Puerto Rican immigrants are going to the unemployment desk in that department asking to be referred to jobs where there are no unions."

He said that efforts of the last 7 months to correct these conditions among the Puerto Rican workers had not achieved much.

"Of course," he remarked, "you can't get much cooperation from a national union the officers of which are practicing the same sort of larceny on a national scale as is being practiced by their so-called local representatives on a local scale."

I digress for a moment to comment on what the investigation by the McClellan Committee revealed, with reference to Puerto Ricans, many of whom had arrived in the United States from Puerto Rico unable to speak the English language or to defend themselves.

The evidence showed that one of the unions of the United States; namely, the Teamsters, issued certain paper charters to underworld characters in New York City. A paper charter is a charter which is issued to a man for a local union which has no members. What did these racketeers of the underworld in New York City do with these paper charters, issued to them by the biggest union in the United States, at the request of James R. Hoffa, according to the testimony? They went to American employers who were manufacturing on the narrowest of margins and who were trembling on the verge of insolvency, but who, nevertheless, were furnishing employment to certain Puerto Ricans, which enabled those Puerto Ricans to keep body and soul together.

Those marginal employers were paying to Puerto Ricans in many instances the minimum wage required by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. The racketeers went to these marginal employers, operating as they were on the verge of insolvency, and told them that they were going to organize their employees. The racketeers said to the employers, "We are going to organize them either the easy way for you or, if necessary, the hard way for you."

Being marginal employers, operating on the verge of insolvency, the employers asked the racketeers, "What do you mean by organizing my employees the easy way, and what do you mean by organizing them the hard way?" The racketeers replied, "When we organize the employees the easy way, we do it under a contract with the employer whereby the employer makes them all members of the union without consultation with them, and they pay us out of their wages the sums of money necessary to pay the union initiation fees and the dues."

Racketeers further explained that when they organized unions the hard way, they resorted to whatever steps might be necessary, such as intimidation or violence, in order to coerce the employees into accepting membership into the union whose paper charters they held.

The natural thing occurred, considering the economic plight in which these employers of the Puerto Ricans found themselves. They entered into what we call sweetheart contracts with the racketeers. They made all of their employees members of what had been paper locals by deducting from their minimum wage the initiation fees and dues required by the racketeers.

As a result of being unionized in this easy way, the Puerto Ricans actually had their wages reduced.

It was not surprising that they did what Mr. Meany declared in the interview in the New York Times they did. They went to employment offices and asked to be given jobs in places where there were no unions.

And yet, Mr. President, if Congress repeals section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, it will extend the evils of compulsory unionism in all areas of the United States. It will say to the Teamsters Union, "You have a right to demand union shop agreements in the 19 States that believe in the liberty of the individual to exercise his own sovereignty and make for himself the decision whether he wishes to belong to a union or refrain from belonging to a union, and whether he wishes to pay union dues or to refrain from paying union dues."

The Teamsters Union has been expelled from membership in the AFL–CIO for the reasons Mr. Meany set out in such eloquent language in his New York interview; that is, for having officers who were corrupt.

If some unions in this country are too corrupt in the estimation of the AFL–CIO to be allowed to be affiliated with it, it seems to me that those unions are unfit to have compulsory unionism in every State in which they may operate.

I do not believe that free Americans ought to be condemned to compulsory membership in unions which the AFL–CIO declares are unfit by reason of their corrupt leadership to be affiliated with the AFL–CIO.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ERVIN. I am delighted to yield to the able and distinguished Senator from California for a question.

Mr. MURPHY. I ask the Senator whether during his experience on the McClellan committee, if they ever came across the records of the experience that we had in my former industry in Hollywood. Two men from Chicago were given a contract, not to take over the motion picture industry, but they were given a contract, without any discussion on the part of the membership of the unions already in existence and already in the AFL–CIO, to take control of the entire entertainment industry. Both those men, the famous Brown and Bioff, had shocking records. This was one of the most frightful experiences of the type thing the Senator is discussing.

I was wondering if that had been made a part of the record during his experience on the McClellan committee.

Mr. ERVIN. In reply to my good friend the Senator from California, I do not recall that that was revealed to the committee. We did have several revelations made in other instances somewhat similar to the situation described by the Senator.

I wish to discuss the arguments made for compulsory unionism. Before I do so, however, I wish to say that if any Senator thinks I am overdrawing the picture of what was revealed by the investigations of the McClellan committee, I commend to him the reading of any one of four books.

One of these books is written by Sylvester Petro. It deals with and analyzes relevations before the McClellan committee which were made down to the date of the publication of the book, which date was approximately 1 year before the investigations ended.

The book by Sylvester Petro is entitled "Power Unlimited—The Corruption of Union Leadership."

Professor Petro brought to the writing of this book one of the most brilliant minds of America, a complete understanding of the problems which arise in the labor and management field, and a complete understanding of the labor law. He was then and now is professor of labor law at the New York University School of Law.

Every American who loves this country and who believes that freedom should be preserved in this country ought to read this book.

Mr. President, another book which discusses in detail what was revealed by the investigations conducted by the McClellan committee, was written by the counsel of that committee, ROBERT F. KENNEDY, who is now the distinguished junior Senator from the great State of New York. He gave his book the title, "The Enemy Within." This is a most fitting title, because the revelations in the McClellan committee disclosed that we have an enemy within this Nation who is gnawing at the vitals of the Nation. That enemy is a composite of the corrupt and dictatorial union leaders together with those members of the bar and of local law enforcement establishment, who have been corrupted by those corrupt and dictatorial union members.

The third of the four books that I mentioned is a book written by the man who, above all others, was responsible for the work of the select committee which conducted the investigations into the labor-management field. It was written by JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, a Senator of the United States from the great State of Arkansas, who manifested throughout these hearings a degree of courage, in the face of intimidation, which I can only describe as being sublime.

He wrote a book analyzing what was discovered in these investigations. It is entitled "Crime Without Punishment."

The book illustrates not only the evils which corrupt unionism does to those who in the words of the Book of Genesis must eat their bread in the sweat of their faces, but also to society itself. Where unionism is corrupt, as it was when the unions were invaded by gangsters and racketeers, it not only corrupts itself, but also corrupts society in the places where it flourishes.

A journalist, also, has written a book on this subject. His action in reporting the revelations made day by day before the committee won for him the Pulitzer Prize offered to journalists. I refer to Clark Mollenhoff, a reporter for the Des Moines Tribune-Register and the Minneapolis Star. He has written a book entitled "Tentacles of Power, the Story of Jimmy Hoffa." This book has just come from the press and merits the consideration of every American who desires to have those who work kept free from tyranny at the hands of corrupt or dictatorial union leaders.

Clark Mollenhoff covered the hearings of the McClellan committee daily from the time the hearings began until they ended. No person, other than possibly Senator MCCLELLAN and Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, knows more about the threat that the conditions disclosed by the evidence taken in those hearings pose for the free labor movement in the United States or for American freedom in general. I make the distinction that I have just made between Mr. Mollenhoff's knowledge and that of Senator MCCLELLAN and Senator KENNEDY because Senator MCCLELLAN, as chairman of the select committee, and Senator KENNEDY, as counsel for the select committee, undoubtedly had access to sources of information of a confidential nature which were not equally available to Clark Mollenhoff.

Incidentally, I would add at this point that in addition to the testimony which the committee took in open hearings, and which is analyzed in these four books, the committee had other information which it received in literally scores of thousands of letters from union members in various areas of the United States who were required to maintain their union membership in order that they might earn their daily bread. Those thousands upon thousands of union members reported to the committee, in those thousands and thousands of letters, thousands and thousands of individual acts of tyrrany practiced against them and their rights as free Americans by corrupt or dictatorial union officers.

I wish to reiterate that in saying these things I am not condemning the American labor movement as such. I recognize the truth that a good union can do work of great benefit to American workers. Furthermore, I admit that a good union, which is devoted to the interests of its members, can do much good for society in this Nation by compelling recalcitrant employers to deal fairly with their employees. But good unions slander themselves when they say that a good union, which works for the purpose of promoting the interests of workers, cannot get members without having a draft to obtain and retain them. Such a contention is refuted by the facts. Good unions do not need compulsory unionism to get members, and bad unions ought not to have compulsory unionism. No American should be required to join a union as the price of obtaining his daily bread if that union is dominated by Communists or is dominated by corrupt or dictatorial officers.

Unfortunately, the revelations made by the hundreds of witnesses who testified before the McClellan committee—whose testimony is recorded on 20,432 pages of printed record—made it manifest that some unions in the United States are unfit to enjoy the supposed benefits to be derived from compulsory unionism. The AFL–CIO itself has branded these unions unfit to be affiliated with it.

Mr. President, there are four arguments made to justify compulsory unionism.

The first is that compulsory unionism—that is, the power to compel all of the workers in an industry or in a factory to become and remain dues-paying members—is necessary for union security.

Every legislative body ought to weigh any argument based upon a plea of necessity with great care. I say this because one of the greatest statements ever made on the floor of any legislative body was the statement made on this subject by William Pitt, the famous English statesman, before the House of Commons in the debate on what was called the India bill.

He had this to say on the subject:

> Necessity is the plea for every infringement of liberty. It is the argument of tyrants; it is the creed of slaves.

A labor union is a voluntary association. There are many kinds of voluntary associations in this country. There are thousands of voluntary associations which can be called civic clubs. There are voluntary associations which can properly be called fraternal organizations. Those fraternal organizations have millions of members.

Also, there are many varieties of voluntary associations which can be called patriotic societies; such as, the American Legion, the American Legion Auxiliary, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Veterans of the Second World War, and scores of others.

All of these voluntary associations have members, all of them do good work, and all of them are able to exist and be strong notwithstanding the fact that they have no way to draft people into membership but, on the contrary, are required to obtain their members by voluntary persuasion.

I have great faith in an old book which is called the Bible. To me, the Bible lays down the rules for the guidance of men and nations, and it reveals to us religion in its highest form.

The Bible advises men to be wise and act wisely. The labor unions say that a wise man joins a labor union if he is a worker. But the union leaders who demand repeal of 14(b) say that if a man will not be wise and join the labor union, he should be compelled to join.

If the Bible reveals anything about the nature of God, it reveals that God is all-powerful, and could have made all men act wisely had He seen fit to do so.

But the only way that God could have made all men do what is wise at all times and in all circumstances would have been to make them puppets on a string. If men were puppets on a divine string, and had no freedom of action, they could be compelled to be wise.

But God did not want men to be subject to compulsion. He wanted man to be free, and He wanted man to choose the good rather than the evil, the wise rather than the foolish, at his own volition.

In the very nature of things, God could not let man choose what was good or wise on his own volition unless He gave man freedom; and He could not give man freedom unless He gave him the right to choose between what is good and what is evil, and between what is wise and what is foolish.

We hear a great deal about the free-rider argument. But all of us, in a sense, are free riders. All of us are benefited by the activities of good civic organizations, good fraternal organizations, and good patriotic organizations. To carry

the free-rider argument to its logical conclusion, we should be taxed in some way for the support of such organizations.

I do not believe so. All of us are free riders in the sense that in many ways we get the benefit of good works in our communities without paying for them. But Divine Providence wanted men to be free; and although the church was established to teach the religion promulgated by the Bible, the good Lord said to the churches, "You must obtain your members by voluntary persuasion, and not by coercion or draft laws or draft contracts," because the choice to be or not to be a church member cannot be separated from freedom.

Let us examine the validity of the argument that the unions need compulsory membership because free men will not support them in adequate numbers for them to exist and be strong.

Mr. President, the union movement hinders its own progress by demanding that Americans be denied their freedom of choice and drafted into membership against their wills by union shop agreements. I believe that unions weaken themselves in the estimation of the American people by demanding compulsory union membership.

Other voluntary associations accomplishing worthwhile purposes are able to obtain their members by voluntary persuasion. They exist and they are strong. There is no reason why good unions cannot acquire their membership in exactly the same way that the church and all other voluntary associations acquire their members. There is no substantial reason why a union should be given the power to draft members into its union just as the United States has the power to draft men into the military service in time of war. No other organization in America has ever been granted that power. No other organization in America has demanded any such power at the expense of liberty.

As I said a moment ago, I believe that unions weaken themselves by demanding that they be given the power to draft workers into membership against the will of such workers.

I am not alone in this view. One of the wisest men who ever sat on the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States was Justice Louis Brandeis. In one of the right-to-work cases, the *American Federation of Labor* v. *The American Sash and Door Co.*, 335 United States, U.S. 538, Justice Frankfurter wrote a concurring opinion upholding the right-to-work provisions of the Arizona Constitution; and in the course of that opinion, he quoted these words, which were spoken by Justice Brandies before he became a member of the Supreme Court of the United States—and he was known throughout this land as a friend of unionism.

Justice Brandeis declared:

> The objections, legal, economic, and social, against the closed shop are so strong, and the ideas of the closed shop so antagonistic to the American spirit, that the insistence upon it has been a serious obstacle to union progress.

Those are the words of Justice Brandeis which were quoted by Justice Frankfurter, on page 551 of the opinion in the case I have cited.

On another occasion, according to Justice Frankfurter, Justice Brandeis wrote:

> But the American people should not, and will not, accept unionism if it involves the closed shop. They will not consent to the exchange of the tyranny of the employer for the tyranny of the employee.

Justice Brandeis was talking in express terms concerning the closed shop. There is virtually no distinction between a closed shop and a union shop, because the union shop agreement requires that, so far as the individual worker is concerned, a closed shop be in existence 30 days after the worker begins employment. After 30 days, according to the decisions to which the Senator from Ohio and I referred some time ago, he is in a closed shop forever, because he can be fined if he attempts to leave through means of a decertification or a deauthorization petition.

The facts of history show that unionism has been growing over the years; and will continue growing without Congress expanding the power of unions to draft members.

In 1898, union membership in the entire United States was only 467,000. By 1948, union membership in the United States had grown to 15,600,000. According to the United States Book of Facts, Statistics, and Information for 1966, membership in unions in the United States is now 17,630,000.

Thus, the record shows that membership in labor unions has been constantly increasing and is still increasing, and that the labor unions which exist for the benefit of their members do not need compulsory unionism in order to obtain members.

The claim that they do need such compulsion is an insult to the good union and to the American workingman who receives benefits through the union.

One of the things which has made America great has been recognition of the fact that Americans have the right to different opinions. The most precious right of Americans, in my judgment, is the right of dissent. The right of the workingman to refuse to join a union, as authorized by the right-to-work laws of 19 States, is an expression of this right of dissent.

It is well to have differences of opinion in the United States. It is well to have differences of opinion with reference to the desirability of labor unions as well as the desirability of many other institutions in the United States.

Mr. President, I wish to read another statement of Justice Brandeis, quoted by Justice Frankfurter on page 552 of the decision in the American Federation of Labor against The American Sash and Door Company, to which I have already referred.

In summing up his views on unionism, he said:

> It is not true that the "success of a labor union" necessarily means a "perfect monopoly." The union, in order to attain or preserve for its members industrial liberty, must be strong and stable. It need not include every member of the trade. Indeed, it is desirable for both the employer and the union that it should not. Absolute power leads to excesses and to weakness: Neither our character nor our intelligence can long bear the strain of unrestricted power. The union attains success when it reaches the ideal condition, and the ideal condition for a union is to be strong and stable, and yet to have in the trade outside its own ranks an appreciable number of men who are nonunionists. In any free community the diversity of character, of beliefs, of taste—indeed mere selfishness—will insure such a supply, if the enjoyment of this privilege of individualism is protected by law. Such a nucleus of unorganized labor will check oppression by the union as the union checks oppression by the employer.

In the statement of Judge Brandeis quoted by Judge Frankfurter we find a statement which is tantamount to the statement which I made to the effect that we need good unions to deter recalcitrant employers and to compel them to be just in their treatment of their employees.

Justice Brandeis rightly says that unorganized workers tend to check oppression by unions. I wish to add that oppression by unions is best checked when union members are permitted to withdraw their membership from unions when they do wrong.

As Prof. Sylvester Petro so well says in the passage which I quoted from his book, the most efficacious way to secure union members their rights against dictatorial union officers and to prevent corrupt practices by such officers is to allow its members freedom not to pay dues for its support.

In this passage quoted by Justice Frankfurter from Justice Brandeis we have what is tantamount to an approval of the right-to-work laws which say that a man can belong to a union if he wishes to or can refrain from joining if he desires to do so. These laws are essential to the existence of the individual liberty of the worker.

Mr. President, when I yielded to my good friend from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], I was discussing the first argument made for compulsory unionism and for the repeal of section 15(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. I had pointed out the great growth, over the years, in membership in labor unions.

I invite attention to some remarks made on this point by a great American and a great lawyer, Donald R. Richberg. He said this:

> It is simple historical fact that the unions have increased in numbers and in economic and political power in the last 20 years as voluntary organizations and, under favoring national and State laws, they have no need to compel unwilling workers to join and pay them dues.

I invite the attention of Senators and union leaders to the following portion of Mr. Richberg's statement:

> It is also hardly debatable that a voluntary organization of workers united for self-help is inherently a much stronger organization than a union composed to a considerable extent of unwilling members. Many of the strongest friends of organized labor have pointed out on many occasions that the strength of unionism and voluntary organizations would be greatly weakened by converting them into compulsory monopolistic organizations which, if legally permitted, will inevitably require detailed regulation by

Government which would otherwise be unnecessary.

Two members of the National Defense Mediation Board, Judge Charles E. Wyzanski (former Solicitor of the Department of Labor) and former Senator Frank P. Graham, both made this point in opposition to compulsory unionism. President Franklin D. Roosevelt made a similar public pronouncement. Mr. Justice Frankfurter, in the State "right-to-work cases" (335 US 538) quoted extensively from the late Justice Brandeis, who held that "the ideal condition for a union is to be strong and stable, and yet to have in the trade outside its own ranks an appreciable number of men who are nonunionists. Such a nucleus of unorganized labor will check oppression by the unions as the unions check oppression by the employer."

An organization which exists for a worthwhile purpose insults itself when it says that it cannot get members unless it drafts unwilling people into membership.

Of course, that argument was made at one time on behalf of certain churches. The ecclesiastics and the legislators subservient to their will made exactly the same argument on behalf of compulsory church membership at one time. At the beginning of my speech this morning, I referred to the old saying, in the Book of Ecclesiastes: "There is no new thing under the sun." History repeats itself. A nation which has not sense enough to learn the lessons taught by history is doomed to repeat all the mistakes of the past.

On the basis of this argument, laws were passed establishing State religions and compelling all persons to attend their churches. Most of the people who came to America originally were dissenters from the religions which were established by law in the lands of their origin. In those countries people were denied the right to bend their knees to their God in their own way. They were denied religious freedom, just as the proposal before the Senate would deny people economic and political freedom, and in cases like that of the woman from Milwaukee, Wis., religious freedom.

So laws were enacted requiring people to attend church—that is, to attend a particular church—or be fined. Laws have been passed requiring people to pay taxes for the support of churches, just as the advocates of compulsory unionism say that people should be compelled to pay taxes to labor unions. I am glad to have this instruction sheet, which makes it clear that those who demand compulsory unionism cannot see the difference between union dues and taxes, because they have enjoyed such tremendous power for so long that they consider themselves as having or being entitled to the power of the Government. The discussion between the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and myself has shown that in fact labor unions, in many respects, have more power than the Government.

But there was a time when people were taxed to support churches. It was argued at that time that the gospel of the living God could not be disseminated over the face of the earth unless people were taxed to disseminate a particular variety of it, the variety taught by people who had the most political power and who could control the king or the parliament or the lawmaking body of their nation. Unfortunately, while most of the people who came originally to America came here to escape such compulsion, some of the people who came here for that purpose imposed the same old conditions on others.

Artemus Ward, the humorist, speaking about the Puritans, said:

They came to America in order that they might enjoy their own religion, but then took pains to see that nobody else enjoyed his.

Certainly I should think that the cause of the Almighty is at least on a par with the cause of supporting unions or supporting any other kind of mundane activity. Unfortunately, in America laws were passed in various States to establish certain churches and to make the people pay taxes for the support of those churches. That was what brought forth the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom.

I am certain that many people in the sound of my voice have visited Jefferson's home at Monticello. They will recall that as one approaches the home, he ascends a steep hill, and that the road winds around that hill past the graveyard in which the immortal remains of Thomas Jefferson and of the members of his family rest.

If one stops long enough, he can read the epitaph on Jefferson's gravestone. It is my understanding that this epitaph was written by Thomas Jefferson himself. At the time the epitaph was written, Thomas Jefferson had been a member of the House of Burgesses of Virginia; he had been Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia; he had been Ambassador to France; he had been a member of George Washington's Cabinet; he had served two terms as Vice President during the administration of John Adams; and he had been twice honored with election to the highest office under our Constitution, the Presidency.

Yet, Mr. President, when Jefferson came to write his epitaph, he never mentioned the fact that he had ever held any of those offices. He never mentioned the fact that the men of his generation had honored him in such an exceptional manner. He said this:

Here lies Thomas Jefferson, author of the American Declaration of Independence, of the Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom, and founder of the University of Virginia.

He did not care whether he was remembered for the services he had rendered to the people of Virginia as a member of the House of Burgesses of Virginia. He did not care whether he was remembered for the services he had rendered to the people of Virginia as their Governor. He did not care whether he was remembered by the people of the United States for the services he had rendered to his Nation as Ambassador to France, as a member of Washington's Cabinet, as Vice President, or even as President. He wanted to be remembered as the author of the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom.

What does that statute provide? It provides that to compel a man to make contributions of money for the dissemination of doctrines which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical.

If it is sinful and tyrannical to say that a man must make contributions of money for the dissemination of religious doctrines, it is equally as sinful and tyrannical to say to a man "You will not be permitted to earn daily bread for yourself or your wife or your children unless you join a union, or, at least, pay union dues for that privilege."

I shall speak at this time in reference to the second reason which is given as a justification for compulsory unionism. It is this:

Compulsory unionism is merely an application of the majority democratic rule which requires the minority to support the majority.

I do not believe there is a more specious argument made to justify any course of action or any program.

In connection with this point, I read another statement made by Donald R. Richberg. It reads as follows:

This is a wholly fictitious argument because our laws and customs already require the minority of employees who are not members of a labor union to accept the terms and work under the contracts of the majority. This is similar to the requirement that any minority or dissenting group in a community must accept the laws enacted by the majority representatives. But, even in the case of public laws, a dissenting minority, a political party in opposition, is not required to stop its opposition; nor is it required to contribute to the political support of the majority party. Even members of the majority are at liberty to withdraw from such an association.

Those who espouse compulsory unionism are essentially adopting the Communist theory that there should be only one party to which everyone should give allegiance and support. Inside the party there may be disagreements, but no one is permitted to go outside and support an opposition movement.

The claim of democratic majority rule by compulsory unionism is a pure fraud. Our democratic theory of majority rule is based on the preservation of minority rights and minority opposition and the possibility of shifting the majority power. But when the workers are required to join and support a union regardless of their desire to oppose it, the whole democratic basis of majority rule disappears. It is supplanted by a monopoly rule which has no place in a democratic society and which, as a matter of fact, is a product of state socialism and communism.

Mr. President, I take one simple illustration and show how absurd and how fictitious and fraudulent the claim is that compulsory unionism is merely an application of majority democratic rule.

We had an election in November 1964, in which those of us who adhered to the Democratic Party swept the country by what may well be described as an overwhelming majority.

After the Democratic Party came into power in large numbers in both Houses of Congress, the President of the United States recommended to the country the establishment of what he calls the Great Society.

The Great Society is like Providence in one respect. It distributes its blessings among all Americans—and, I might add, among all the world—Republicans on the

same terms as Democrats, and Independents on the same terms as Democrats.

Who is making the Great Society possible? It is not the Republicans because they do not favor it. It is not the Independents, because they do not support it. It is the Democratic Party.

The Democratic Party is rendering services to all of the people of the Nation. If it is right to compel individual workers to pay union dues on the theory that the union is conferring benefits on them, and if that constitutes what is called majority rule, then, by the same token, those who accept that kind of theory and happen to adhere to the Democratic Party should introduce a bill in the Senate or in the House to provide, "Since the Democratic Party is conferring upon the Republicans the blessings of the Great Society, the Republicans ought to contribute to the support of the Democratic Party."

Of course, we who are in politics know that these blessings do not in fact come to the people like manna from heaven. It takes a great deal of money to win political campaigns. The Democratic Party spent much money, and I suppose the Republicans spent a great deal of money in the last election. I have read in the newspapers statements to the effect that we Democrats have not yet been able to obtain enough money to pay off all of our campaign debts.

We would not have this Great Society if we Democrats had not won that election at great cost. Since we are conferring the blessings of the Great Society on the Republicans, the Republicans should be compelled to pay dues to our national committee and to our State committees and our local committees, which enabled us to win the election and confer these great benefits upon them.

That would be as logical, as just, as sensible, and as fair, if we are going to apply majority rule—since we Democrats are in the majority—as the claim that compulsory unionism can be justified because the union confers benefits upon everybody, and has been adopted as the bargaining agent by the majority. Therefore, since the majority rules, the individual Republican and Independent should pay dues to support the efforts of the majority. I am surprised that some of the people who believe in this majority rule theory have not introduced a bill to say to the Republicans, "We are not even going to permit you to earn a livelihood in this free land of ours unless you make the same kind of contributions to the Democratic National Committee, the Democratic State committees, and the Democratic local committees as the Democrats have made."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to yield the floor to the able and distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and to such other Senators as may desire to engage in colloquy with him, for such questions, answers, observations and statements as he or they may see fit to make, under these condtions: First, that my act in so yielding the floor to the Senator from Kentucky and others will not impair in any way my right to the floor; and second, that my act in yielding under those circumstances will not constitute any further remarks which I may wish to make on this occasion a second speech on the pending motion, under the Senate rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(The colloquy referred to appears following Mr. ERVIN'S speech.)

(Mr. COOPER introduced a bill and a joint resolution. His remarks in connection therewith appear elsewhere in the RECORD.)

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the third argument for compulsory unionism is the so-called "free-rider" argument which I alluded to earlier. This argument may be stated substantially in this form: The union negotiates a contract for the benefit of all of the employees in the appropriate bargaining unit, including those employees who are unwilling to join the union and pay dues to the union. The union is required to take this course because the law requires that the union will be the sole bargaining agent for all of the employees in the bargaining union, including those who are unwilling for the union to be its bargaining agent.

This argument further proceeds upon the theory that everything the union does is an act which the union is required to do by the Taft-Hartley Act.

I do not know of any more cogent answer to this argument than a statement by Donald R. Richberg. I take the liberty of quoting what he has to say on this subject:

> Much public stress is laid on the argument that, since the union negotiates for the benefit of all workers of a class, all such workers should be compelled to contribute to the cost of maintaining the union activities. This argument has a superficial appeal, but it is both fundamentally unsound and highly deceptive as to the facts.
>
> The argument is fundamentally unsound because all through our society voluntary organizations carry on activities which benefit a great many who do not contribute any financial or other support. Fraternal organizations, churches, civic and political organizations raise money, organize work and carry it on for the benefit of a large number of persons who contribute no support. How absurd it would be to suggest that whenever a voluntary organization benefits any group of people it should be empowered to compel them by law or by economic pressure to contribute support.
>
> The argument is also highly deceptive for three reasons. First, only a part of the dues and assessments of the unions is devoted to negotiating contracts. The unions have a great many activities such as political campaigns, social and economic propaganda, insurance, and so forth, to which no one should be compelled to contribute particularly when he himself is not convinced that they are for his benefit.
>
> Second, the real objective of forcing all workers to join unions is, as the union leaders themselves admit, not so much to compel them to pay their share of an expense, as to compel them to accept the discipline of the organization and, by concerted actions and the appearance of increased numbers, add to the economic and political power of the union. Third, the unions sought and obtained by law a special privilege in the right to represent any minority of nonmember employees and to make contracts binding on any such minority. The unions took away by law the right and freedom of individual employees to contract for themselves—and now the unions demand that nonmembers be compelled to pay for having their freedom of contract taken away and exercised against their will.

Mr. President, I have alluded today to the very illuminating book, written by Prof. Sylvester Petro, entitled "Power Unlimited—The Corruption of Union Leadership."

Professor Petro has something to say of a very cogent nature on this so-called free-rider argument. I quote from the book, beginning at page 295, a part of the section entitled "Compulsory Unionism Agreements and Free Riders":

> Compulsory unionism agreements and free riders: Paul Bradshaw, a former union agent who told the committee that he loved unions and that they were just like a religion to him (1758), said all there is to say about compulsory unionism agreements: that they are not acceptable in a free country. No employer should ever agree to one, and no legislature should ever permit one. Senator Ives tried his best to shake Bradshaw, using the spurious free-rider argument, but Bradshaw would not be shaken. He said that no man should be compelled to join a union, even if the union's effort benefited him (1759). Unlike Senator Ives, he had had some real experience in the labor movement.

Mr. President, I omit the next two sentences in the interest of time, and continue my reading as follows:

> The union leaders have had a long free ride on the backs of the workers, consumers, and investors of the country: A free ride which has permitted Walter Reuther to spend $10 million in an attempt to break the Kohler Co., the Carpenter bosses to spend over $300,000 on a book about a past Carpenter president, Hoffa to spread money around in local union elections in which the contributing members have no interest, Dave Beck, Ray Cohen, James Cross, and thousands of others to live off the fat of the land.
>
> If the unions do not keep very quiet about their fraudulent free-rider argument, someone might even suggest that the premise upon which it rests be erased; and that premise is one which unions want very badly. The unions' free-rider argument rests on the premise that unions are compelled by law to bargain nondiscriminatorily on behalf of all employees in the bargaining unit, even though only a majority of those employees choose freely to pay dues. Three points should be noted about this requirement. First, it places no burden on the union whatsoever. One may be sure that unions expend no special efforts upon securing benefits for the nonunion men in a bargaining unit. If the nonunion men get anything, it is only an incidental result of the union's efforts to get something for its own members. Second, the fact is that unions never produce anything at all; they cannot exact more than fair market wages without engaging in socially abusive conduct. Workers who do not wish to participate in and finance such conduct ought not to be forced to do so. Third, the exclusive bargaining principle is not something which the law has forced upon unions; it is something which the unions have sought and wish to retain, for it gives them almost the power over employees which compulsory unionism agreements provide—and may, indeed, be viewed as a species of compulsory unionism. In shrieking so much about free riders, the unions have managed to cover up the fact that they have been battening on forced riders.
>
> If unions persist in complaining about free riders, the proper thing to do is to

repeal the provision which makes them bargaining representatives for employees who do not want them. That provision is bad on principle, anyway, and if it were repealed there would be no need of an NLRB at all, for representation elections would no longer be necessary if unions were bargaining agents for only those employees who voluntarily designated them as such.

There is every reason in the world to prohibit all forms of compulsory unionism, and not a single valid reason to perpetuate it in any form. The Taft-Hartley Act should be amended to prohibit all devices which tie employment to union membership. Indeed, not a single word has to be added to the act in order to extirpate this incubus, and in that fact lies a very interesting point. The fundamental principle of the Taft-Hartley Act is the principle of free employee choice. Those portions of the act from which unions derive the power to compel dues payments by unwilling employees are all in the form of exceptions or qualifications to basic principles and provisions of the act. These qualifications, to be found in sections 7 and 8 (a)(3), need only be removed. When they are, the principle of free employee choice will emerge cleanly and coherently, and one of the worst evils America has ever known will disappear.

One final point must be emphasized. The compulsory membership contracts allowed by the Taft-Hartley Act are a special privilege. Every form of economic coercion is prohibited to employers. They may in no manner or form whatsoever make employment hinge upon nonmembership in a labor organization. They may not condition hiring on a promise by an employee to stay away from unions. They may not fire, threaten to fire, or in any other way put pressure on an employee for his taking up union membership. All these prohibitions rest upon the theory that an employee's choice of union membership should be completely free. That is the principle of free employee choice. Equally applied to unions, it would forbid compulsory union membership of every kind. Viewed in this light, the precise nature of the union's complaint about free riders may accurately be judged. It is the tireless and insatiable lust for power and special privilege expressed in still another form.

I wish to reiterate and emphasize the closing sentence in the book by Prof. Sylvester Petro:

It is the tireless and insatiable lust for power and special privilege expressed in still another form.

As Donald R. Richberg points out in his statement, only a small part of union dues are spent for the purpose of bargaining collectively in behalf of employees in the bargaining unit. As he states, vast union sums are spent for many other purposes.

Now, I wish to read a statement. During the course of my argument I have referred to an instruction sheet issued in behalf of the AFL–CIO for the purpose obviously of instructing those who advocate compulsory unionism and repeal of section 14(b) how to answer questions about these matters.

They have this question:

Isn't a lot of dues money spent on politics and other activities, besides just union affairs?"

I invite attention of Senators to the answer because the answer reflects that the writer of this instruction sheet regards the unions as some kind of a super government which should manage not only the collective bargaining processes on behalf of those who work, but exercise control over all other activities in which its people engage, not in the capacity of workers but in the capacity of citizens.

The question was:

Isn't a lot of dues money spent on politics and other activities besides just union affairs?

The answer is: "No."

The answer is followed by an explanation.

By far the greatest share of the dues dollar is spent on direct trade union activities—negotiations, administration, grievance procedure, organizing the unorganized, training local officers and staff, preparing necessary economic data—the bread-and-butter operations. But beyond this, the labor movement has realized for more than 30 years that it cannot live apart from the rest of the country. Education, social security, medicare, minimum wages, unemployment insurance, housing, hospitals, highways—all these and more are as important to the well-being of workers as the terms of their contract. So politics and legislation are also "union affairs."

I invite special attention to the last two sentences:

Finally, no dues money at all is contributed to political candidates in Federal elections; the law forbids it. Only voluntary COPE dollars can be used for that purpose.

This answer to this question shows that the writer expresses an opinion which he entertains, and which apparently is entertained by many union leaders, that union leaders have authority to take money paid to unions in the form of dues and to use it for any economic, political, or social cause for which they elect to use it. I submit that nothing in the Taft-Hartley Act justifies any claim of that nature. The Taft-Hartley Act is specific upon the nature of the authority which that act confers upon the unions.

I wish to refer to the preamble of the Taft-Hartley Act. The preamble, which is embodied in section 1, states in as plain language as can be found that the act is passed for the purpose of providing a method for "the friendly adjustment of industrial disputes arising out of differences as to wages, hours, or other working conditions, and by restoring equality of bargaining power between employers and employees."

I invite the attention of Senators to subsection 5 of section 2 of the Taft-Hartley Act, which again makes manifest how much authority unions have in spending the dues paid by members, particularly by those who are members under union shop agreements. This subsection of section 2 defines what is a labor union within the purview of the Taft-Hartley Act. I read the definition:

The term "labor organization" means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work.

Subsection 5 of section 2 makes it so clear that he who runs may read, and not err in so doing: that a labor union has no right to take the dues of its members and apply them to anything whatever except to dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work. Yet this instruction sheet broadly asserts that labor unions have a right to take the dues of members and use them to further any kind of social, economic, or political cause they may favor, no matter how much the individual employees who pay those dues may object to those activities.

This instruction sheet is based upon the theory that under the Taft-Hartley Act a labor union is to do the thinking for all of its members and can take their dues and use them for any purpose satisfactory to those who control the union, regardless of whether the members are willing to have them do so.

I shall have to clarify this statement in one way. The statement reads:

Finally, no dues money at all is contributed to political candidates in Federal elections; the law forbids it.

Several lawsuits have been tried which are inconsistent with that statement. Before I read one case on this point, I wish to invite attention to another statute, to show what authority a union has as a representative of persons in a particular bargaining unit. Section 9(a) of the Taft-Hartley Act spells that out in language that is abundantly clear that the union has no authority to spend the dues of union members for anything except for purposes of collective bargaining in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours of employment, or other conditions of employment:

Representatives designated or selected for the purposes of collective bargaining by the majority of the employees in a unit appropriate for such purposes, shall be the exclusive representatives of all the employees in such unit for the purposes of collective bargaining in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours of employment, or other conditions of employment: Provided, That any individual employee or a group of employees shall have the right at any time to present grievances to their employer and to have such grievances adjusted, without the intervention of the bargaining representative, as long as the adjustment is not inconsistent with the terms of a collective-bargaining contract or agreement then in effect: Provided further, That the bargaining representative has been given opportunity to be present at such adjustment.

That is the authority, and the only authority, which a union has to collect and expend dues. There is no authority given to a union to take the dues of members and spend the dues for the purposes of propaganda or for furthering social or economic or political or other causes not having a direct relationship to the conditions specified in section 9(a) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

There is a statement in this fact sheet to the effect that no union funds are spent for the election of candidates for Federal offices. The statement is disproved by a case brought in the State of Georgia by members of the International Association of Machinists. The case is the *International Association of Machinists* v. *Street*, 367 U.S. 740.

The opinion in this case states on page 744:

The appellees, in behalf of themselves and of employees similarly situated, brought this action in the superior court of Bibb County, Ga., alleging that the money each was thus compelled to pay to hold his job was in substantial part used to finance the campaigns of candidates for Federal and State offices whom he opposed, and to promote the propagation of political and economic doctrines, concepts, and ideologies with which he disagreed. The superior court found that the allegations were fully proved.

I invite the attention of Senators to the findings of fact by the court. These findings of fact are set out in footnote 2 on page 744 of the opinion. It reads:

The funds so exacted from plaintiffs and the class they represent by the labor union defendants have been, and are being, used in substantial amounts by the latter to support the political campaigns of candidates for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States, and for the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, opposed by plaintiffs and the class they represent, and also to support by direct and indirect financial contributions and expenditures the political campaigns of candidates for State and local public offices, opposed by plaintiffs and the class they represent. The said funds are so used by both each of the labor union defendants separately and by all of the labor union defendants collectively and in concert among themselves and with other organizations not parties to this action through associations, leagues, or committees formed for that purpose.

Those funds have been and are being used in substantial amounts to propagate political and economic doctrines, concepts, and ideologies and to promote legislative programs opposed by plaintiffs and the class they represent. Those funds have also been and are being used in substantial amounts to impose upon plaintiffs and the class they represent, as well as upon the general public, conformity to those doctrines, concepts, ideologies, and programs.

The exaction of moneys from plaintiffs and the class they represent for the purposes and activities described above is not reasonably necessary to collective bargaining or to maintaining the existence and position of said union defendants as effective bargaining agents or to inform the employees whom said defendants represent of developments of mutual interest.

The exaction of said money from plaintiffs and the class they represent, in the fashion set forth above by the labor union defendants, is pursuant to the union shop agreements and in accordance with the terms and conditions of those agreements.

Those are the findings of fact made by the judge. Those findings show that, in the State of Georgia, persons involved in that suit who were drafted into the unions against their will and who were compelled to pay dues to those unions as a price for holding their jobs, were having a substantial part of their union dues spent for the election to office of candidates for President, Vice President, Senators, and Representatives in Congress whom those union members opposed, and candidates for State offices whom they opposed, and for propaganda and economic and social programs which they opposed.

It is absurd to say that no union dues collected from members drafted into unions against their will by union shop agreements are being used for the purpose of electing candidates to Federal offices.

In a subsequent part of this debate, I hope to have an opportunity to read to the Senate decisions of the courts ruling that unions had no right to spend union dues for any purposes except purposes connected with the bargaining process and for the maintenance of the union for the purpose of carrying on the bargaining process.

Another relevant case originated in my State and was tried originally in the Superior Court of Mecklenburg County, N.C. It is the case of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, and others, against Allen. It is reported in volume 373 of U.S. Reports at page 113.

Incidentally, this case was tried, before a jury. It was tried on the evidence and the findings of the jury were based upon the evidence. I read this statement from the case:

After a trial, the superior court granted an injunction upon the jury's separate findings that moneys exacted under the agreement were used by petitioner for purposes not reasonably necessary or related to collective bargaining.

That "use" refers first to support or oppose legislation; second, to influence votes in elections for public office; third, to make campaign contributions in such elections; and, fourth, to support the death benefits system operated by the petitioners, the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks.

Those are the findings of a jury. It appears that it has actually been found in those two cases, at least, that union dues paid by unwilling members who were drafted into the unions by union shop agreements have been used for political purposes in one case at least for the purpose of electing a President, a Vice President, a Senator, and a Representative in Congress whom some of the persons paying those dues opposed.

Those two cases arose in the Southern States. I should like to call attention to a case that arose in Los Angeles if I interpret the facts aright. It was the *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Sterling Electric Motors*, 109 Federal Reporter (2d series) 194. This was a decision of the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, in a case in which the court reviewed a most astounding ruling of the National Labor Relations Board.

Sterling Electric Motors was a very small company, with a comparatively small number of employees. One of the international unions brought a suit against the employer, to prevent the employer from negotiating with an association formed by the employees of Sterling Electric Motors for the purpose of engaging in collective bargaining with the company.

Here was an international union which did not want the local people in a little company to represent themselves in bargaining for contract terms with their employer, and brought a proceeding before the National Labor Relations Board to have it adjudged and decreed that these employees of this little company could not be their own bargaining agents.

Strange to say, the National Labor Relations Board sustained this contention without making the employees, or the association they had formed for bargaining purposes, parties to the proceeding.

When the case reached the circuit court, the circuit court pointed out that the proceeding was repugnant to the first principles of due process of law, in that the parties primarily concerned were given no notice and no opportunity to be heard; and yet, despite these facts, had been denied their right to act, through an association created by themselves, as their own bargaining agents.

The court reversed the ruling of the National Labor Relations Board, and thereby struck a blow for due process and freedom. It is interesting to note some of the things the court said about compulsory unionism, and about the choices that the employees of small companies have, and about the efforts of gigantic national or international unions to swallow up small groups of employees. I shall read a portion of the decision, beginning at the bottom of the first column on page 201:

The facts of this case compel the consideration of the dilemma confronting the employees of these smaller independent industrial units. The census shows they constitute a vast majority of the manufacturing plants of the country. The evidence here proves the intimate contact of the Sterling employees in seeking betterment in wages and hours, not only with their foreman, but directly and as intimately with the general manager and the superintendent. This dilemma for these men and men everywhere in the United States in these smaller plants has three alternative solutions.

I read these extracts because I think they show something of the necessity of protecting people from compulsory unionism. I proceed to read from the opinion about these three alternative solutions:

One alternative is to join the great internationals or associations. These give added power often to correct abuses which otherwise could not be remedied. However, they may have a remote control by men, sometimes with power almost autocratic but unfamiliar with the particular small plant problems. They collect larger dues, often to support general sympathetic strikes with which the employees of the independent plant may have no sympathy, and sometimes to be spent in aid of officeseekers to whom they are opposed. Into these larger associations the small plant employees are sometimes forced by outside picketing and sometimes by actual violence. When so forced their collective bargaining agent may be designated by methods as remote from "their own choosing" as where the employer influences or dominates their choice.

Another alternative is the so-called inside union. While this is exposed to possible employer domination by the very intimacy of the small plant activities, where properly organized it has "the normal relations and innocent communications which are a part of all friendly intercourse, albeit between employer and employee" recognized and approved by the Supreme Court. *Texas & N. O. R. Co.* v. *Railway & S. S. Clerks*, 281 U.S. 548, 568, 50 S. Ct. 427, 433, 74 L. Ed. 1034. In these normal relations the employees often learn whether the plant is prosperous or is running at such a loss that any increase in the wage factor of the cost sheet makes certain the shutdown of the plant entirely or in the department showing the larger red ink figures. That is to say, the employees know what pressure for their betterment will

and what will not cause the loss of employment of all or of some of them. Obviously such a small union may be far more advantageous to its members than one under the remote control of policymakers thousands of miles away.

(10) The third alternative for the small plant seems almost ignored in the titanic struggle for power of nationwide internationals and associations, though the right to choose it is as worthy of the consideration of courts and legislatures as either of the other two. That is the right not to join or create or assist any labor organization at all, but to deal individually with the employer. What we have described above regarding the result of "normal relations and innocent communications" between employers and employees properly may lead the latter to choose to remain unorganized. The Supreme Court construes a predecessive statute for the protection of collective bargaining as not prohibiting the employer's "entering into such contract of employment as it chooses, with its individual employees," *Virginian Ry. Co.* v. *System Federation No. 40*, 300 U.S. 515, 557, 57 S.Ct. 592, 604, 81 L.Ed. 789, and puts a like construction upon the National Labor Relations Act, *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.*, 301 U.S. 1, 45, 57 S.Ct. 615, 81 L.Ed. 893, 108 A.L.R. 1352. In a proceeding seeking to destroy a labor organization, we do not interpret the intent of Congress in enacting the Labor Board legislation to have established any presumption that employees are always to be deemed to be aiding a violation of the act if they prefer no organization and decline to create one.

(11) Each of these three rights is of equal value and in administering the National Labor Relations Act is entitled to the protection of the Board. The Sterling company's employees' choice of the second alternative did not receive such protection.

Mr. President, I wish that time permitted me to discuss further how some union dues are spent. I wish that time permitted me to read to the Senate at this time an illuminating chapter from the book entitled, "The Enemy Within," written by the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. I refer to chapter 10 which begins on page 109, and which bears the appropriate title of "Bread and Yachts," and gives specific details of how corrupt officers in some of the unions investigated by the McClellan committee misappropriated vast amounts of union dues.

I should also like to read pages 146 through 151 from the book written by Sylvester Petro for the same purpose. These books show that union dues have been spent for all kinds of purposes having no relation to union affairs without the consent of the union members.

I have read many newspaper articles time and again concerning the United Automobile Workers taking union dues which had been contributed in part by men who did not believe in compulsory integration, and giving those union dues to organizations which were bent on imposing compulsory integration on all the people of America. I respectfully submit that that is a denial of basic freedom.

I invite attention to a newspaper article which is several years old, but which illustrates how union dues were spent without the consent of union members for all kinds of purposes. The article was written on July 19, 1954, published in the CIO News, and is entitled "Murray Fund Gives Protestants $200,000." This is money which was taken from union dues and given to the National Council of Churches of Christ, an organization representing certain Protestant churches.

Undoubtedly, many members of the CIO who paid dues which were turned over to this fund were not Protestants. Many of them were undoubtedly Catholics or Jewish. Some of them may have been agnostics or atheists. I respectfully submit that it is a denial of basic freedom, for a union to collect union dues especially from men who are drafted into membership against their will, and use those union dues, directly or indirectly for the propagation or dissemination of religious doctrines in which union members may not believe. The article exemplifies the very kind of wrong which Thomas Jefferson undertook to prevent by the Virginia statute for religious freedom.

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

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

MURRAY FUND GIVES PROTESTANTS $200,000

A grant of $200,000 to the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America was announced last week by the Philip Murray Memorial Foundation, created to honor the memory of the late president of the CIO and the CIO Steelworkers.

The money will be used by the National Council "on behalf of the practical application of religious principles to the everyday world of economic life."

Half the sum will be used to assist in financing, over a period of years, the council's national education program in the area of the church and economic life. The remainder will be allocated to a Philip Murray Fund to establish and maintain, at the council's headquarters, a permanent library and research service for the churches and interested members of the public in the field of the relationship of religion and ethics to economic life.

Announcement of the grant was made by CIO President Walter P. Reuther; Emil Rieve, chairman of the foundation, vice president of the CIO and president of the CIO Textile Workers, and Bishop William C. Martin, president of the National Council and Methodist bishop, of Dallas, Tex.

"The trustees of the Philip Murray Memorial Foundation," said Reuther and Rieve, "are most favorably acquainted with the work of the National Council and especially the excellent work it is doing in the field of the church and economic life.

"The trustees of the foundation feel certain that the late Philip Murray, who spent his entire life in the practical application of religious principles to the problems of our workers, would most heartily approve the extensive educational program contemplated by the national council to stimulate a better understanding and application of religious principles to our society.

"The foundation welcomes this opportunity to help serve the council's work on behalf of the national welfare. It is our belief that the activities which this grant will make possible are indispensable to the achievement of ethical and spiritual gains comparable to the scientific and technological advances of the Nation."

Bishop Martin, in accepting the grant, said it would help the national council's 30 member churches "make the Christian faith a more vital force in the lives of men and nations.

"We are gratified that the program of the national council has so commended itself to the Philip Murray Memorial Foundation," he said, "that it desires to share in the support of the council's program for a better community and national life.

"The grant will contribute to the cooperative effort of the churches to make the Christian faith a more vital force in the lives of men and nations. It is accepted with heartfelt thanks.

"The grant to the council by a foundation established to advance the Nation's welfare exemplifies, we believe, a growing recognition on the part of American institutions of the indispensable service religion renders to mankind."

The foundation with funds of about $1 million contributed by CIO unions and their members in memory of the late Philip Murray, had previously announced gifts to the American Association for the United Nations; Providence Hospital, Washington, D.C.; Histadrut, the Israeli Federation of Labor; the legal and educational fund of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Howard University, Washington; the National Religion and Labor Foundation; and the American Arbitration Association.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the hour is growing late and I do not have time today to finish my speech. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue my speech on a subsequent date, without having my remarks on this occasion count as a speech on the motion pending before the Senate.

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

During Mr. ERVIN'S speech on the motion to proceed to consider H.R. 77,

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, provided he does not lose the floor?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the able and distinguished Senator from Ohio with the understanding that I shall not lose the floor by so doing, and will not have any subsequent remarks which I may make on this subject counted as a second speech under any of the Senate rules, and upon the further condition that the colloquy between the Senator from Ohio and myself may appear in the RECORD after the conclusion of my speech. I make this third unanimous consent for the purpose of preserving the continuity of my remarks in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I simply say, lest there be a misunderstanding, that I assume the Senator from North Carolina knew I did not contemplate in any way that the Senator from North Carolina might lose the floor on the basis of the request which I made, either in the form of questions or statements.

Mr. ERVIN. To make that matter clear beyond peradventure, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my yielding may be understood as including either inquiries or observations or statements on the part of the Senator from Ohio.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. My question is, on the basis of the long experience of the Senator from North Carolina as a judge and the knowledge acquired by him as a

scholar of the law, is it not a fact that when a uniform law is adopted on the basis of a uniformity of operation, it is generally contemplated that there shall be a uniformity of circumstances to which that uniform law shall apply?

Mr. ERVIN. I would say to the Senator from Ohio in response to his interrogation that any legislative body which would adopt a law that was uniform where there was no uniformity of circumstances would be as foolish as the man who had a bed in which he made all his guests sleep. Those who were too short for the bed were stretched to fit it, and the ones who were too long had their feet cut off so they would fit the bed. I would say that is a perfect illustration of folly inherent in Congress passing a law providing a uniform law for all of the 50 States of the Union when the circumstances in the States are dissimilar. One of the wisest provisions in the Taft-Hartley Act is section 14(b), which authorizes the States to have self-determination in this field by adopting right-to-work laws if they desire to do so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I correct in my recollection that the person of whom the Senator from North Carolina speaks, who adopted the plan of capturing travelers and putting them into the same bed, and stretching them if they were too short so they fitted exactly into the bed, or lopping off a part of the head or feet if they were too long, was Procrustes and that the story has its origin in mythology?

Mr. ERVIN. Yes.

As the Senator from Ohio points out, the Procrustean bed is exactly the kind of bed which those who advocate repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law would like to have the people of all the States put in, so that if they were too short, they would be stretched to fit the bed, and if they were too long, they would have their limbs severed so as to fit the bed.

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

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that this Procrustean practice, with all its ferocity and impracticality, has become a rather general rule in much of the legislation we pass?

Mr. ERVIN. I deeply regret to say that it is. I will say to the Senator from Ohio that in all too many instances Congress enacts new legislation of a uniform nature on the Federal level in areas where the public would be better served by diverse legislation on the State level.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to ask a further question if the Senator will yield, providing he does not lose his right to the floor.

Mr. ERVIN. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Ohio under the circumstances already enumerated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that request be acted upon by the Presiding Officer.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the seemingly honest and sound answer that must be given to this question: Are the economic circumstances that prevail in various and separate parts of the country similar, or is it not a fact that economic circumstances, let us say, in a small town in Mississippi, with respect to the cost of living and otherwise, are different than the economic circumstances, let us say, in the city of Euclid, Ohio?

Mr. ERVIN. That is undoubtedly so. That is corroborated by the statement made by the able and distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] on the floor of the Senate during the morning hour.

He stated that the people of New England paid more taxes than people anywhere else in the Union. He noted that the cost of living is greater in New England than elsewhere in the United States and, therefore, the quota on residual oil should be lifted so that New Englanders could buy residual oil freely at lower prices.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to propound another question. Is it not a fact that the per capita income in many States is far less than it is in other States of the Nation?

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator is undoubtedly correct.

People who insist on reciting figures about wages and compensation, and so on, to support their arguments remind me of an old story.

If the Senator from Ohio will permit me, I will tell that story which I have told before on the floor of the Senate. It illustrates a point about the use of figures to prove assertions.

In my county, there are some mountains called the South Mountains. An old South mountaineer had been buying groceries on credit from the neighborhood grocery store. He decided that it was about time for him to pay his grocery bill. He went to the store and asked the grocer the amount of his bill. The grocer told him the amount, which was much more than the old mountaineer thought it should be.

The old mountaineer complained about the size of the bill. The grocer reached for his account books, spread them out on the counter, and he said, "Here is the record of your account. Here are the figures. You know figures don't lie."

The old mountaineer said, "I know figures don't lie, but liars sure do figure."

We have heard much about figures relating to wages and per capita earnings. Those who use them overlook the fact that in some States like North Carolina, for example, farmers raise their own food on their own farms. There are more people living on farms in North Carolina than in any other State in the Union. There are more farms in North Carolina than any other State in the Union except Texas. The food which farmers grow and eat themselves does not go into the computations of their income.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. But those figures are used, not only by liars, but by honest men, to prove various conclusions, among them the conclusion that North Carolina ought to have union shop contracts, and that if North Carolina had union shop contracts sharecroppers in North Carolina would earn the same compensation as steelworkers in Pittsburgh. That is one argument.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the soundness of the argument that at one time the income of the sharecropper can be made to equal the income of the Toledo people of Ohio, where the cost of living is so different?

Mr. ERVIN. I would say that when it comes to the merits, it rests upon no more solid foundation than quicksand. It is totally devoid of logic and reason and commonsense.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the Senator from North Carolina in agreement with the conclusion that it would be wrong to adopt a national law compelling a uniform measure although the economic circumstances in the different States and different areas vary substantially?

Mr. ERVIN. It would be unwise. It would be uneconomic, as well as have the effect of robbing States of the right to legislate in a field which really belongs to the States. In addition, it has the effect of robbing the people of the liberty of making their own decisions in these matters.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is correct. Is it the position of the Senator from North Carolina that if Kentucky wants a right-to-work law, it should be permitted to adopt such a law if it feels that will enhance its economy, and if it does not want it, that right should still exist so that the people can determine it?

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator is exactly correct. And those who are qualified to make that determination live, and move, and have their being in the State of Kentucky, and are familiar with the conditions prevailing in the State of Kentucky.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that when an attempt is made to repeal section 14(b), which prohibits the individual States from determining for themselves what will best help their economy, we in Washington are attempting to do the thinking for the citizens of the different States, such as Kentucky, Ohio, and Indiana, and others?

Mr. ERVIN. I would say that instead of attempting to do the thinking for the people of the 50 States Congress would be attempting to deprive them of the power to think so far as their thoughts are going to be productive of action on their part.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

LEGISLATION GOVERNING THE RECOVERY BY BAIL BONDSMEN OF FUGITIVE BAILEES

During the delivery of Mr. ERVIN's speech,

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the able and distinguished Senator from Maryland with this understanding: First, that my yielding to him for his questions, observations, or statements will not impair in

any way my right to the floor; second, that my yielding to him will not result in any subsequent remarks which I may make on this occasion being counted as a second speech under any rule of the Senate governing proceedings had before the Senate; and third, that any inquiries which the able and distinguished Senator from Maryland may make of me, or any observations which he may make, or any statements which he may make, or any colloquy between him and me, as well as this unanimous consent request, shall be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from North Carolina for his courtesy.

The subject which I am about to discuss will be of interest to the Senator from North Carolina because, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary, he has been the leading initiator in the field of bail reform, and the bill which I propose to introduce at this time is a bill which moves in that direction.

A short time ago, the attention of the country was focused upon an incident that happened in the 13th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, represented by Hon. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER. The incident involved 19-year-old Tyrone Collins who, while free on $500 bail pending the trial of an assault charge in Mobile, Ala., moved to his new home in Pennsylvania in alleged violation of the conditions of his bail.

Without going into details—and incidentally this is not the detailed description as reported to me by Representative SCHWEIKER—the young man moved with his family, when his father was discharged from the Air Force. He telephoned the bonding company and left his name and address and a mail forwarding address, none of which the bonding company bothered to consult when it wished to reach the boy.

In any event, the Alabama bondsman, without the aid of Pennsylvania law enforcement authorities, or any search or arrest warrant or any other judicial process, summarily removed Collins from his home in Norristown, Pa., by force during the middle of the night and, without the interposition of any judicial authority, removed him some 1,000 miles away to Alabama.

Here, again, Representative SCHWEIKER advises me that the complaint was made to him, not by Collins' family, but by the State local enforcement officers at Norristown, Pa., who had specifically told the bondsmen that they could not remove the boy when he went to them. So the bondsmen not only ignored any precepts of fairness, but they ignored the specific orders of the local law enforcement officers of Norristown, Pa.

The Nation was shocked, not because it felt that Tyrone Collins should not have to stand trial on the charge levied against him by the authorities of the State of Alabama, but because of the procedures employed by the bondsmen to return Collins to Alabama. The decision of private citizens, motivated simply by a desire to protect their financial investment, using summary action and force to abduct their quarry from the domain of the sovereignty of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to a distant part of the country, without any judicial sanction and consequently without any assurance of procedural due process, was more than most citizens believed tolerable. Yet, according to longstanding court decisions, what happened in the Collins case was not proscribed by the due process guarantees of the Constitution, nor by any other provision of Federal law or State law. I might add that I would consider it a sort of common law kidnaping.

The Collins incident brought to light a situation not generally known to the public: that at common law a bondsman possesses the power to take a bailee into custody summarily at any time and return him to the authorities who initially sanctioned his release, and that this power may be exercised even when the bailee has fled to another State or jurisdiction. Virtually no restriction is placed upon what the bondsman may do to effectuate this return. There need be no compliance with any State arrest procedures, with procedures securing persons against unreasonable searches and seizures, or with any requirement that a person taken from one State to another without his consent be given a judicial hearing on the reasonableness of the removal. In short, the bondsman can act without the sanction of any State or Federal tribunal. This common law rule is still the law today.

This common law is still the law in the United States. Incidentally, the last time it was passed upon by the Supreme Court of the United States was in 1878, and the court upheld the common law at that time.

When it became apparent that what had happened in the Collins incident was not a violation of any Federal law, the almost universal response was one of outrage. Not only had the integrity and sovereignty of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania been flaunted by what had happened, but it was also apparent that there had been, at least by modern standards, a violation of individual rights that in analogous circumstances could never legally occur. It was evident that this situation could no longer be tolerated. No longer could society condone a philosophy that regarded the bailee as nothing more than the bondsman's chattel—such as a car about to be repossessed—a mere piece of property that the bondsman-owner could abuse in any way without answering to the law for his actions.

In this case, in Norristown, Pa., when the two persons sought Collins—and incidentally, neither of them was employed by the government of Alabama—they were acting like headhunters—they entered Collins' home at midnight, posed as law enforcement officers, said they could be reached at the Norristown jail, when they could not, took Collins, and went into other States. Seventy-two hours passed without any opportunity or right being granted to the individual to call his family, call a lawyer, or to call even the Alabama authorities.

The irony of the Collins situation was made all the more poignant by the fact that when the State officials request the return of a fugitive from justice who has taken refuge in another State, they comply with very strict procedures, specified by article 4, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution, which utilize the executive authority of the refuge or asylum State for taking the fugitive into custody. Only after the fugitive has been given a hearing in the asylum State by the authorities of that State, and it has been determined that he has left the jurisdiction of the demanding State in violation of law, can the fugitive be turned over to the authorities who seek his return to the State whence he originally fled. If a public official must go through this sort of procedure to get back a person who is already a convicted criminal, how strange it was, people thought, that a private person, owing no allegiance and no sense of public duty to any State authority, strictly out for his own headhunting bounty, answerable to nothing but his own conscience, could ignore such procedures in seizing an individual who was not a criminal but simply an accused, presumed by the law to be innocent of the charges pending against him.

Had the individual been actually convicted of crime by the State of Alabama and fled to jurisdiction, he would have been protected by the Constitution. It would have been necessary to have extradition proceedings in the State of Pennsylvania. But Collins was not even a convicted felon, and the bondsman was able to follow his own procedure; so at midnight he entered Collins' home, abducted Collins, and returned him to Alabama.

Recognizing that something should be done, Representative SCHWEIKER and I resolved to correct this egregious state of affairs, so as to make bail bondsmen subject to minimum standards of procedural due process, and are State authorities in comparable situations.

Accordingly, we are today introducing in both Houses of Congress a bill, which we have jointly worked out over the past 4 weeks, to provide for the implementation of these minimum standards in cases such as that involving Tyrone Collins. In formulating the content of the bill, we were fortunate to have the counsel and advice of Mr. Ronald Goldfarb, the noted authority on bail problems, whose recent book, "Ransom," pointed out the need for reform in this area. Mr. Goldfarb testified before the subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] last summer, when lengthy hearings on bail reform in the United States were held.

Simply stated, the main provisions of the bill we are today introducing are these:

First. When a bondsman seeks the return to another jurisdiction of a person who has violated the conditions of his bail, the bondsman must apply to a judicial officer of the United States—either

a Federal judge or a U.S. Commissioner—for a warrant authorizing the taking into custody of the fugitive bailee.

Second. If the bondsman is able to show probable cause—and this is a minimum standard—that the person named in the warrant application has violated the terms and conditions of his bail, the judicial officer shall issue the warrant, and the person is to be brought promptly before the judicial officer for a hearing.

Third. At the hearing, the fugitive bailee is to be informed of the nature and purpose of the proceeding against him, of his right to retain counsel, of his right not to make a statement, and of the fact that any statement made by him may be used against him. He also is to be given reasonable opportunity to consult counsel.

Fourth. At the hearing the bondsman must establish that the identity of the alleged fugitive bailee is as he asserts, that the bondsman and the fugitive are in a bail relationship, and that the conditions of bail imposed to secure the fugitive's appearance in a future judicial proceeding have been broken.

Fifth. If the necessary showing is made at the hearing, the judicial officer is to issue a warrant for removal of the fugitive bailee, promptly and directly, to the appropriate authorities of the jurisdiction whence he has fled.

Sixth. Violation of these procedures by the bondsman is made a Federal crime, punishable by a fine of up to $5,000, or imprisonment of up to 2 years, or both.

I hope that the bill I am introducing today will receive the prompt attention of the Senate and that hearings will be held at the earliest possible date.

I intend to meet with the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina. The Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments and the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery held hearings on bail restriction last year. I hope that they will consider this legislation as they consider other legislation in the field of bail reform.

I urge Congress to support this bipartisan effort to remedy a longstanding and grievous flaw in the pattern of existing law. I am confident that the Senate will agree with my assessment of the need for this legislation, and that the bill I am introducing today will become law before the end of the session.

For the information of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill which Representative SCHWEIKER and I have worked out be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2855) to amend chapter 207, title 18, United States Code, to prescribe procedure for the return of persons who have fled, in violation of the conditions of bail given in any State or judicial district of the United States, to another State or judicial district, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2855

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 207, title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 3147. Return of Persons Jumping Bail.

"(a) Whenever any person who has been admitted to bail pending his appearance at any future judicial proceeding in a court of the United States for any judicial district moves or travels to any other judicial district of the United States in violation of a condition of his bail, and whenever any person who has been admitted to bail pending his appearance at any future judicial proceeding in a court of a State moves or travels to any other State in violation of a condition of his bail, a surety upon the bail may apply to a nearby judicial officer of the United States within such other judicial district or State for a warrant to take such person into custody and to bring him before such judicial officer for further proceedings under this section. Upon a showing of probable cause for belief that the person named in such application has moved or traveled to such district or State in violation of the conditions of bail duly given, such judicial officer shall issue to the applicant, or in the discretion of such judicial officer to any nearby law enforcement officer of the United States having authority to make an arrest for the violation of any law of the United States, a warrant for the taking of such person into custody and his production before such judicial officer without unreasonable delay for further proceedings under this section.

"(b) Whenever any person who has been taken into custody upon application so made by a surety upon bail is brought before a judicial officer of the United States, the surety may apply to such officer for a warrant for the removal of such person to the appropriate district or State for compliance with the conditions of the bail. The judicial officer shall then inform such person of the nature and purpose of the proceeding, of the right of such person to retain counsel, and of the right of such person to have a hearing upon the pending application or to waive hearing thereon. Such judicial officer also shall inform such person that he is not required to make a statement and that any statement made by him may be used against him, and shall allow him reasonable opportunity to consult counsel.

"(c) If, in a proceeding under subsection (b), the person as to whom an application for a warrant for removal has been made waives hearing, the judicial officer shall remand such person into the custody of the applicant, and shall issue to him a warrant for the removal of such person to the appropriate district or State. If such person does not waive hearing, the judicial officer shall hear evidence offered by the parties to the proceeding. At the hearing, the person as to whom the application was made may cross-examine witnesses against him, and may introduce evidence in his own behalf. If it is shown by evidence taken in the hearing that such person has been admitted to bail in the named district or State, that such person has moved or traveled from that district or State in violation of an obligation imposed by the conditions of bail duly given to secure his appearance in a judicial proceeding within such district or State, and that the applicant is a surety upon that bail, the presiding judicial officer shall remand such person into the custody of the applicant, and shall issue to him a warrant authorizing the removal of such person to the appropriate district or State. If no such showing is made, the person as to whom the application was made shall be discharged from custody.

"(d) Any warrant for removal issued under this section shall be conditioned upon the prompt and direct return of the named person by designated means to the appropriate authorities of the district or State in which there is pending the proceeding in which such person is obligated to appear.

"(e) Whoever, acting under authority or color of authority arising from any bail given to secure the appearance of any person at any judicial proceeding, takes, attempts to take, or conspires with any other individual to take such person into custody at any place with intent to remove such person, or who knowingly removes such person, without his consent to any other judicial district of the United States for appearance in a judicial proceeding of a court of the United States, or to any other State for appearance in a judicial proceeding of a court of that State, without compliance with the requirements of this section or of chapter 209 of this title, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

"(f) As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'bail' means any bond, recognizance, undertaking, or promise given to secure the appearance of any person as a party or witness in a judicial proceeding;

"(2) The term 'surety', when used with respect to bail, means a person, or a duly authorized agent of a person, who is a surety upon a bail bond or recognizance, or who has given any other undertaking or promise to secure the appearance of any other person as a party or witness in a judicial proceeding;

"(3) The term 'judicial officer of the United States' means a judge of the United States or a United States commissioner;

"(4) The term 'State' means any State or possession of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and

"(5) The term 'court of a State' means any court of a State or any political subdivision thereof.

"(g) Nothing contained in this section shall affect or impair the application or enforcement of any provision of chapter 55 of this title."

(b) The chapter analysis of chapter 207, title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"3147. Return of Persons Jumping Bail."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie over for a period of 10 days in the event that any other Senators wish to cosponsor the legislation.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, Representative SCHWEIKER and I have worked for several weeks on this legislation. We studied numerous possibilities of approaching reform. We felt that the procedure which I have outlined would provide a minimum burden to bondsmen and that it could be followed within a relatively short time because U.S. Commissioners are available. We felt that it would protect the procedural due rights of the alleged bailee, as well as those of the bondsman's own interest and that it would serve the ends of justice.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as a part of the colloquy between the Senator

from Maryland and myself, and subject to the unanimous-consent agreement, I commend the Senator from Maryland for his interest in this particular problem.

In common with a major segment of the American people, I was very much outraged by the event to which the Senator from Maryland has alluded.

The right of bail to apprehend a person arose in the common law which prevailed in England. There is quite a difference, I think, between the siutation in England and the situation in America, in that England is a common jurisdiction, and, in America, we have separate jurisdictions of the States.

I had contemplated introducing a bill to make the taking of a principal by a bail bondsman under the circumstances indicated by the press in respect to this incident, a Federal crime. However, I think that the approach which the Senator from Maryland takes to this matter is probably a more desirable approach because it does recognize that the bondsmen have an economic interest in the apprehension of the principal. It also recognizes that the principal has certain rights under the due process clause of the 14th amendment, as well as under the due process laws of the State in which he is seized by his bondsman.

I assure the Senator from Maryland that I am very sympathetic toward his bill and I shall do all I can to obtain speedy action on it in the committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator.

During the delivery of Mr. ERVIN'S speech,

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from North Carolina be kind enough to yield to the Chair for announcements?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield for that purpose.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints Senator INOUYE to attend the United States-Mexico Interparliamentary meetings, to be held February 9–16 in Washington, Philadelphia, and San Francisco, in lieu of Senator METCALF, resigned.

The Chair also appoints Senators MORSE and JAVITS to attend the fourth meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council at the Ministerial Level, Buenos Aires, Argentina, convening during the fourth week in March 1966.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate three messages from the President of the United States—on tariff, on foreign aid, and Employees Training Act of 1958. Without objection, they will be printed in the RECORD, without being read, and appropriately referred.

The messages from the President were referred as follows:

To the Committee on Finance:

SEPARATE CLASSIFICATION IN TARIFF SCHEDULES FOR CERTAIN TEXTURED OR TEXTURIZED YARNS

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith, in accordance with section 2 of Public Law 89–229, a report concerning the feasibility and desirability of separate classification in the tariff schedules of the United States for those articles of manmade fibers commonly referred to as textured or texturized yarns.

The report concludes that such separate tariff classification for textured yarns is feasible but not desirable in view of the current situation.

Textured yarn production in the United States has been rising steadily in recent years, from 74 million pounds in 1960 to over 250 million pounds in 1965. During this period, the independent throwster industry, which processes a major portion of textured yarn, has had rising employment. At the same time, imports have been declining. The Tariff Commission has estimated that the annual imports of textured yarns declined from more than 2 million pounds in 1962 to less than 1 million pounds in 1965, representing less than one-half of 1 percent of the domestic market.

However, the representatives of the domestic industry have argued that a serious threat of injury looms in the future. In part because of this concern, the report recommends that more accurate import data for textured yarns be provided in the future, so that Congress, the executive branch, and the industry can keep close watch on import levels and consider additional measures should they be warranted. I am therefore directing that steps be taken to obtain more accurate data on imports of textured yarns.

I am also transmitting for the information of the Congress the report of the Tariff Commission on textured yarns which I requested.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 1, 1966.*

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM (H. DOC. NO. 374)

To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend a foreign aid program to help those nations who are determined to help themselves.

I recommend a program to help give the people of the less developed world the food, the health, the skills and education—and the strength—to lead their nations to self-sufficient lives of plenty and freedom.

I propose to carry forward the best of what we are now doing in the less developed world, and cut out the worst. I also propose to make the basic changes the times demand.

My recommendations are grounded in the deep conviction that we must use foreign assistance to attack the root causes of poverty. We must concentrate on countries not hostile to us that give solid evidence that they are determined to help themselves.

This is the lesson of the past. It is the hope for the future. It is the guiding principle for a nation ready and willing to cooperate with the industrious, but unwilling to subsidize those who do not assume responsibility for their own fate.

During the past year I have given our foreign assistance program the most sober and searching review. I have questioned the merit of each program. Special groups have concentrated on the particular areas of food, education, and health. A Cabinet committee has examined the details of our general economic and military assistance.

Thus, the steps I recommend today have been developed in the light of advice from senior officials in the executive branch, congressional leaders, and experienced advisers from outside Government. They also have been developed with full recognition of our balance-of-payments situation.

They emerge from a rigorous examination of our past experience.

They are informed by compassion and shaped by the history of two decades.

They are the proof of our devotion to the works of peace.

They reflect our vision of a world free from fear and ripe with opportunity.

They will shape the legacy we leave our children.

I

The quest for peace is as old as mankind.

For countless centuries man struggled to secure first his home, then his village, then his city. It is the unique heritage of our century that men must strive for a secure world.

Peace, plenty, freedom—our fathers aspired to these as we do now. But the fateful truth of our age is that all our personal and national hopes hang in a balance affected by events and attitudes half a world away.

We have paid a fearful price to learn the folly of isolation. We have learned that the human misery which infects whole nations with a thirst for violent change does not give way to mere slogans. We have learned that the works of peace require courage and foresight. The need knows neither national boundary nor narrow ideology.

We have demonstrated this understandings in many ways over the past two decades. Our military strength has protected many countries threatened by invasion from without or subversion from within. Our economic assistance programs have rebuilt Europe. We have helped untold millions to gain confidence in peaceful progress, where there has been neither peace nor progress for centuries.

We will never know how many crises have been averted, how much violence avoided, or how many minds have been won to the cause of freedom in these years. But I believe we have many such achievements to our credit.

Yet today the citizens of many developing nations walk in the shadow of misery: half the adults have never been

to school; over half the people are hungry or malnourished; food production per person is falling; at present rates of growth, population will double before the year 2000.

These are the dominant facts of our age. They challenge our own security. They threaten the future of the world.

Our response must be bold and daring. It must go to the root causes of misery and unrest. It must build a firm foundation for progress, security, and peace.

II

Although we recognize the shortsightedness of isolation, we do not embrace the equally futile prospect of total and endless dependence. The United States can never do more than supplement the efforts of the developing countries themselves. They must supply most of the capital, the know-how—and the will to progress. If they do we can and will help. If they do not, nothing we can supply will substitute. Nothing can replace resources wasted in political or military adventures.

For the essence of economic development is work—hard, unremitting, often thankless work. Most of it must be done by the people whose futures and whose children's futures are directly at stake.

Only these people and their leaders can invest every possible resource in improved farming techniques, in school and hospital construction, and in critical industry; make the land reforms, tax changes, and other basic adjustments necessary to transform their societies; face the population problem squarely and realistically; create the climate which will attract foreign investment, and keep local money at home.

These are just a few of the steps on the road to modernization. They are far from easy. We would do well to remember how difficult many of them were for us. But they are absolutely necessary. Without them, outside help is wasted. Neither we nor they can afford waste, and we will not continue any partnership in which only we recognize that fact.

As I said last October, "Action, not promises, will be the standard of assistance." It must be clear that the principle of our assistance is cooperation. Those who do not fulfill their commitments to help themselves cannot expect help from us.

III

In this spirit of cooperation, I propose that the United States offer to join in new attacks upon the root causes of world poverty.

The incessant cycle of hunger, ignorance, and disease is the common blight of the developing world. This vicious pattern can be broken. It must be broken if democracy is to survive.

The problem of hunger is a continuing crisis. In many parts of the world we witness both the ravages of famine born of natural disaster and the failure of food production to keep pace with rising needs.

This is a catastrophe for all of us. It must be dealt with by all who can help. In many other countries food output is also falling behind population growth. We cannot meet the world food needs of the future, however willing we are to share our abundance. Nor would it serve the common interest if we could.

The solution is clear: an all-out effort to enable the developing countries to supply their own food needs, through their own production or through improved capacity to buy in the world market.

I will shortly send to the Congress a special message which will recommend new legislation to redirect and strengthen our food aid programs to induce greater agricultural self-help abroad; make food aid a more integrated element of general programs of economic cooperation; move as quickly as our mutual interests permit toward harder financial terms, thereby adding to our commercial markets and a favorable balance-of-payments result.

In addition, I propose that the Agency for International Development increase its efforts in the field of agriculture by more than one-third, to a total of nearly $500 million. One-third of this total will finance imports of fertilizer from the United States. The remainder will finance transfer of American farming techniques, the most advanced in the world; improvement of roads, marketing and irrigation facilities; establishment of extension services, cooperatives and credit facilities; purchases of American farm equipment and pesticides; research on soil and seed improvements.

These programs will also have long-range benefits for our own farmers. Higher incomes abroad mean greater exports for our highly efficient food producers.

To combat ignorance, I am proposing a major new effort in international education. I propose a 50-percent increase in AID education activities to a total of more than $200 million. Shortly I will transmit to the Congress a special message proposing an International Education Act which will commit the United States to a campaign to spread the benefits of education to every corner of the earth. Nothing is more critical to the future of liberty and the fate of mankind.

To fight disease, I will shortly propose an International Health Act which will provide for extensive new programs at home and abroad.

We now have the capacity to eliminate smallpox from the list of man's natural enemies; to eradicate malaria in the Western Hemisphere and in large areas of Africa and Asia; and to relieve much of the suffering now caused by measles, cholera, rabies, and other epidemic diseases.

I will propose a two-thirds increase in fiscal year 1967 in AID support of health programs, to a total of more than $150 million. In addition to financing disease eradication, we will step up our program to combat malnutrition. We will expand help to community water supply projects. We will finance the training of more doctors and nurses, needed for new health centers and mobile health units.

I also propose to provide nearly $150 million in food-for-work programs, and more than $100 million in contributions to international organizations to further support the war on hunger, ignorance, and disease.

IV

We stand ready to help developing countries deal with the population problem.

The United States cannot and should not force any country to adopt any particular approach to this problem. It is first a matter of individual and national conscience, in which we will not interfere.

But population growth now consumes about two-thirds of economic growth in the less developed world. As death rates are steadily driven down, the individual miracle of birth becomes a collective tragedy of want.

In all cases, our help will be given only upon request, and only to finance advisers, training, transportation, educational equipment, and local currency needs.

Population policy remains a question for each family and each nation to decide. But we must be prepared to help when decisions are made.

V

In many areas, the keys to economic and social development lie largely in the settling of old quarrels and the building of regional solidarity. Regional cooperation is often the best means of economic progress as well as the best guarantor of political independence.

I propose that we continue and enlarge our support of the institutions and organizations which create and preserve this unity.

Last April I pledged full U.S. support for regional programs to accelerate peaceful development in southeast Asia. We have already begun to implement this pledge by support to the Nam Ngum Dam in the Mekong Basin and to other projects.

In my legislative proposals, I am requesting new and specific authority to carry forward this support for regional progress.

We must make it clear to friend and foe alike that we are as determined to support the peaceful growth of southeast Asia as we are to resist those who would conquer and subjugate it.

These efforts in Asia will be further enhanced by the formation of the Asian Development Bank, which was the subject of my message to the Congress of January 18. I am confident that this Bank will be a major unifying force in the region, and a source of vital development capital invaluable to our mutual interests.

In Africa, we look forward to working closely with the new African Development Bank as its programs materialize.

We also look forward to progress toward an East African economic community and other subregional common markets on that massive continent. As these institutions and arrangements develop, the United States intends to make greater use of them as channels for our assistance. We will move in the direction of more regional administration of our bilateral programs.

We have recently extended our ongoing commitment to the Alliance for Progress, which includes strong support for the successful economic integration of Central America. The movement toward greater cooperation among all

Latin American economies will gain momentum in the years ahead. It has our strong support.

The United States will support the proposal of the Inter-American Committee of the Alliance for Progress and the Inter-American Development Bank to establish a new fund for feasibility studies of multinational projects. These projects can be of enormous value to countries which share a river valley or another natural resource. They are sound combinations of good economics and good politics.

VI

I propose that the United States—in ways consistent with its balance-of-payments policy—increase its contributions to multilateral lending institutions, particularly the International Development Association. These increases will be conditional upon appropriate rises in contributions from other members. We are prepared immediately to support negotiations leading to agreements of this nature for submission to the Congress. We urge other advanced nations to join us in supporting this work.

The United States is a charter member and the largest single contributor to such institutions as the World Bank, the International Development Association, and the Inter-American Development Bank. This record reflects our confidence in the multilateral method of development finance and in the soundness of these institutions themselves. They are expert financiers, and healthy influences on the volume and terms of aid from other donors.

I propose that we increase our contributions to the United Nations development program, again subject to proportionate increases in other contributions. This program merges United Nations technical assistance and preinvestment activities. It promises to be among the world's most valuable development instruments.

VII

We will expand our efforts to encourage private initiative and enterprise in developing countries. We have received very useful advice and guidance from the report of the distinguished Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid. Many of the recommendations of that report are now being put into effect.

We will review frankly and constructively with cooperating countries the obstacles to domestic and foreign private investment. We will continue to support elimination of inefficient controls; formation of cooperatives; training of labor and business leaders; credit facilities and advisory services for small- and medium-sized farms and businesses.

The U.S. Government can do only a small part of the job of helping and encouraging businessmen abroad. We must rely more and more on the great reservoirs of knowledge and experience in our business and professional communities. These groups have already provided invaluable service and advice. We in Government must find ways to make even greater use of these priceless assets.

I propose to: continue our support for the International Executive Service Corps; increase the AID authority to guarantee U.S. private investments in developing countries.

VIII

To signify the depth of our commitment to help those who help themselves, I am requesting 5-year authorizations for our military and economic aid programs.

For development loans and loans under the Alliance for Progress, this is merely a reaffirmation of the principle adopted by the Congress in 1961 and 1962. It will not impair the ability or the duty of the Congress to review these programs. Indeed, it will free the Congress from the burden of an annual renewal of basic legislation, and provide greater opportunity for concentration on policy and program issues.

Annual congressional consideration of both economic and military programs will be maintained through full annual presentations before the substantive committees, if they so desire, as well as through the annual appropriation process.

The military and economic authorization requests are contained in two separate bills. I believe this is a forward step in clarifying the goals and functions of these programs in the minds of the public and the Congress.

IX

I am requesting a total appropriation of $2,469 million in fiscal year 1967 to finance programs of economic cooperation. As in the last 2 years, I am requesting the absolute minimum to meet presently foreseeable needs, with the understanding that I will not hesitate to request a supplemental appropriation if a clear need develops.

Aid to Vietnam: The largest single portion of my request—$550 million in supporting assistance—is to support our effort in Vietnam. Our help to the Government of Vietnam in carrying forward programs of village economic and social improvement is of crucial significance in maintaining public morale in the face of the horror of war. With the help of AID advisers, who often serve at great personal risk, the Vietnamese Government is patiently building the foundations of progress in the rural areas.

Other supporting assistance: The remainder of my request—$197 million—is for aid to countries whose security is directly threatened. This is concentrated in programs for Laos, Korea, and Thailand. Each country is a key link in our defense system. Each lives in the shadow of great and hostile powers. Each is well worth the investment.

Alliance for Progress: I am requesting a total of $543 million in fiscal year 1967 appropriations for the countries cooperating in the Alliance for Progress. Of this total $88 million will be used to finance technical cooperation.

At the Rio Conference, the United States announced its intention to support this great hemispheric effort beyond 1971. Our ultimate goal is a hemisphere of free nations, stable and just—prosperous in their economics and democratic in their politics.

We can cite many indications of heartening progress:

In 1965 alone Chile settled about 4,000 families on their own land, about as many as had acquired land during the preceding 35 years;

Brazil, as a result of courageous economic policy decisions, has reduced its rate of inflation, restored its credit, encouraged private investment, and modernized many of its economic institutions;

In only 2 years, the five members of the Central American Common Market have increased intramarket trade by 123 percent.

These are not isolated or exceptional examples. The keynote of the Alliance for Progress has always been self-help. The pattern of our assistance—65 percent of which is concentrated in Brazil, Chile, and Colombia—demonstrates our determination to help those who help themselves.

Most heartening of all, a new generation has risen to leadership in Latin America as the Alliance for Progress has taken hold. These young men and women combine a belief in democratic ideals with a commitment to peaceful change and social justice. We are happy to welcome them as leaders of great nations in the community of freedom.

Development loans: Nine-tenths of the $665 million requested for this account is for five countries—India, Pakistan, Turkey, Korea, and Nigeria.

We have long recognized the importance to all the world of progress in the giant nations of South Asia. But in the past year we witnessed a tragic confrontation between India and Pakistan which forced us to withhold all new assistance other than food. We will not allow our aid to subsidize an arms race between these two countries. Nor can we resume aid until we are reasonably certain that hostilities will not recur. The progress of reconciliation—first at the United Nations and then at Tashkent—holds promise that these two great countries have resolved on a course of peace. My request for development loan funds is made in the hope and belief that this promise will be fulfilled.

Turkey has continued her steady progress toward self-sustaining growth, and has remained a stanch NATO ally. She deserves our continued support.

Korea has made similar economic progress and has shown her dedication to the cause of freedom by supplying a full military division for service in Vietnam.

Nigeria has recently suffered a painful upheaval, but we are hopeful that she, too, will maintain her responsible and progressive course.

The uncertainties of world affairs permit no guarantees that these hopes will be fulfilled. But I do guarantee the Congress and the American people that no funds will be used in these or other countries without a clear case that such expenditures are in the interest of the United States.

Technical cooperation: This request—$231 million—will finance American advisers and teachers who are the crucial

forces in the attack on hunger, ignorance, disease, and the population problem. The dollar total is relatively small. But no appropriation is more critical. No purpose is more central.

Contributions to international organizations: I am requesting $140 million for these contributions in fiscal year 1967. The majority of these funds will support such efforts as the United Nations development program and the U.N. Children's Fund. The remainder represents our share of the cost of maintaining essential United Nations peacekeeping and relief activities in areas of tension and conflict.

Other: The remaining $142 million of my request is distributed among the contingency fund, AID administrative expenses, and support of American schools and hospitals abroad.

XII

In making these requests, I assure the Congress that every effort will be extended to minimize the adverse impact on our balance of payments. I think the record is proof of the sincerity of these commitments.

AID procurement policies have been tightened to the point that, with minor and essential exceptions, all funds appropriated to AID must be spent in the United States for American goods and services. As a result, offshore expenditures of AID funds declined from $1 billion in 1960 to $533 million in 1964.

Further steps have been taken. I now expect that the figure will drop to about $400 million in fiscal year 1967. Receipts are expected to rise to $186 million in fiscal year 1967, yielding a net outflow of only $214 million.

XIII

I am transmitting the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1966 as separate legislation. This new act will provide a 5-year authorization for the program which strengthens U.S. security by building the strength of others to deter and resist aggression.

The new act will provide:

Effective coordination between our economic and military programs: I request the Congress to retain in the new act those provisions which place responsibility for continuous supervision and general direction of all military assistance programs in the Secretary of State.

Greater emphasis on self-help: As with economic aid, we must condition our military aid upon commitments from recipients to make maximum contributions to the common defense.

Greater emphasis on civic action programs: We shall give new stress to civic action programs through which local troops build schools and roads, and provide literacy training and health services. Through these programs, military personnel are able to play a more constructive role in their society, and to establish better relations with the civilian population.

Emphasis on training: One of our most effective methods of building free world security is through the training provided foreign military personnel. Today, 8,500 foreign trainees come to this country each year and a similar number are trained at our service schools overseas. They return to their home countries with new professional skills and a new understanding of the role of the armed forces in a democratic society.

Continued shift from grant aid to military sales: We will shift our military aid programs from grant to sales whenever possible—and without jeopardizing our security interests or progress of economic development. Military sales now exceed the dollar volume of the normal grant aid program. This not only makes a substantial favorable impact on the balance of payments, but it also demonstrates the willingness of our allies to carry an increasing share of their own defense costs.

I am requesting new obligational authority of $917 million for military assistance in fiscal year 1967. This is the bare minimum required if we are to keep our commitments to our allies and friendly armed forces to provide the equipment and training essential to free world defense.

The military assistance request for fiscal year 1967 does not include funds for support of South Vietnamese and other allied forces who are engaged in the crucial struggle for freedom in that country. Financing for this effort will come directly from Department of Defense appropriations.

Almost three-fourths of the total program will go to countries adjacent to the borders of Soviet Russia and Communist China. The armed forces of such countries as Greece, Turkey, Iran, and the Republics of China and Korea are effective deterrents to aggression. The balance of the funds will strengthen the capacity to maintain internal security in countries where instability and weakness can pave the way for subversion.

XIV

Americans have always built for the future.

That is why we established land-grant colleges and passed the Homestead Act to open our western lands more than 100 years ago.

That is why we adopted the progressive programs proposed by Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt.

That is why we are building the Great Society.

And that is why we have a foreign assistance program.

We extend assistance to nations because it is in the highest traditions of our heritage and our humanity. But even more, because we are concerned with the kind of world our children will live in.

It can be a world where nations raise armies, where famine and disease and ignorance are the common lot of men, where the poor nations look on the rich with envy, bitterness, and frustration; where the air is filled with tension and hatred.

Or it can be a world where each nation lives in independence, seeking new ways to provide a better life for its citizens: a world where the energies of its restless peoples are directed toward the works of peace; a world where people are free to build a civilization to liberate the spirit of man.

We cannot make such a world in one message, in one appropriation, or in one year. But we can work to do this with this appropriation in this year. And we must continue to build on the work of past years and begin to erase disease and hunger and ignorance from the face of the earth.

But the basic choice is up to the countries themselves. If that choice is for progress, we can and we must help. Our help can spell the difference between success and stagnation. We must stand ready to provide it when it is needed and when we have confidence that it will be well used.

This is the price and the privilege of world leadership.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 1, 1966.*

To the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

REPORT ON GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES TRAINING ACT

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 18(c) of the Government Employees Training Act (Public Law 85–507, approved July 7, 1958), I am transmitting forms supplying information on those employees who, during fiscal year 1965, participated in training in non-Government facilities in courses that were over one hundred and twenty days in duration and those employees who received training in non-Government facilities as the result of receiving an award or contribution.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 1, 1966.*

During the delivery of Mr. ERVIN's speech,

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the able and distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] for the purpose of introducing an amendment on a joint resolution and making such observations and statements and propounding such inquiries in reference thereto as he may desire, under the following circumstances: First, that my act in so yielding to him will not impair in any way my right to the floor; and second, that any remarks I may have to make subsequent to so yielding will not be counted as a second speech under any rule of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION PROPOSING THAT THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES BE AMENDED TO PROVIDE 4-YEAR TERMS FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing 4-year terms for Members of the House of Representatives. I will not vote in favor of the 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives unless:

First, they are chosen at elections to be held in the even-numbered year in

which the presidential election is not held; and

Second, they shall be prohibited from being candidates for any elective office, State or National, other than that of President of the United States without first resigning from their office in the House of Representatives.

I favor sparing the Members of the House the ordeal of running for reelection every 2 years. They, of course, should be compelled to give an accounting of their services to their constituents in reasonable intervals. Requiring them to give an accounting every 2 years is unreasonable and imposes upon them the burden of being in political campaigns practically during the whole tenure of their encumbency.

Alluding to my proposal that the elections be held in the even numbered year different from the even numbered year in which the President is elected, I point out that Members of the House of Representatives should be elected on the basis of their individual merit. They should not be chosen on the basis of their support for the presidential candidate and furthermore on the basis only of the strength of the President.

This latter concept of electing Congressmen leads to rubberstamp mechanical mindless representation of the electorate.

In the history of our method of electing Members of the Congress, there is no precedent for mechanical type of selecting Members to the Congress of the United States.

The Members of the Senate are not all elected in the same year that the President is. Their terms are staggered; one-third being elected every 2 years, thus insuring a semblance of continuity of judgment in approaching the social, economic, and international questions confronting the public.

Our forefathers in writing the Constitution of the United States had as their principal goal the protection of the liberties of the individual against the usurpations of power exercised by a government of men with unlimited authority. They purposed to protect the minorities against the tyranny of the masses. Our forefathers believed that the economic and spiritual well-being of individuals must be accepted as the goal of our Government.

They believed that in the last analysis the goodness or badness of a government must be judged upon its effects upon the liberties of individuals.

Freedom requires that each person shall reap what he has sown; that his own welfare should in justice depend upon his own efforts, sacrifices, and foresight; that all he has a right to demand of society is opportunity to seek his welfare on those terms.

By electing the President and all of the Members of the House of Representatives at the same time inevitably will lead to a complete destruction of the rights of the minority. This destruction of minority rights is in complete conflict with the liberal and genuine intentions of the men who wrote the Constitution of the United States.

It is, therefore, my opinion that for the protection of the individual, the minority groups, the general public, and to perpetuate a system of government contemplated by the writers of our Constitution in 1787, we should not adopt a system of electing our Members to the House of Representatives or Senate that will produce ends completely in conflict with what our forefathers advocated.

I now come to my proposal that no Member of the House of Representatives should be permitted to run for any other elective office except for President—National or State—in an election year when he is not required to run for election to his office as a Member of the House.

In support of this position I call upon my colleagues to examine the situations in the different States of the Union where incumbent elected State officials with protracted terms of office declared their candidacy for other elective offices having everything to gain and nothing to lose. These individuals would not dare to run for another elective office knowing that to do so they had to give up the elective office which they presently held. On the other hand, knowing that they were secure in holding the office to which they were elected and held, they ventured into running for another elective office knowing they had nothing to lose and everything to gain.

I think this condition is weak, indefensible, and unjustified, and, therefore, cannot be supported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 132) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing 4-year terms for Members of the House of Representatives, introduced by Mr. LAUSCHE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

PROTECTING AIR PASSENGERS ON INTERNATIONAL FLIGHTS

During the delivery of Mr. ERVIN'S speech.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to my good friend, the able and distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], for an insertion or a question or questions or observations or statements under the following conditions, first, that my act in so yielding will not impair in any way my right to the floor, and, second, that my act in so yielding will not be taken, under any rule of the Senate, to be a second speech on the subject I am now discussing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? There being no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina for his generosity in yielding to me. The Senator is not only the senior Senator from North Carolina, but he is also senior among us all on constitutional law.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be printed at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, there is an important international meeting in Montreal starting today that will be another round in the battle to secure adequate liability protection for American citizens killed or injured in international air flights. The International Civil Aviation Organization meeting called for February 1, 1966, will be discussing the question of raising the Warsaw Convention limit, which now sets the figure of $8,300—fixed in the thirties—as the maximum which can be recovered from a negligent international air carrier causing injury or death to an American passenger.

I am pleased that the U.S. representatives to this meeting will be advocating the interests of American air passengers. The State Department has announced that the United States will be withdrawing from this outmoded and inequitable Warsaw Convention as of May 15, 1966, unless some plan providing reasonable protection for Americans on international flights is in prospect. We hope that the meeting in Montreal will produce such an agreement between the governments and air carriers involved.

However, I hope that there will be no retreat from the State Department's support of a limit of liability of $100,000 per passenger, as a minimum figure by American standards, of the responsibility of negligent carriers toward their passengers. Of course there is no artificial limit of liability applying to domestic flights. This artificial limit applies only to international flights. This controversy on international air carriage seems to arise because some countries do not put the same value on human life as do American courts.

Americans fly on more international flights than do the people of any other nation. I feel that this protection should be given to the American people.

I hope that the State Department will not return from Montreal with anything less than a really adequate limit to protect American passengers. As the New York Times points out in a fine editorial published on October 23, 1965, the United States and American passengers can do nicely without the Warsaw Convention or any other artificial international agreement of this nature.

Passengers need no international convention. They can let the existing law and the international law apply. This was merely an international limit set in the thirties in order to protect the then infant airline industry. The limit is no longer needed.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial titled "Protecting Airline Passengers" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Oct. 23, 1965]

PROTECTING AIRLINE PASSENGERS

In announcing its intention to withdraw from the Warsaw Convention, the United States has moved to end an anachronistic and unfair scheme limiting airline liability to passengers on international flights.

The Warsaw Convention was set up to protect airlines when flying was in its infancy. Its rigid and inadequate liability of $8,300 for death or injury of a traveler was designed to prevent airlines from being put out of business as a result of liability claims.

In 1955 the Hague protocol called for doubling the liability limit to $16,600, which was still grossly inadequate. The United States did not ratify the Hague protocol; but earlier this year the Johnson administration requested congressional approval of it as "the first step in recognition of the need for greater protection of passengers in international aviation."

Now the administration has wisely decided to take a much bigger step to protect airline passengers. It plans to renounce the Warsaw Convention by May 15 and reject the Hague protocol unless the airlines agree to raise the liability ceiling to $100,000 per passenger. It would be preferable to follow domestic practice and do without a ceiling, which has not hurt domestic airlines, but the administration plan does at least scrap the wholly inadequate limits that the airlines have maintained.

Over half of the international airline traffic is handled by American companies and a large portion of the passengers using international airlines are Americans. As we have previously said on this page, we would prefer outright renunciation of the Warsaw Convention and rejection of the protocol because they are no longer needed by the airlines and have never been in the interests of passengers. But the administration's proposal is one that can reasonably be met by foreign airlines and will protect passengers instead of penalizing them.

During the delivery of Mr. ERVIN'S speech,

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the able and distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] for a statement or for observations or for questions or for insertions upon the following conditions: First, that my act in so yielding will not impair in any degree my right to the floor and, second, that my act in so yielding may not cause any subsequent remarks which I may have to make on this occasion to be construed as a second speech upon the motion now pending before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? There being no objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOLLAND BEFORE THE NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL CONVENTION

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank my gracious friend for yielding to me. The only observation I care to make is that I think he is always generous, and I appreciate that generosity.

Mr. President, on yesterday I had the great privilege of speaking at Jacksonville, Fla., before the National Cotton Council Convention at their annual meeting held this year in Jacksonville, Fla.

Approximately 1,000 delegates of that great industry were in attendance. The council represents one of our greatest agricultural industries. I regret to say that that industry is probably in more trouble right now than any other of our great basic industries.

Mr. President, my speech delivered yesterday is rather lengthy. I do not care to burden Senators by reading the speech here.

I ask unanimous consent that my address delivered on yesterday before the National Cotton Council Convention, held in Jacksonville, Fla., be printed at this point in the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent that it be printed after the conclusion of the speech of my able friend the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina, as well as after the remarks of my distinguished friend the senior Senator from Texas.

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

ADDRESS MADE BY HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, U.S. SENATOR, BEFORE THE NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL CONVENTION, JANUARY 31, 1966, ROBERT MEYER HOTEL, JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

I am happy to be here with the National Cotton Council, the most authoritative representative of one of our oldest major agricultural industries. It pleases all of us Floridians that your organization selected Florida, the Sunshine State, as the site for its annual meeting this year.

Agriculture plays a highly important role in the economy of our State, with our farms, groves, ranches, and forests producing about a billion dollars of annual income, but cotton is not now one of our big agricultural industries. Cotton is, of course, very important to those 5,589 Florida farmers who have allotments to produce and market it. And it is quite important to the entire economy of those areas in Florida where it is still grown. Florida is proud to have the men of this great industry—stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific—meet here today and tomorrow in Jacksonville.

As a Senator directly representing those people in Florida whose livelihood depends upon cotton, my interest in the industry also stems from my service as second ranking Democratic member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee for the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies. It may interest you to know that for a number of years I have been "adopted" as the third Senator from several of our vegetable and fruit producing States of the West, including California, all of which at the time had no representation on the Senate Agriculture Committee. I have been highly honored by these adoptions and it is my pleasure to serve those States' agricultural interests on many occasions, as I have also served other States which were similarly situated. I have attempted, indeed, to serve all of agriculture on a nationwide basis.

For the past 3 years the Agriculture Committees of both Houses have had before them proposed legislation on cotton. I supported the 1964 act, but not the 1965 act. I had some rather strong reservations on the cotton title of that most recently enacted farm bill, as I suspect some of you did, along with other reservations on other parts of that omnibus bill. As a whole, I felt that bill vested unprecedented power, far too much power, in the Secretary of Agriculture and I also expect it to prove much too expensive. I particularly regret that it adopts so much of the so-called Brannan plan, involving direct compensation or production payments, amounting to a Government dole to farmers, particularly in the cotton title.

I have always opposed the principle of production payments to farmers producing surplus crops. I have only supported production payments where the practice helped to enlarge the production of a deficit crop vital to our national security as in the cases of sugar and wool where we have tried to increase domestic production. The present law, the 1965 act, continues the principle of one-price cotton, which is a laudable goal, though I feel that the subsidy to the textile mills should appear as a direct subsidy to them, as under the 1964 act, and not be included in the payments to farmers. I also feel that the textile industry failed to justify the 1964 subsidy to it, either by increasing its use of domestic cotton, decreasing its use of synthetics, or keeping the subsidy within the expected amount, which was greatly exceeded. Despite my doubts, I hope the act works better than I expect and that at such time as the cotton support program comes up again before Congress we will find the cotton economy of this Nation in a healthier condition than it was last year or than it is now.

When the productiveness of our soil, coupled with advanced science and technology of farming, results in overproduction as it often does, there are two possible solutions to the problem: (1) reduce production; (2) expand the market, one method of which is to cut costs of production. It is as simple as that. We have tried other solutions but they have proven, I believe, a snare and a delusion.

As chairman of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee and a member of the legislative Committee of Agriculture for years, one of my major concerns with cotton has been research in both production and utilization. I have supported action by our committee that made available increased funds for research in those areas. The objective, as you know, is to keep cotton competitive, both in the world markets and with synthetics, by finding cheaper methods of production of cotton and wider use of finished cotton products. And, Congress hasn't done too badly in this research field. In fiscal year 1964, we made available $11¼ million for all cotton research purposes; in fiscal 1965 over $14¼ million; and for fiscal 1966 we have supplied a total of $17,914,000.

You may recall that back in 1960 we added money to the agriculture appropriations bill for the establishment of a cotton insect laboratory in Mississippi. It is my information that outstanding progress has been made in its primary objective of elimination or at least more economical control of that most destructive of all cotton pests, the boll weevil.

Let me digress at this point and tell you a story that some of you may know, but I am sure that many of you have not heard. For many years cotton was the primary crop in our neighboring Southern States before the boll weevil came east about 1920. This was all changed when farmers found their crops virtually destroyed by the pest.

Looking for other ways to use their productive soil, their excellent climate, their adequate rainfall, and their managerial abilities, these farmers in some areas began to grow peanuts. The peanuts grew extremely well. They helped farmers pay off debts incurred by losses suffered from the boll weevil, and rejuvenated the economy of these areas. Peanuts made such a major contribution to the economic recovery that the citizens of one little town, Enterprise, Ala., decided to do something in recognition of this great change which the peanut had brought about. It was suggested that a monument be erected in the center of the town. Then the question arose as to what type of monument would be appropriate.

Somewhat facetiously, somebody suggested that they dedicate the monument to the boll weevil which had forced crop diversion and brought the peanut prosperity to the area. And in that town today stands this monument to the boll weevil. I hope before too many years the boll weevil will be just an unhappy memory and that we can have many monuments erected to it in healthy and prosperous cotton-producing areas so that future generations may know that there

once existed this very destructive pest. In many areas production of poultry, livestock, tobacco, and other crops have substituted, in whole or in part, for cotton.

When the Agricultural Act of 1964 was passed, it included a provision authorizing a special $10 million cost-cutting research program for cotton. One of the most urgent needs of the industry today is to get the cost of growing cotton down so that farmers can compete with synthetic fibers at home and abroad, and with low cost foreign cotton production without resort to Government subsidy.

I delayed the conclusion of our hearings on the 1965 appropriation bill for several weeks in 1964 with the understanding that an amendment to the budget would be submitted requesting the Congress to appropriate this $10 million authorization. Either there was a mixup in communications, or somebody in the executive branch changed his mind because when the budget amendment was submitted, it did not include a request for cotton research funds. I pressed the Department of Agriculture officials and called representatives of the Budget Bureau before my committee in an effort to find out why no action had been taken to implement the enabling legislation. We were not able to find any conclusive answer to this question.

Our committee finally included, on our own initiative, additional funds for cotton cost-cutting research, but not the $10 million. It is extremely difficult to add new appropriations for items not in the budget, and not justified by specific testimony, and this was one reason why we did not include the full amount.

Finally $1,925,000 was included that year, for fiscal 1965, for cost-cutting research. Of this amount $240,000 was for planning new facilities to cost a total of $3 million, including the planning cost, to house such research.

In the committee report on the Department of Agriculture appropriations bill for that year, we included a strong statement urging the Secretary of Agriculture to do what he could to see that the special $10 million program was included in the budget for the next year, which was fiscal 1966—this current year. Even though funds for many new programs of great magnitude were requested in the budget, only a small increase was provided for cotton. I still cannot understand why the expenditure of this relatively small sum—almost infinitesimal when considered in terms of the cost of the current cotton program—is not considered to be a sound investment.

In any event, in the conference bill for the current year we included a substantial sum ($2,685,000) for cost-cutting research as a part of the continuing research program. We also appropriated $2,760,000 for construction of the new facilities, making a total of $5,445,000 for the cotton cost-reduction program for this year. I hope that we will be able soon to go much further with this very important program as we consider the budget for the fiscal year 1967 which begins on July 1.

In stressing cost-cutting research, I do not intend for a moment to downgrade other types of cotton research. I know there is great potential for improving the quality of cotton fabrics and cotton garments through the Department of Agriculture's utilization research program conducted primarily at the New Orleans Laboratory. We have had very important developments stem from this research, such as the wash-and-wear finishes, which have helped hold many of the cotton's markets. I want to commend this organization and also the industry for its efforts and financial contributions to the expansion of this urgently needed research.

I turn now to another subject which is of vital importance to the cotton industry and to the general economy of the United States. That is the pending legislation on labor. Unfortunately, it appears that this administration, up to now, has refused to adequately take into account the very serious consequences of its past and proposed actions on the agricultural economy of this country insofar as its labor policy is concerned. I refer to two matters—the first being the refusal of the administration to permit the entry of urgently needed workers in Western States from our good friend and neighbor, Mexico, and the grossly unwarranted restrictions on the importation of our friends from the islands of the British West Indies and Canada to do farmwork, primarily in fruits and vegetables, both in the State of Florida and generally along the eastern seaboard.

I realize that cotton farmers across the belt have, to a very large degree, mechanized their operations to a point where they are using relatively few foreign workers. However, in those areas which continue to use them, the abrupt cutoff has had serious consequences. Unfortunately, completely mechanized production and harvesting of most fruits and vegetables is not possible with our present technology. While we are working on it, we may never learn to completely mechanize the production and harvesting of citrus fruits, for example. Up to this time, the present administration has recognized in a near adequate way the needs of only one of our large Florida producing agricultural industries, with supplemental labor from the British West Indies. In that industry, the Florida sugarcane producers are today using over 8,500 canecutters from the offshore islands admitted by the Secretary of Labor because even he has found that American labor is not to be found to cut sugarcane by hand with machetes on the muck lands where it is produced and cannot be handled by machines. Some of the mills are understaffed with cutters, but I repeat, we have been allowed a near adequate supply in that field only.

In my nearly 20 years of service in the Senate, I do not recall ever having devoted more of my time and my energies to any one subject than I have in connection with endeavoring to obtain an adequate supply of farm labor including workers from Mexico, from the British West Indies, and from Canada. Hardly a day passed last year that I was not in conference with administration officials or was pleading on the Senate floor in a bipartisan effort, along with many of my colleagues, and particularly with the able junior Senator from California, the Honorable GEORGE MURPHY, for a reasonable administration of our existing laws with respect to the importation of supplemental foreign workers. Some crops were lost because of the shortage of labor and farmers and the Nation suffered the consequences. Some planting was discontinued—some production and processing was moved to Mexico. I do not know what this present year will bring, but it looks like we must continue this fight for justice and right particularly for our farmers who produce highly perishable seasonal crops.

At this point in my prepared remarks, I must digress in order to give full credit to Mr. Wirtz, the Secretary of Labor, for a decision which he made last night which I think is sound and for which I commend him. I certainly want to see that Mr. Wirtz gets his due.

On contacting the Federal-State Frost Warning Service at Lakeland after I got here yesterday, I was advised of the serious threat to agriculture offered by the existing cold wave which we are feeling here today in Jacksonville. Mr. Warren Johnson, who for years has headed up that very fine service at Lakeland, told me that the cold wave was going to have most serious effects upon the citrus crop, the sugarcane crop, the vegetable crop, and other perishable crops in our State, extending all the way from the vicinity of St. Augustine, a few miles below here, to and including the vegetable fields south of Miami. He stated the predictions for Sunday night's cold in the various areas of the peninsula and I could, of course, see for myself that the prospect was indeed a serious one.

Shortly after noon yesterday, therefore, I called Secretary Wirtz at his home in Washington and advised him of the situation and also of my feeling that a crash program would have to be set up with all possible speed to allow the importation of an added labor force from the British West Indies to harvest frozen citrus fruit and to complete the cutting of the cane in such a short time in each case as to forestall souring and spoilage. He was cordial, took the matter under advisement and last night he had one of his publicity men advise my administrative assistant in Washington that he (Mr. Wirtz) would assist our Florida industries in the matters mentioned if the freeze damage resulted in the degree that seemed reasonably certain. In other words, he pledged his assistance to our Florida producers who would be so adversely affected to help them salvage citrus and cane crops and I take it that the same would be true of other crops that might be salvageable by allowing a crash program of importation of the needed labor from the offshore areas in the British West Indies.

While the degree of damage is not yet completely ascertainable, it is now quite clear, after knowing the very low temperatures which existed last night and in many places for many hours, that serious damage has been sustained and that the loss can only be alleviated through the immediate buildup of much larger harvesting forces. I am grateful indeed to Mr. Wirtz for his responsiveness in this matter and I want you folks to know that while I have been extremely critical of him in other matters and may have to be again in the future that I certainly want to see that he receives full credit for his action in this particular matter.

The second matter in which the administration's labor policy offers a grave threat to agriculture is in the field of proposed enlargements of the minimum wage laws.

Although hearings on minimum wage legislation were held last year, no action was taken in the Senate. A bill was reported out of committee on this subject in the House of Representatives, which would have imposed minimum wages on farmworkers. In addition it would have eliminated most of the agricultural processing and handling exemptions. Apparently, the House leadership decided that they did not have the votes to pass the bill, so action was postponed until this session of congress.

It seems that some of our self-styled friends of the laboring men are unwilling to recognize the inflationary impact and the inevitable unemployment which would result from the imposition of a minimum wage of $1.75 per hour in agricultural employment. It is my earnest hope that a little more reason and a little more commonsense will prevail in this field of legislation during this session of Congress.

A third matter having a serious impact on agriculture, though it affects other employment even more greatly, is the most fundamental issue facing the Nation this year in the field of labor. It is, of course, the effort of the administration and of the labor hierarchy to have Congress repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. This section authorizes States to enact so-called right-to-work legislation which permits an employee of a business firm having a union contract to decide whether he desires to join or not to join the labor union. This so-called right-to-work provision is a part of our Florida constitution. Our State was the first to place it in our constitution. Repeal of section 14(b) would inevitably mean that the right-to-work laws now in effect in 19 States would be cast aside. No additional State

could adopt right-to-work statutes or constitutional provisions.

Employees of companies having unions would have to join a union within 30 days or their employer would be forced to fire them. Thus workers would be forced to pay dues to an organization to help, among other things, finance extensive political activity which, in some instances, would be contrary to the views of the workers. Workers would be forced to abide by union rules or be fined by union officials. Union officials would not need to be concerned so much as they are now with justifying their activities to their members in order to gain financial support. Members who refused to pay dues would lose their jobs. The Senate is receiving vast piles of mail from union members who do not want to see 14(b) repealed.

Those of us in the U.S. Senate who feel that the repeal of section 14(b) would be a further serious impingement on the rights of individuals and the rights of the several States, and who feel that compulsory unionism is fundamentally wrong, appear to be slightly in the minority. Therefore, we have no alternative except to discuss the issues involved in this matter at such length as to try to arouse the American people to the fact that passage of this bill will seriously jeopardize our liberties.

This course is now commonly referred to as an extensive educational program. If we can get this message across to enough people, I feel confident that we will have the votes to thwart the attempt to remove this vital section from the laws of our land. I may say to you that we have a number of teachers in the Senate who have agreed to discuss the issues at some length during this educational discussion. They have prepared their lessons well and are willing to stay overtime, if necessary, to get the facts across to the American people. I have confidence in our ability to win this fight.

In conclusion I want to discuss briefly a problem confronting you and other farmers for which there probably is no fast cure. There was a time when the voice of the so-called farm bloc was heard loud and clear in the State legislatures and in the Halls of Congress. For a number of reasons, maybe the evolution of farming, the exodus of millions of small farmers to other pursuits, the sharp decline of the small family farm, this voice has become less compelling of attention, despite the valiant efforts and excellent services of your own council, the Farm Bureau Federation, the Grange, the cooperative groups, and other farm organizations. There is a tendency for the general public to lose sight of the fact that production of food and fiber is absolutely vital to the welfare of ourselves and all the peoples of the world. For those not farm oriented either by experience or association, there is little attraction to dedicated service on congressional Committees on Agriculture.

It is a grueling task that requires many hours and days of study and downright hard work unaccompanied by much press comment or many headlines. But the real problem is lack of unified support among the several farm groups of sound, constructive farm legislation.

I have no pat suggestions for restoring the farmer to his former position of great influence in the national legislative picture, but each of you may want to give serious thought to the condition I have described to the end that some cultivation might be initiated at the "cotton roots" to see that your voice in the legislative Halls might again carry that stentorian ring that it once did in years gone by. The old adage "United we stand, divided we fall" is still true and it applies peculiarly to American agriculture today where so many divisions now exist.

During the delivery of Mr. ERVIN'S speech,

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, before passing to the next argument that is used to bolster the argument for compulsory unionism, I should like to ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] for comments or remarks upon any subject of his choosing, under the following conditions: That my rights to the floor will not be impaired by my so yielding to the Senator; secondly, that any remarks I may make subsequently to the time he makes his remarks or comments will not be counted as a second speech on my part on the motion before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I thank my friend from North Carolina for his courtesy. While I do not desire to address myself to the question of 14(b) at this time, I will have something to say about the subject at a later time. I wish to discuss for a few moments one of the issues that is very prominently being discussed both on the floor of the Senate and around the country at large at this time. These issues stem from the President's peace offensive at Christmastime, the enuciation of some of the wishes of some Members of this body, by letter and in other forms, and I should like to speak in particular about one of the issues that seems to be looming ever larger in the minds of the doubters and those who, for other reasons, or for their own reasons, oppose the President's position on the role of the Vietcong in the crisis that faces the world in southeast Asia

Mr. President, the role the Vietcong, and in particular the National Liberation Front, as the Vietcong are sometimes mistakenly called, has suggested some of the most misleading and untrue profiles of the tortuous conflict in Indochina.

In its proper context, it seems to me that the National Liberation Front needs to be viewed in the perspective of the changing tactics of the Communist Party in the many years of the cold war and to distinguish between tactics and strategy.

This is a tactical shift rather than a strategic shift, the kind of shift that had its beginning when the men in Moscow sought, first of all, to close in on areas closest to the sources of Soviet power; namely, countries in Eastern Europe, where the armies from Russia were already in occupation.

This was the device of imposing on their presence the presence of a great power in the selection of front governments and, ultimately, ruling governments, in most of Eastern Europe.

The second stage of the Soviet tactics then came in the form of bringing pressure on contiguous territories not directly occupied by the Russian armies, but next door, so that by infiltrating leaders, manpower, supplies, and propaganda, they could fish in the troubled waters of postwar devastation. This was notably true in the cases of Greece and Turkey.

We experienced the third phase of Communist world policy soon thereafter in Berlin, where the great gamble was on the rattling of the nuclear sabers, the threat of total war, and the intimidations that go with the inhibiting compulsions of so-called free societies in the more civilized portions of the globe. That was met at Berlin.

Then there was the flagrant, open commitment of troops in direct combat in Korea.

Finally there was the testing of nuclear intentions of power balances in the endeavors of the Soviet Union to transfer the vestiges of their power to the weights in the scales of power balances in the Western Hemisphere, notably in the case of Cuba.

Now we find the latest phases in the tactics expressing themselves in southeast Asia in the form of the National Liberation Front.

It has been suggested in the debates in this body and in the discussions in the press and in other communications media that the United States has been neglecting the possible path to peace that would lead through dealing directly with the National Liberation Front, and that somehow we have to find it possible to acknowledge the existence of the front and to deal with this front directly as a negotiating power in the conflict in Vietnam.

It is in regard to this last of the tactical shifts of the Communists that I should like to devote some special time in my remarks.

The National Liberation Front, will be able to have all of its views represented at any negotiations to which Hanoi might agree. The U.S. Government has made its intentions clear on this point. Again and again the President has referred to unconditional discussions or negotiations with any government.

Thus, if Hanoi were to accept such a bid it would be with the full understanding that the National Liberation Front would be represented through Hanoi, or with Hanoi at such a conference table.

However, thereby hangs a good bit of the misconception that has tended to engulf some portion of our population. That is the connection between the National Liberation Front and Hanoi.

The record also shows that the National Liberation Front was in fact created by Hanoi. It remains under the control of Hanoi.

I believe that the sooner we disabuse ourselves of the idea that somehow this is some endemic development within the borders of South Vietnam, some sort of peasant rebellion against Saigon, the sooner we shall be able to come to grips with the hard facts of the power pulls that are the realities in southeast Asia.

As Prof. Bernard Fall has very carefully pointed out—and he has not been the friendliest historian on this question—the Vietcong operated until December 1960, he said in his book, as "the extension of the then existing Communist underground apparatus."

In September 1960, the Third National Congress of Lao Dong, the Communist-front group in Hanoi, adopted a simple

resolution urging the creation, from its deliberations of a front group to achieve unity in all of Vietnam.

Mr. President, that resolution, passed by the Lao Dong Party in North Vietnam at that time, goes on to say that "our people"—meaning the North Vietnamese in the Communist Party, the Lao Dong—must strive to establish a unified bloc of workers, peasants, and soldiers, and to bring into being a broad national unified front. These are not revolutions in the rural areas of Vietnam and not in the remote provinces of the 17th parallel. This is in the resolution adopted by the power in Hanoi in September of 1960.

From time to time it is asserted that the National Liberation Front was actually created south of the division line that separated the two Vietnams in 1954. Many of us have tried to find any substantive basis for this allegation. We have tried to find anything that would support in any way these assertions. So far nothing can be located. Nothing substantial has been submitted. These assertations have been contributed only by the members of the National Liberation Front themselves when they try to protest.

But none will meet the test of documentation. Not only is there evidence to the fact that the September and December statements in Hanoi contain no reference whatsoever to any endemic developments in Vietnam already in existence, but Hanoi goes on to suggest that they better "get with it" from Hanoi and inject such a front group in the south in order to provide the trappings for a rallying point for their cause, as they describe it.

Thus, it can be seen that the National Liberation Front was the creature of Hanoi. It was conceived in Hanoi, by Hanoi, and for Hanoi.

I am mindful of the many complications, the overlapping of issues, and the complexities of opinion of the problems in the South.

My comments here are aimed at serving only one purpose, and that is to lay bare the dimensions of the National Liberation Front about which so many in our country right now seem to be speaking so loosely and so inaccurately.

The leadership of the National Liberation Front is clearly identifiable, as well.

Until April of 1962, Professor Fall goes on to tell us in his book, the National Liberation Front had not disclosed any names of its alleged leaders. This was nearly 2 years after its inception, after it was cooked up in Hanoi, and still no mention of its leaders.

In spite of the fact that its program had been made public from the very beginning, when the names of some leaders were finally revealed, it became clear that none of these avowed leaders had ever occupied any significant position in South Vietnamese political life either before 1954 or since 1954.

The purpose of indicating that, Mr. President, is merely to suggest that this entire enterprise was a concoction for psychological warfare purposes, in an attempt to inject and infuse into the complexities of the South—complexities still not grasped by some in our country—that this was a genuine civil war and this was the evidence for it, the National Liberation Front. Whatever elements of genuine civil strife there may be, and there are many, it is important we understand what they are.

I suggest they are not vested in the National Liberation Front. The sooner we eliminate that language, that term, from our attempt to analyze the conflict in Vietnam, the sooner it will be possible for us to deal straightforwardly with the hard issue of the core of the problem.

Many names were tossed into the hopper when the pressure was on Hanoi and on the South Vietnamese in the rural areas to produce leaders for the National Liberation Front, but the best that could be done was to pull up names of persons who had been for a long time open and avowed professional spokesmen for the Communist Party in the north. Thus, the name of the first Secretary General of the NLF, Mr. Van Hieu, who had been a Communist Party member, a known promoter of the Communist cause, and self-identified in that role ever since 1945, was selected. Never had he held a position of political responsibility in Vietnam before or after the French.

Or, similarly, the so-called chairman of the NLF. The chairman was another of the avowed, self-styled members of the Communist Party in the North. The National Liberation Front is forced to put such men forward as leaders because of a simple, significant fact; that is, that despite the turbulence of South Vietnamese politics, not a single significant non-Communist spokesman or group in the South has ever until now embraced the Vietcong or the National Liberation Front. The only admitted recognition and embracing that seems to go on is from foreign capitals far removed from southeast Asia.

Starting with Mr. Diem and the fall of his government, whether we take the students, or the Buddhists, or the so-called liberals, or the Catholics, or the military—any political group one seeks to identify in South Vietnam—to this day, critical as they may have been of Mr. Diem, protesting, as they were, conditions in Saigon, not a one of those groups has yet sought to embrace or endorse the Vietcong. None of them has been willing to acknowledge the validity of the National Liberation Front as a grassroots, native-born, native-controlled South Vietnamese political group. It is this that makes it imperative that we assign the National Liberation Front to its proper category, at its proper level, with its proper motivation: merely a child of Hanoi, an arm of the policy of Hanoi, an instrumentality in the tactics of power politics that Communists have pursued since the end of World War II.

The role of the Communist Party in using, implementing, and engulfing the National Liberation Front is, it seems to me, beyond question. It is a role that has been identified in detail by the International Commission that the Geneva agreements of 1954 established in the hope that somehow a resolution of the impasse between the two Vietnams might be arrived at.

In a circular dated December 8, 1961, and available through the International Control Commission, the groups involved in the National Liberation Front were instructed to realize that:

> The Vietnamese People's Revolutionary Party has only the appearance of being an endemic group within south Vietnam. When we recognize it for what it is.

The directive goes on:

> We need this group in our efforts to take the south in the interests of the north. However, during any explanations, you—

Whoever the members of the party may be—

> must take care to keep this intent strictly secret, especially in South Vietnam, so that the enemy does not perceive our purpose.

This is only another way of saying that the old front group operation was being translated into an operational and tactical plan. The National Liberation Front, incidentally, has never claimed that it was the government. It has never asserted that it had status as a government. It should be noted that the term "provisional government" has yet to be employed by the group in describing its role.

Thus it is not political in the administrative sense, and never has been. Yet there are those who refer to it recklessly as though it were an existing repository of power responsibility that ought to be dignified as a subject of negotiation.

This, further, is a characteristic of the National Liberation Front that helps us to strip it bare, it seems to me, of its outward manifestations and to show it for what it really is at the heart of the problem. The front is openly and clearly a creature of the government in Hanoi. It has operated repeatedly as Hanoi's political instrument for the purpose of taking over and imposing upon the south a Communist government. The front itself has no resemblance to genuine nationalist rebel organizations that have operated in other countries at such times as this. The fact that there may be within its membership some genuine South Vienamese nationalists who are latecomers, who are looking for a place to roost, in their sincere sense of protest against the Diem regime, should not obscure the central fact that the origin, the leadership, and the purposes of this front group remain as I have just described them—to serve the ends of the Communist government in Hanoi.

The nature of the National Liberation Front has been well summed up by neutral observers, including George Chaffard, of L'Express, who after visiting National Liberation Front bands, and roaming around parts of South Vietnam and conversing with some of their spokesmen, himself concluded that the aims of the National Liberation Front are classically those of a national front preceding a Communist takeover. The North Vietnamese Communist Party coordinates the whole operation, Chaffard concludes. As the years pass and the leaders of the NLF make less and less of an effort to prove their disguise, it is more and more openly a clearcut Communist organization.

Mr. President, having suggested that the National Liberation Front was created by Hanoi and controlled by Hanoi, I

should like to make another suggestion. At most, the National Liberation Front, even if we allow the very best construction of what we know about it, is only one of the smaller of many interest groups within South Vietnam. Even considered solely as a group within the area south of the 17th parallel, it has no standing that merits its being treated as anything other than one of the smaller of the interest groups in the region.

The Front commands a small segment of military forces and some political cadres, but still it is a tiny percentage of the total in the areas under dispute.

Thus, if the Front were to be accepted as an independent negotiating partner, it would be impossible on grounds of political reality, as well as on grounds of moral fairness and rightness, not to accept in like fashion a host of other and larger groups to be represented in such a political negotiation, whatever it may be.

Mr. President, I shall mention a few. The Catholics are at once obvious as a large group within South Vietnam, and the Mahayana Buddhists as an even larger group, particularly in some areas. There are other segments of Buddhist groups that have factionalized among themselves and could make a far better case for having a voice than the Front. The northern refugees, nearly a million strong, have a case. The Southern Regionalists may have a case, and the Hoa Hoa, and the Cao Dai are minority political groups, larger than the National Liberation Front.

The South Vietnamese Army, the Vietnamese Civil Service, the labor unions, the Montagnards, the Nationalist Political Party, and other splinter political groups would each have as much validity in claiming the right to be recognized and to have a voice in a conference as would the National Liberation Front.

Whatever else we strive to do in our own national interest and in the interest of finding some common denominator somewhere, somehow that might enable us to find a less violent solution to the strife in South Vietnam, it is important that we not single out one of the more obscure groups in numbers, one of the more unrepresentative groups in South Vietnam, a group that is clearly and patently identified as an instrumentality and creature of Hanoi for special consideration in any negotiations, fancied or real.

At the very most that one could argue for their case, the members of the National Liberation Front might be entitled at some point, it seems to me—if they accept the idea of living at peace within the country—to express their political views, as do other groups.

I suggest also that it is only through Hanoi that America can accomplish its central objective of finding a less violent end to the aggression from the north and of obtaining a removal of external interference from the affairs of South Vietnam.

We may leave it open to question as to whether we believe that any member of the National Liberation Front, or any member of the Hanoi government, can survive politically if he dares to negotiate because of the thesis that these men peddle among their party members and in the ranks of the faithful. But, be that as it may, I number myself among those who say that our own country should not be inhibited as it continually probes for any possible breakthrough, as the President has striven to do.

We must make doubly certain that in the future, as we look backward on this matter, the judgment of history can never point a finger of accusation at the United States and say that we did not try, that we did not create every conceivable chance.

However, in trying to create that chance, it is also important that we be realistic and that we not lose sight of the reason why we are there, in the dreams of what we would rather have happen if we had our way.

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

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming may yield to the Senator from Ohio for questions, statements, or observations under the unanimous-consent agreement under which I yielded to the Senator from Wyoming.

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

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator for his thorough and accurate discussion of the background of the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam.

I gather from his statement that he is of the definite conclusion that the purpose of all the discussions that have come from Ho Chi Minh and the Communists of the north has been to establish the National Liberation Front as the duly constituted government of South Vietnam. In substance, that is what I gather. I should like to have the Senator comment on that.

Mr. McGEE. The evidence, both from sources in our Government, and from independent sources on the National Commission—which does not include Americans, but is made up of Canadians, Polish, and an Indian—establishes that same incontrovertible hard fact, that it is an instrumentality of Hanoi, aimed at imposing by force, or any other devious means, a Communist government in South Vietnam under the control of Hanoi.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am in thorough accord with what the Senator has said. I have in my hand a paper showing 14 points laid down by the President of the United States as grounds for the settlement of the controversy in South Vietnam and North Vietnam.

Point No. 9 states:

> We support free elections in South Vietnam to give the South Vietnamese a government of their own choice.

It seems to me that, with that proposal made by the President of the United States, the South Vietnamese should be given the opportunity to decide for themselves what type of government they want.

It is necessary to look to North Vietnam to see what its position is on the matter of open, free elections, to decide what type of government shall be had.

In connection with this statement, I call to the attention of the Senator what the North Vietnamese have said pertaining to open, free elections.

Mr. McGEE. The North Vietnamese, under Ho Chi Minh, answered that question unequivocally in 1956, when all of the Geneva agreements broke down, when the intent of the agreements was torn to shreds, when we learned, through Hanoi and Mr. Ho Chi Minh, that by free elections they meant elections free of any opposition party except the Communist Party. One party rule: there was one party, one truth, one set of positions, one group that should prevail. That is the heart of his concept of free elections.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I come down to the date of April 13, 1965, as further fortification for the statement just made by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE]. I read:

> TOKYO, April 13.—Premier Pham Van Dong of Communist North Vietnam has laid down a four-point program for peace that calls for the exclusion of all foreign interference in both the North and South.

I shall read point 3 and point 4.

Mr. McGEE. These are statements from Hanoi?

Mr. LAUSCHE. From Hanoi.

Mr. McGEE. The Premier of North Vietnam.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And we can assume that the statements were authorized by Ho Chi Minh.

These are the statements:

> The internal affairs of South Vietnam must be settled by the South Vietnamese people themselves—

So far, well enough. I continue—

> in accordance with the program of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation (Vietcong), without any foreign interference.

I ask the Senator if that does not mean that there must be a surrender to the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation before there can be what are supposed to be open free elections.

Mr. McGEE. Indeed, that is obvious and conspicuous in the statement of the Premier of North Vietnam. They are using their own front and party that they invented, they created, they lead, and they control, which serves their purpose; and only if the people of South Vietnam accept the mandate of the National Liberation Front, directed from Hanoi, will they be permitted to make "their own self-determining way" for the future.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I hope the Senator from Wyoming will suffer my repeating the statement, because it is very significant, and it has not been emphasized anywhere, so far as I know:

> The internal affairs of South Vietnam must be settled by the South Vietnamese people themselves, in accordance with the program of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation, without any foreign interference.

Does that not mean that all the other people whom the Senator has mentioned will have nothing to say, except that the election shall be conducted by the South Vietnam Liberation Front?

Mr. McGEE. Not only conducted by it but counted by it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Now I ask the question: If the election is carried on in that way, will it or will it not be a duplication of the one-party elections which have been held in all other countries where the Communists have said, "We will have open, free elections"?

Mr. McGEE. Indeed it would be. We should learn that fact from history. History can teach us some important lessons in that respect. I hope it taught us that lesson in Greece, where exactly the same demands were made in 1945 and 1946, and we were compelled to hold the line, even in support of a king and royalty and some black-market groups, in order to win the votes for a genuine self-determining development in Greece. It meant that for a time we had to abandon the good guys in the rural areas of Greece who were involved in that civil war situation.

In Germany the same thing was true. This was exactly what the Communists had in mind when they wanted free elections in Germany, provided that members of the Communist Party conduct those elections.

The Communists cannot stand free elections in Berlin. They cannot stand free elections in Eastern Germany, because they would be swept out immediately by the German people. This is an old hoax, and the fact that some of our people here in America are taken in by that hoax, after the lessons we should have learned from the cold war, is an exceedingly distressing factor of our time, and makes the chances of an opportunity for winning peace in Vietnam all the more difficult, even now.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It seems to be a travesty and an insult to the intelligence of the people, when the North Vietnamese state that: "We want the issue settled by the South Vietnamese people themselves, but in accordance with the program of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation."

Our Government has said that it is content to permit the people of South Vietnam to determine what type of government they want. In twisted words, North Vietnam, through its Premier, has said that it wants the people of South Vietnam to determine what type of government they want.

Yesterday the President of the United States asked that Ambassador Goldberg take up the matter in the United Nations. I suggest at this time that an exploration of the legitimacy of the proposals by North Vietnam and by our Government should be made by the United Nations, with a view of bringing about open, free elections, supervised by the United Nations or by a new international agency created to observe the elections. I should be happy to hear the Senator comment on that suggestion.

Mr. McGEE. I say to my friend from Ohio that this is indeed an interesting and provocative suggestion. I feel compelled to say, on my own behalf, that it will probably be a great deal more complicated than that. It is not like aiming toward elections in Greece, where they have had a far more sophisticated experience with some of the trappings of self-government or responsible local government, at least, for many years, or in Germany, where such capabilities existed wherever free elections could be had.

In South Vietnam, we have the tragic circumstance that there has been almost no experience in self-responsibility in government. We would only be deluding one another if we agreed that in trying to stage now what we might call free elections, we would achieve elections such as we think of in the American vernacular or in the experience of other countries in the so-called free world. I do not believe that can happen very soon.

But I believe that we should try to win them by drawing a line. We must try to draw a line in Vietnam for the Vietnamese to grow into that kind of responsibility, allowing time and opportunity for them to rise to this capacity, which all peoples can do if they are not suppressed from the outside by forces that are deliberately geared to prevent their self-expression.

If we include the timing in our concept, and realize that perhaps in our time we shall not see any genuine free elections so-called, because the people yet have to grow up with that kind of experience, then we could say, "Yes, indeed; take any means for a chance for whatever determination they choose to make, but free from any imposition on what they do from Hanoi or any of the other areas to the north."

Mr. LAUSCHE. There is soundness in what the Senator has declared. The point, however, which I am trying to make is the approach to the problem from the standpoint of the immediate time that our Government is prepared to have open and free elections, to the extent they can be obtained with the present untrained experience of the South Vietnamese, while the North Vietnamese have made, in the words of their Premier, false and beguiling statements that they wish the people of South Vietnam to determine what shall be done but, quote, "in accordance with the program of the Liberation Front." This absolutely means the old Communist type of election.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator is correct. Let me suggest that even if there may be some dispute over the degree to which the people of South Vietnam—or similar areas which were too long under colonial domination—might be capable of rising to self-government, the fact remains that we know the surest way they will never obtain it would be to turn them over to the Communists. Whatever else our feelings may be, at least we have a moral goal in the matter of what we believe, and political righteousness in terms of freedom for all people to make their own determination of what they wish to live with, and what conditions they will accept, and so forth. We also know how they cannot get that by surrendering to forces from the outside that would move in by sheer power, and cram its doctrine, its methodology, and its leadership down the throats of its neighbors.

It is the prevention of such a situation that we stand for in this country.

I hope we are not trying to make little democrats out of everyone—and with all due respect to my friends on the other side of the aisle, I mean little democrats with a small "d." I hope we are not trying to make little Americans out of everyone.

To me, American foreign policy is simple, and that is to uphold the right of every nation, of every people, anywhere, to determine its own future, its own destiny within its own confines, so long as it does not impose its attitudes upon its neighbors by force, or have to succumb to imposition from its neighbors by force.

That is as simple and as plainly as it can be put. Let the nations work out the variations of the future they want.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is my position, and I am quite certain that it is the position also of the Senator from Wyoming, that when we made the statement that we support free elections in South Vietnam, to give the South Vietnamese a government of their own choice—which we did in a brief statement, and simply put—we declared what the Senator has just stated a moment ago to be his concept of the philosophy of our Government.

If the Liberation Front really wishes peace, it would seem to me that it would go to the negotiating table and there discuss ways and means to insure free and open elections. But, that they will not do.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator does not blame them, does he?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I blame them because——

Mr. McGEE. Because that would destroy them.

Mr. LAUSCHE. They wish South Vietnam to be surrendered to them——

Mr. McGEE. Of course. They cannot afford to negotiate. They cannot afford to compromise. They cannot afford to settle. Their only hope is to settle by the imposition of force—their force—on only one kind of peace; namely, their peace. They cannot afford anything else.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Another condition laid down by the Premier is that all foreign troops be pulled out, and then that elections be held in accordance with the concept of the Communists in holding an election.

I thank the Senator from Wyoming very much for his comments.

Mr. McGEE. I also wish to thank the Senator from Ohio for his valuable contribution in this dialog that we have been able to spell out on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the Washington Post for April 14, 1965, entitled "North Vietnamese Peace Program Calls for End of All Interference"; and a statement on U.S. official position on Vietnam.

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

NORTH VIETNAMESE PEACE PROGRAM CALLS FOR END OF ALL INTERFERENCE

TOKYO, April 13.—Premier Pham Van Dong of Communist North Vietnam has laid down a four-point program for peace that calls for the exclusion of all foreign interference in both the North and South.

The New China news agency, quoting a North Vietnamese broadcast, said the points were made by Dong Monday in a report to the national assembly in Hanoi.

The four points made by Dong, the agency said were:

"1. Recognition of the basic national rights of the Vietnam people: Peace, independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity.

"2. Pending peaceful reunification of Vietnam, while Vietnam is still temporarily divided into two zones, the military provisions of the 1954 Geneva agreements on Vietnam must be strictly respected; the two zones must refrain from joining any military alliance with foreign countries, there must be no foreign military bases, troops and military personnel in their respective territory.

"3. The internal affairs of South Vietnam must be settled by the South Vietnamese people themselves, in accordance with the program of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation (Vietcong), without any foreign interference.

"4. The peaceful reunification of Vietnam is to be settled by the Vietnamese people in both zones, without any foreign interference."

The "stand expounded above * * * is the basis for the soundest political settlement of the Vietnam problem," Dong said. "If this basis is recognized, favorable conditions will be created for the peaceful settlement of the Vietnam problem and it will be possible to consider the reconvening of an international conference along the pattern of the 1954 Geneva Conference on Vietnam."

The New China news agency said that on the first point "according to the Geneva agreements, the U.S. Government must withdraw from South Vietnam U.S. troops, military personnel and weapons of all kinds, dismantle all U.S. military bases there, cancel its 'military alliance' with South Vietnam. It must end its policy of intervention and aggression in South Vietnam * * * The U.S. Government must stop its acts of war against North Vietnam."

Dong said U.N. intervention in Vietnam would be "inappropriate" because the United Nations is "basically at variance with the 1954 agreement." The 1954 agreement halted the war between the French and the forces of Ho Chi Minh, now president of North Vietnam, and left the country divided.

U.S. OFFICIAL POSITION ON VIETNAM

The following statements are on the public record about elements which the United States believes can go into peace in southeast Asia:

1. The Geneva Agreements of 1954 and 1962 are an adequate basis for peace in southeast Asia.

2. We would welcome a conference on southeast Asia or on any part thereof.

3. We would welcome "negotiations without preconditions" as the 17 nations put it.

4. We would welcome unconditional discussions as President Johnson put it.

5. A cessation of hostilities could be the first order of business at a conference or could be the subject of preliminary discussions.

6. Hanoi's four points could be discussed along with other points which others might wish to propose.

7. We want no U.S. bases in southeast Asia.

8. We do not desire to retain U.S. troops in South Vietnam after peace is assured.

We support free elections in South Vietnam to give the South Vietnamese a government of their own choice.

10. The question of reunification of Vietnam should be determined by the Vietnamese through their own free decision.

11. The countries of southeast Asia can be nonalined or neutral if that be their option.

12. We would much prefer to use our resources for the economic reconstruction of southeast Asia than in war. If there is peace, North Vietnam could participate in a regional effort to which we would be prepared to contribute at least $1 billion.

13. The President has said "The Vietcong would not have difficulty being represented and having their views represented if for a moment Hanoi decided she wanted to cease aggression. I don't think that would be an insurmountable problem."

14. We have said publicly and privately that we could stop the bombing of North Vietnam as a step toward peace although there has not been the slightest hint or suggestion from the other side as to what they would do if the bombing stopped.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I hasten to add that at the beginning of this problem, in 1954, 1955, and 1956, we did not divide Vietnam. Vietnam was ultimately divided by the forces and the power blocs which were operating in that area at that time. We did not divide Korea. That was an expedient aimed at trying to achieve the transition from total war to some kind of peace.

We did not divide Berlin. We did not divide Germany, but, we are confronted by the hard facts of a divided world, nonetheless.

As Adlai Stevenson put it on one occasion so much more eloquently than I:

> Our real choice is not that of a divided world or one world, but a divided world or no world.

We have long since learned of the necessity to accommodate ourselves to a reasonable division of the areas of power. It is what some in the old-fashioned days used to call, "restoring the balance of power." Those are dirty words. The mere mention of balance of power inflames some of our friends in this body. It also inflames many of my former cohorts in the academic world who regard balance of power as a dirty phrase. Indeed, it is. It is wrong. It is immoral. But, it is a fact of life. For, in all of the great progress which we have made in technological know-how, in scientific endeavor, in medical solutions to hitherto defiant health problems, in all of this great progress which we have made, we have made virtually no progress in the science of orderly existence on earth.

If Napoleon Bonaparte were to come back to earth today, he would recognize the same vestments of nationalism and national power in the world; they have changed little in 250 years.

It is a sorry commentary that the only substitute that civilized man, so-called, has been willing to accept for war, is the balance of power. Therefore, it behooves us, upon whose shoulders has been thrust by history the responsibility to reestablish that balance in the world, to start with the hard facts of international life; namely, the balance of power.

Of course, that is not the end that we seek. That is not the goal. But, that is our starting point, not our stopping point.

Unless we can reestablish the balance of power in the world, we cannot meaningfully plan or even hope for a more stable society of man in the years ahead.

That is what rests upon our conscience as well as upon our shoulders in this role of leadership which we assume. We did not choose it. We did not seek it. But, as the emerging power of great strength in the wake of the disasters of World War II, we inherited it. We inherited it from the British, from the French, and from the Dutch.

Unless we can reestablish the balance of power, we will simply forfeit to a world in chaos and international anarchy.

This opportunity gives us our beginning. Once we achieve it, Mr. President, we will have then won the opportunity for which the war was waged—that is, the opportunity to do it a little better, the opportunity to improve upon the trappings of the world order, if we can.

But, we have got to win the opportunity first. That opportunity remains ever elusive if we do not restore the balance of power. We have come a long way along the road of balancing the world in the wake of World War II—a long way. We were tested in Greece and Turkey, Iran, Berlin, Korea, and Cuba. Now it is Vietnam.

Each crisis, in its own terms, by its own forces, was the measure of our willingness to assume the responsibility of power in drawing the line of balance around the globe. Such a line has almost been drawn. We can begin in the northern area of our earthly domain in Finland, and with a piece of chalk sketch a line on the globe down across eastern Europe, above Greece and Turkey, Iraq, Iran, Pakistan and India, almost to the China Sea.

That represents a firm line that has been drawn, not by a geographer, not by a theoretician, not by a philosopher, but by the sheer balancing force of the counter power. One source of that power was vested in Moscow, and the other in the United States of America. But the line has been drawn, and it has produced a greater semblance of order in the world—in that part of the world, that is—than at any time since World War II. But only in the East has it remained in a vacuum, in a total state of fluidity.

We have come so close to rebalancing the globe that it would be a forfeiture of deep responsibility finally to stop now, finally to be so near and yet stop when it is still so far.

That is the reason why it makes a difference what we do now, and that is why we are in Vietnam. That is why we have no rational, no meaningful, no moral alternative but to stay there for the present, to draw that line there, and to epitomize in our own vestments of power the hopes of those nations and lesser people in numbers, though no lesser than the next person in aspirations, their hopes to survive in dignity, their dreams to grow in affluence.

It is this on which our decision rides. It is this on which the course of the debates in this body hinge. That is the

reason why I have taken these few minutes today to make a part of the record what I think is an unassailable, factual account of the origin of the National Liberation Front, of the role it occupies with and for Hanoi, and plead with my colleagues in this body, in all the differences we may have, at least to strip away the falsehood, strip away the hoax that engulfs the NLF.

Once we do that, it seems to me that we have a better chance more realistically to deal with the hard-gut issues of Vietnam.

As I terminate these comments, I thank my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] for his courtesy in yielding to me at this time that I might develop for the record the story of the beginnings of the National Liberation Front, how it was conceived, and for what purpose it was conceived. That is what really counts. The point of the National Liberation Front remains what is described in the simple word "front." It is a front. It is a facade, and nothing more. Let us not be deceived any more than we were deceived anywhere else around the world by new psychological tactics of the Communists in Moscow in one interval, and by the psychological tactics of the Communists in Peiping at another interval, and now the Communist group operating currently out of Hanoi.

If my friend from North Carolina is of such mind, I would like to return the floor to him, and thank him for his courtesy.

Mr. ERVIN. Let me assure my good friend from Wyoming that I was asked to yield the floor to him in order for him to make a very clear statement about the status of the Vietcong. I think it was a most worthwhile statement because of the need to have that status clarified. We have had much loose talk about negotiating with the Vietcong. To me the Senator from Wyoming has made it clear that it would be about as sound a basis for negotiation as if some country would demand that when it entered into negotiations with the United States, in addition to the officials representing the United States, there should also be negotiations with members of the Masonic Lodge, members of the Knights of Columbus, members of the Ku Klux Klan, the Protestant churches and the Catholic churches——

Mr. McGEE. And the B'nai B'rith.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes; the B'nai B'rith, the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith; and the various unions, the members thereof, and different social organizations as well, because they have been sustained within the borders of the United States on the same basis, except that they have been less turbulent and their activities have been more gratifying.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator's comment is quite appropriate. The point of parallelism is drawn excellently. I would assume that the Senator would want these comments to be included in the context of my remarks rather than as a part of his remarks.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes, because they are relevant to the speech that the Senator made, and not to my speech.

During the delivery of Mr. ERVIN's speech,

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Carolina very much for yielding to me. I note that, with his usual legal ability, he has covered every eventuality which might occur within the next few minutes.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my previous unanimous-consent request be broadened to permit the Senator from Kentucky to introduce bills, and to engage in colloquy with other Senators for such questions, answers, observations, and statements as he or they may care to make in connection with such bills, under the same conditions.

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

INVESTMENT CREDIT FOR PRIVATE INDUSTRY COMBATING WATER AND AIR POLLUTION

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from North Carolina for his courtesy in yielding to me. I know it is very difficult for him to give up his time to me, but I appreciate it very much.

Mr. ERVIN. I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that it is always wonderful to have an opportunity to be courteous to such a courteous gentleman. I yielded to him notwithstanding the fact that I had a long speech to deliver, and I do not know whether I shall have sufficient time to complete the speech today.

For that reason, I intend to ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to continue my speech at a subsequent day without having my speech of today counted as a speech on the pending subject.

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and myself, I send to the desk a bill to increase the investment credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution. I ask that the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks, and that it lie on the desk until a week from tomorrow, through next Wednesday, for additional cosponsors.

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, this bill would increase the present investment credit of 7 to 14 percent for those industries purchasing and installing facilities and equipment controls that would abate or eliminate air and water pollution.

The Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, during the last several sessions of Congress has held extensive hearings on the subject of water and air pollution. As a result of this study by the committee, several bills were passed by the Senate and enacted into law.

The Water Quality Act, which became Public Law 89–234, provides for a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, increases from $100 million annually to $150 million annually the grants for waste treatment facilities over the next 2 years, and increases individual project grants from $600,000 to $1.2 million, and multiproject grants from $2.4 to $4.8 million. It sets up a 4-year, $80 million program for demonstration grants involving new or improved methods of controlling pollution from storm sewers. Finally, it authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish water quality standards in interstate waters in those situations where the States have failed to take action.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] deserves great credit for his leadership in this field. He introduced the bill and conducted the hearings. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] also, as the ranking member of the subcommittee, deserves great credit, as does my cosponsor. I opposed the bill first introduced and passed, for, as I stated in my individual views and in debate on the floor of the Senate, I thought the first bill gave too large a grant of authority to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in fixing water quality standards. I pointed out also that private industry in the State and local communities would be required to bear the chief burden of installing antipollution facilities, and that the bill as originally passed by the Senate did not provide adequate provisions for their participation in the establishment of these standards.

However, these provisions of the Senate bill were remedied in great measure by the House bill, and I supported the bill finally agreed upon in the House and Senate conference.

In April of last year, the committee held hearings on amendments to the Clean Air Act. The purpose of that act is to provide for the establishment of standards for automotive vehicle emissions, the establishment of a new Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory to conduct a national research and development program, and for international control of air pollution where a foreign country is adversely affected by air pollution from sources within the United States.

This law also contains a title 2 designated as the "Solid Waste Disposal Act," which authorizes a total of $92.5 million for 4 years to be used by the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Interior for research, demonstrations, and training in connection with disposal of garbage, refuse, and other discarded solid materials.

The committee reported favorably and the Senate passed S. 560, the Federal Installations, Facilities, and Equipment Pollution Control Act, which is designed to provide for improved cooperation by Federal agencies to control water and air pollution of Federal installations and facilities and to control automotive vehicle air pollution. The bill authorized necessary funds for the installation and maintenance of waste disposal systems in Federal buildings to meet the standards established by the Secretary and makes it mandatory upon the agency concerned to request from the Congress such appropriations as may be necessary to comply with these standards. The act requires future Federal construction, building, or installation to be provided with waste disposal facilities.

On January 25 of this year, the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, under the able direction of the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], as a result of hearings held in major cities throughout the country, issued a report calling for a national expenditure of $20 billion, including a $6 billion Federal contribution over the next 6 years, to control water pollution.

In his budget message, the President proposed a program and funds to implement this important legislation enacted by the Congress last session, in the following terms:

Increased urbanization and industrialization have resulted in a rapid buildup of pollutants in the environment. Expenditures to deal with these problems will increase by $92 million to $331 million in 1967.

This increase will allow acceleration of research on pollution and training of more manpower to deal with pollution problems. The attack on air and water pollution and the solid waste problem will be intensified under recently enacted legislation which also established a Water Pollution Control Administration.

A new program will be started in selected river basins to demonstrate methods for a broad attack on the water pollution problems of an entire basin. Water pollution from existing Federal installations will be reduced in accordance with the recent Executive Order No. 11258, and a similar directive governing air pollution is planned. Legislation will be proposed to (1) strengthen water pollution enforcement authority, including the registration of those responsible for discharging effluents into interstate and navigable streams, and (2) expand research, training, and control programs and demonstrate new techniques for waste treatment.

The trend in legislation seems to look solely to the Federal Government to solve this problem through increased financial contributions. This will be necessary, but we must remember that the increase in pollution is caused by more advanced agricultural and industrial uses and if we are to come to grips with this problem we must have the support of private industry. One way of increasing the participation of private industry is to give industry a financial incentive to purchase and install facilities for the abatement of water and air pollution. It is only proper that where industries purchase expensive equipment and facilities to reduce pollution—which facilities bring no financial return on their investment but are devoted to the greater public purpose and benefit—that a portion of that cost should be borne by the public.

In the January issue of the monthly letter published by the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., of New York, there is an interesting article on this subject entitled, "Progress and Pollution—Can the Link Be Broken." In the body of that article the question of private industry purchasing equipment to control air and water pollution receives the following comment:

If businesses and communities are to be expected to install control equipment on a massive scale to abate air and water pollution, more thought will have to be given to methods of inducing them to make the necessary investment. It needs to be frankly recognized that there is little motive in most cases for the individual business unit to assume unusual costs in order to reduce or prevent pollution, particularly if competitors aren't doing so. Control equipment is nonproductive so far as yielding any marketable product is concerned. In a competitive industry, it may represent the marginal item of cost that prices a company out of some market. Recognizing this, a community eager to attract new plants may be tempted to relax in enforcing pollution regulations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, despite the fact that installation does not produce profits many segments of industry with a sense of public obligation are investing large sums of their own operating funds.

There is wide interest everywhere in water conservation and water pollution controls. The National Junior Chamber of Commerce has made this subject a major objective and it is important to the whole Nation.

The bill we introduce today on behalf of myself and the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would amend the Internal Revenue Code by increasing from 7 to 14 percent the investment credit to those companies that purchase equipment and facilities abating, controlling, or eliminating air and water pollution.

I should like to speak of the work of the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] who has been in the forefront in proposing economic incentives to private industry as a method for the control and elimination of pollution. The bill which we now introduce was offered by him on the floor of the Senate as an amendment to the Revenue Act of 1964 and was cosponsored by some 25 Senators. The Senate voted to accept the amendment. I regret, however, that the amendment was dropped in the ensuing conference with the House. On April 1 of last year, Senator RIBICOFF introduced a bill, S. 1670, which would encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting companies to amortize for income tax purposes the cost of this equipment over a period of 36 months. As a start, I do not believe it matters greatly which approach the Congress takes; that is, whether the Congress increases the investment credit or provides for a faster writeoff of equipment and facilities or a combination of both.

I hope that these bills will be considered by the Finance Committee of the Senate as well as the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and that in their studies and research they will compare the merits of the two bills. I feel strongly that Congress should give private industry an incentive to carry out this difficult, expensive, but altogether necessary task of clearing up our streams and air. In the last analysis, many of the problems are caused by the great technological advances in our industrial development. Unless we enlist the support of industry in this battle, I do not feel that the problem can be adequately dealt with by Federal and State Governments—and, indeed, municipal governments.

In conclusion, I should like to point out with respect to the bill we introduce today, that the Treasury has estimated in 1964—at the time the amendment was offered—that the loss of revenue for the first year would be $25 million, the second year $30 million, and over the long run approximately $50 million annually. This, of course, might be subject to some change today, but I do not believe by any substantial amount.

When we think of the huge amount of funds the Federal Government is contributing and the even greater amount of funds it is urged to contribute, our bill represents a modest start in aiding private industry in this most important field.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I associate myself with the well-reasoned remarks of the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] in support of the legislation which he has introduced to accelerate industrial investment in facilities to control and abate environmental pollution.

As ranking majority member of the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution I have been actively involved in recent legislative efforts to combat air and water pollution. The 88th Congress enacted the Clean Air Act, of which the able junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] was the primary sponsor. And last year, under the vigorous leadership of the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the 89th Congress enacted the Federal Water Pollution Control Amendments of 1965.

It was my privilege to cosponsor both of these measures and to participate in the hearings, the executive sessions, and the drafting of the final legislation. Throughout this process, it has been my conviction, shared by other members of the Senate Committee on Public Works as well as many Members of this body, that the protean tasks of combating and eliminating environmental pollution will not be accomplished without the cooperation of private industry.

Many segments of business, especially in recent months and years, have evidenced a highly cooperative attitude in this field and have given every indication of a desire to control air and water pollution. However, the Federal Government has not yet applied all the instruments at our disposal to enlist industrial cooperation to the fullest extent. I speak with specific reference to tax incentive legislation to promote greater investments in pollution abatement facilities.

The cost of abatement of industrial pollution, Mr. President, is truly a staggering one. Though we do not have refined figures on the problem for all segments of industry, informed persons tell me that it will be much greater than the $20 billion estimate of our Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution required for municipal waste treatment facilities between now and 1972.

It seems unrealistic for us to expect that this entire burden of investment in non-revenue-producing facilities should be borne solely by industry. The problem of environmental pollution is an organic

component of our highly industrialized technology which has generated benefits shared by all Americans. It seems only equitable, therefore, that one of the major problems of our technology should also be shared by all in the form of some type of tax benefit for investment in pollution abatement facilities.

I am not convinced at this point that there is a preferred single solution, that is, in the form of a 3-year tax amortization, as now suggested by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], or in the form of the pending proposal in which I join with the able senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] which calls for a special investment credit. For this reason, I have identified myself as a cosponsor of both measures, and I hope that the appropriate congressional committees will take early action on the problem and that this Congress will act favorably on some type of incentive legislation.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Morgan Guaranty Survey, January 1966]

PROGRESS AND POLLUTION—CAN THE LINK BE BROKEN?

The problem of pollution is currently being elevated to prominent national attention in much the same way as was the problem of poverty 2 years ago. Almost everyone, or so it seems, is suddenly talking about it, and scarely a week goes by without an official at some level of government announcing a new initiative to curtail the flow of wastes into the country's atmosphere and waterways.

Pollution, of course, is not a new thing in the United States, any more than is poverty; nor indeed are efforts at control. American municipalities have made heavy expenditures over the decades to eradicate or prevent water pollution, and some also have invested considerable sums in recent years to cleanse their skies. Similarly, many business firms have made significant outlays to abate the waste flow that is the inevitable accompaniment of industrial activity.

Realization has emerged, however, that sizable though these efforts have been in total, they simply have not been adequate to keep up with the ever larger waste loads that growing cities, suburbs, and industries are discharging. Sight and smell alone have been sufficient to drive home this fact. Hundreds of bodies of water in the country are patently unfit for drinking, wildlife, or use in manufacturing processes, and the air in many communities often is laden with floating grime and offensive smells.

Aroused by such conditions, the public appears primed to support vastly enlarged abatement endeavors. Concrete evidence of this came in New York State in last November's election, when voters gave approval to a $1 billion bond proposal for financing a clean-up of polluted waterways. The dramatic 4-to-1 vote far exceeded expectations and was rendered especially significant because the borrowing was the largest ever approved in the State's history.

Since the public mood seems similar elsewhere, what happened in New York may well herald the beginning of a major new turn all across the country in the allocation and use of public funds. The ultimate cost of stepped-up pollution control programs defies meaningful estimate, but it is certain that many billions of dollars will be involved. Economic costs rivaling those for space exploration, for instance, are easy to visualize. Underscoring this possibility is the fact that Federal participation in abatement endeavors is rapidly accelerating. Congress last year passed legislation that will require many States to quicken and enlarge antipollution efforts relating to interstate waters. It also provided for national standards limiting emission of automobile exhausts. Acting in accord with this law, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has just set machinery in motion which will make such standards applicable to 1968 model automobiles and which will add an estimated $400 million to consumer spending on new automobiles that year assuming sales of 9 million cars.

Basic to rational regulation of pollution is the question: How clean should water and air be? The answer isn't necessarily the one that most people presumably would give instinctively; namely, that both water and air should be as clean as possible. With regard to water, certainly, an attempt to achieve pristine purity in all instances regardless of intended end use would entail unnecessarily burdensome social costs. Water which is to be used for soil irrigation, for instance, obviously does not have to be purified to drinkable standards. This applies as well to much of the water that is used industrially. Significantly, agricultural and industrial uses account for roughly 90 percent of the country's total water consumption, and feeder systems for these uses often are separate from those running to the country's homes.

Even if a particular stream serves as a source of drinking water, it doesn't necessarily follow that all pollutants must be prevented from entering it. Water taken from a stream, no matter how clean it may seem to be, often must undergo some purification treatment immediately before being routed to household taps. While flowing in the stream, moreover, water has a natural capacity to decompose and dilute many contaminants, thereby cleansing itself. Where there is assurance that this process will be adequate, it would be economic folly to undertake the expense of intercepting and filtering out all waste matter.

But while water doesn't have to be maintained in all instances at a standard of absolute purity, it is clear that the country's expanding water needs demand that water quality in many rivers, streams, and lakes be raised above the levels that presently prevail. With the advance of technology and the wide application of fertilizers and pesticides, waters have been receiving heavy loads of inorganic and synthetic organic chemicals that do not respond to the normal process of decomposition and cleansing by bacteria and oxygen. In numerous other cases water bodies that could assimilate substantial quantities of organic wastes have been so overloaded with pollutants as to arrest the normal breaking-down process. This has occurred principally because the volume of organic wastes has been expanding rapidly with economic and population growth, while the quantity of rainfall and its subsequent flow through waterways remain relatively unchanged from year to year.

The constancy of nature's precipitation bounty is the chief hurdle confronting officials who must plan for the country's future water needs. Projections of water demand point to the very real possibility that the supply that can be captured from rainfall runoff could prove seriously deficient within the next decade and a half. It is inescapable, therefore, that some way must eventually be found either to supplement or short-circuit nature's evaporation and precipitation cycle. The desalting of sea water is one possibility, although as a practical matter this as of now seems to have serious limitations both economically and geographically. A more promising possibility is that ways will be perfected to use fresh water more than once during the flow from watershed to estuary, as is already being done to some extent.

UPGRADING WATER QUALITY

To permit reuse, of course, water must be of suitable quality and this is why accelerated pollution control efforts are so important. The setting of quality standards thus becomes the first task in any coherent abatement program.

More than half the States have taken at least some action along these lines. New York State, for example, has classified all of its 70,000 miles of streams and 3½ million acres of lakes as to proposed use. The classifications, which reflect to some degree the concept of stream specialization, are: A for drinking, B for bathing, C for fishing, D for drainage. Besides this classification program, sanitary engineers in the State have evaluated the sewage facilities that would be required in every community in order to raise water quality to the prescribed classification levels.

While the State has only limited authority to force municipalities to construct such facilities, it has devised a program of financial aid that seems sufficiently generous to assure a good response. Whereas local governments have previously had to carry pretty much the full burden of construction costs for sewers and sewage treatment plants, their share would be only 40 percent under the new approach. New York State will finance the other 60 percent, using the proceeds of the $1-billion bond issue approved last November.

Eventually Albany hopes to get Washington to go halves on the 60 percent, but that will have to await congressional action. The Federal Government now gives some assistance to municipalities, but a formula limiting the size of individual grants works to the disadvantage of communities undertaking large-scale projects. The most that can be granted under present Federal law for a single project is $1.2 million, a relatively small sum in comparison with the typical undertaking in major cities.

Governor Rockefeller has campaigned actively for liberalization of Washington's financial aid to permit Federal payment of a full 30 percent of the cost of municipal sewage facilities. He also has proposed that the Federal Government should follow New York State's lead in providing industry with treatment incentives in the form of 1-year write-off against income taxes on investment in pollution control equipment.

Hopefully the bold initiatives taken in New York will be emulated in other States. If they are not, the alternative is virtually certain to be a national cleanup directed from Washington. The Water Quality Act of 1965 specifically empowered the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enunciate standards of quality on interstate waters unless the States themselves do so to Washington's satisfaction by June 30, 1967. Should the Secretary do this, the results could be unfortunate. "Any attempt to 'standardize' water quality on a nationwide basis," as Governor Bellmon of Oklahoma recently cautioned, "would likely disregard regional differences in water quantity, flow, location, natural characteristics, and usage."

EXHAUSTIVE CONTROLS

A disregard of regional differences is already evident in Federal action dealing with air pollution. The action just taken by Washington to require automotive exhaust controls on 1968 model cars applies unvaryingly to every State and every community in the Nation, making no allowance for differences in population concentration or in meteorological conditions. This inevitably means that some people are going to be making outlays of up to $50 on control devices that will bring no meaningful benefit either to themselves or their neighbors. This could be so, for example, for many residents of Maine—an irony since it is Senator MUSKIE of that State whose name is most closely associated with the enabling legislation.

There are vast expanses of the continental United States where relatively sparse population or brisk air circulation, or a combination of the two, forestalls the formation of automotive smog. Either the wind blows the pollutants away, or temperature changes cause cold air to fall and force warm air, with its load of pollutants, into the higher atmosphere.

The self-cleansing action of air is likely to to be less effective, of course, in areas where population is heavily concentrated or where the topography is such as to produce frequent temperature inversion. As the term implies, this is the opposite of normal weather patterns. A layer of warm air moves in on top of cooler air, forming a blanket that prevents polluted air from rising and diluting itself in the higher atmosphere.

In Los Angeles temperature inversions often combine with exhaust gases to produce the acrid haze that the city has been trying to banish for 18 years. It has been estimated that some 500,000 gallons of gasoline escape unburned from cars every day, mainly as a result of incomplete combustion, and get trapped by warm air in the "kettle" that is formed by the city's encircling mountains. The hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides contained in auto exhaust gases then "cook" in sunlight, reacting photochemically to form smog. The seriousness of this problem finally led to action by California's Legislature requiring that most new U.S.-made cars sold and registered in the State be equipped with exhaust-control devices beginning with the current model year. The standards recently promulgated by Washington relating to 1968 model automobiles essentially follow the California pattern. They apply as well, however, to imported cars.

Although expert opinion is divided as to whether California-type exhaust-control devices actually are needed elsewhere, most car buyers in metropolitan areas probably will pay the extra charge uncomplainingly. Most large cities have so many air pollution problems that the layman tends to think that anything which may cut down the dirt in his air is to the good.

The large industrial city can actually be viewed as a vast combustion chamber daily converting thousands of tons of fuel into the energy and heat that underpin modern life. Amenities and progress result, but so, too, do problems and pollution. Soot and fly ash are the housewife's constant bane, adding to her cleaning chores, blackening her wallpaper, and inflating her laundry bills. Gaseous emissions corrode metals, irritate eyes, offend noses, and reduce visibility. So far, fortunately, the soot and fumes have been more a nuisance than a proven health hazard, but in a few isolated episodes in this country and in Europe acute air pollution, associated with temperature inversions lasting for several days, has been accompanied by increases in the death rate. Unless the tempo of antipollution attack is quickened such episodes could become more common in the future, assuming a continuing trend in the direction of an ever more urbanized and industrialized society.

WHAT TO DO?

But while it is clear that something more must be done, it is far from clear precisely what that "something" should be. A report issued last November by the President's Science Advisory Committee frankly acknowledged that "there are many areas in which ignorance constrains our ability to deal effectively with pollution problems."

An orderly approach to air pollution control logically would involve the setting of standards by each community for the quality of its air, followed by efforts to curtail the most damaging emissions. There are real difficulties in the way of this procedure, however, because it entails not only an assessment of the technological feasibility of curtailment for specific emissions but also a weighing of the costs of control in relation to the costs of damage that occur in the absence of control. In the present state of the art, measurements of costs and benefits are in most instances too imprecise to yield a reliable guide to action.

Given this situation, the excitement that characterizes much public discussion of what should be done is all too likely to lead to hasty or arbitrary proposals for curbing those sources of pollution that for one reason or another have aroused the most alarm. Highly questionable, for instance, is the recent recommendation of a committee of the New York City Council that exhaust-control devices be required by 1969 on all cars, old as well as new. Automotive engineers simply haven't been able to perfect a control device for installation on old cars that is economically feasible, and it is because of this that California, after considerable study, decided to limit its requirements to new vehicles.

A variety of arbitrary proposals also have been made for curtailing sulfur dioxide emissions in New York City, including recommendations that the burning of coal be banned and that stringent limitations be placed on the sulfur content of fuel oil. Some proponents of these steps acknowledge that very difficult problems would be involved, ranging from costly furnace conversions to the limited market availability of low-sulfur oil that in part is the result of national policy limiting petroleum imports. Other advocates are either less candid or less informed. They would have it appear that the recommended shift in fuel-consumption patterns could be accomplished easily and quickly if fuel users were only more public spirited.

PAYING THE BILL

If businesses and communities are to be expected to install control equipment on a massive scale to abate air and water pollution, more thought will have to be given to methods of inducing them to make the necessary investment. It needs to be frankly recognized that there is little motive in most cases for the individual business unit to assume unusual costs in order to reduce or prevent pollution, particularly if competitors aren't doing so. Control equipment is nonproductive so far as yielding any marketable product is concerned. In a competitive industry, it may represent the marginal item of cost that prices a company out of some market. Recognizing this, a community eager to attract new plants may be tempted to relax in enforcing pollution regulations.

The incentive for spending public funds on pollution abatement is also limited. Cities all over the country are pressed to provide services of all kinds to growing populations. Investment in modernized sewage treatment plants or incinerator stations can have less voter appeal than spending for police protection or schools.

Still another deterrent to abatement is the fact that the unpleasant effects of pollution are often so widely diffused that they may not be troublesome to those immediately involved in creating them. Conversely, the benefits of control are usually enjoyed by people other than those who pay the bill. The community that treats its sewage before discharging it into the river, or the plant that catches fly ash in its smokestack, may not itself enjoy cleaner water or air. The beneficiary may be a neighborhood some distance downstream or downwind.

The problem of pollution thus doesn't respond easily to commonsense maxims about "getting what you pay for." If the problem is to be corrected a way will have to be found to channel the general desire for a cleaner society into an acceptable method of getting up the money to pay for it.

One promising suggestion, aimed at fostering greater activity in the antipollution field by industry, would have local, State, and Federal government give tax incentives to business. Mr. W. G. Laffer, president of Clevite Corp., recently proposed a combination of investment credits, accelerated depreciation, and exemption from property taxes on pollution-control equipment. Certain States already provide some tax relief. New York, for instance, permits a 1-year writeoff on water-pollution controls, and Ohio exempts such equipment from property taxes.

An alternative to incentives that is sometimes suggested would be a system of charges levied in proportion to the amount of harmful waste put into the water or the air. Effluent charges are used in the Ruhr region in West Germany, where they have helped to prevent deterioration of water quality in a heavily populated and industrialized area. This approach has been tentatively endorsed by the President's Science Advisory Committee. Such a system, however, would have the disadvantage of necessitating the creation of a large inspection and measurement apparatus. It could prove more costly in the long run, therefore, than tax incentives.

To speed municipal efforts, State and local officials have been urging larger Federal grants to communities for abatement purposes, especially for investment in sewage treatment plants. With local funds widely inadequate to the task, construction of sewage facilities has not kept up with the growth of waste loads. Federal grants for construction of municipal sewage works have lightened local burdens somewhat, but the ceilings Congress has placed on the amount that can be granted for each project discriminate against the most populous States—whose pollution problems are the most severe. These ceilings should be liberalized, as Governor Rockefeller has recommended, and Congress should give high priority to raising grants to local authorities for sewage plants above the present total of $150 million a year.

Actually, the problem which local communities face in providing adequate sewage facilities is merely one small part of what has been aptly termed "the crisis of the cities"—of burgeoning urban needs in the context of limited financial resources. Urban problems in general probably aren't going to be solvable until tax revenues are more equitably shared between Federal and local governments. Some variant of the so-called Heller plan, which would substantially increase the amount of Federal tax collections channeled back to States and localities, may be the answer.

Collaboration between Washington and State and local officials also is necessary to help define industry's role in pollution abatement and to calm down some of the shrillness that presently prevails. In too many instances, slogans—such as "Let the polluters pay"—have substituted for analysis. The production of pollutants, it needs to be understood, is not the consequence of perverse business behavior but the "inevitable concomitant," as the President's Science Advisory Committee has noted, of technological activity.

Businessmen, while they direct much of this activity, can neither be credited with all its benefits nor held uniquely accountable for all its unwanted byproducts. The dividends and debits alike are society's to share.

If substantial pollution-control costs are to be built into the business process, it is society at large that is ultimately going to pay the price of those costs just as it now pays for other social objectives—such as factory safety, abolition of child labor, and minimum wages—that have become accepted costs of doing business. Clean water and clear air simply aren't free goods. Recognition of this is the vital prerequisite to the development of sensible abatement programs.

The bill (S. 2857) to increase the investment credit allowable with respect

to facilities to control water and air pollution, introduced by Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2857

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 46(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of qualified investment for purposes of determining the credit for investment in certain depreciable property) is amended by adding after paragraph (4) thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) FACILITIES TO CONTROL WATER AND AIR POLLUTION.—

"(A) In the case of section 38 property which consists of facilities or equipment to control water or air pollution, the amount of the qualified investment shall be twice the amount determined under paragraph (1).

"(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'facilities or equipment to control water pollution' means a facility or equipment used to control water pollution by removing, altering, or disposing of wastes from any type of manufacturing or mining process, including the necessary intercepting sewers, outfall sewers, pumping, power, and other equipment, and their appurtenances.

"(C) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'facilities or equipment to control air pollution' means a facility or equipment used to control atmospheric pollution or contamination by removing, altering, or disposing of atmospheric pollutants and contaminants from any type of manufacturing or mining process."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1965.

RECESS UNTIL 10 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 2, 1966, at 10 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

George R. Davis, minister, National City Christian Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Spirit of Truth, whose ways are higher than our ways, and whose thoughts are higher than our thoughts, we feel Thy call to us. We cannot rest until we have more nearly approached Thy goodness, Thy love, Thy holiness. We pray in all of our human agencies a deepening of the desire to find and follow Thy laws for men. Just now especially we long for this in governments. And we pray especially in these hours for our own Government. We thank Thee for her greatness, her ideals, her achievements. In these very critical days let Thy blessing rest upon this House of Representatives, the President of the United States, our courts, and all the governing bodies of our Nation. Help us to be strong and unwavering as we carry the burdens of world leadership. Keep us humble. Keep us persistent in the quest for world peace, by every legitimate means, even as we stand faithfully against aggression and tyranny. O God, our Father, hear our earnest prayer, for all men and nations, and be to us all not only the God of the nations, but the Father of each of us, in the name of Him who is the Wonderful Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

SELF-HELP AND U.S. FOREIGN AID

Mr. ZABLOCKI. 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. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I was most pleased by the stress President Johnson placed on the need for more self-help by countries seeking economic aid from the United States. This emphasis on more self-reliance reflects a growing recognition that our economic assistance programs must be genuine partnerships if they are to succeed. The burden must be shared, but the major portion of the burden should be carried by the developing nations themselves. Economic development is an inside job. With all its wealth and technology, the United States cannot induce progress in other nations from the outside.

On the other hand, the people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America now know that a far better life is possible. They know that ignorance, poverty, and despair are not inevitable facts of life. In the face of this new awareness and the new aspirations to which it gives rise, the rich nations of the world can no longer afford just to help their underdeveloped neighbors sustain themselves on the brink of survival. Such a course would eventually lead to worldwide disaster. There is no doubt that we must assist in this struggle for a better life. In doing so, however, we should continue to insist upon adequate standards of performance from those who seek our aid. Our most vital contribution should be assisting the drive toward self-reliance. For us, this is the only practicable course; for new nations with a strong sense of national pride and purpose, it is the only acceptable course.

As the President has emphasized, self-help means more than cost-sharing on individual projects. It means firm commitments about how the finished projects will be used and maintained. In the President's concept, self-help must include such things as the restructuring of a tax system to make it more effective and more equitable; the enactment of stringent fiscal measures to insure that temporary gains are not swept away in a tide of inflation; the institution of agricultural and land reform so that the farmers may realize a better return for their labor.

What we are trying to do in Asia, Africa, and Latin America is to get the less-developed countries started on an upward spiral of rising production, rising income, and rising standards of living so that they eventually will be able to continue on their way unaided.

President Johnson has made clear his determination that U.S. foreign aid shall not be used as a worldwide relief program with the needy nations lined up for handouts from the rich. He is determined, rather, that our aid will be used to help developing nations achieve economic independence as well as political independence. I know that he will receive the enthusiastic support of the Congress in his efforts.

PRESIDENT MADE RIGHT DECISION

Mr. DORN. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson made a forthright, courageous, and wise decision. He is right in resuming the bombing of North Vietnam—the Communist aggressor. The President extended the olive branch of peace. He even gave the aggressor time to reconsider his infamous actions and offered to negotiate. The President's gesture of peace was rejected by additional ruthless aggression. The President had no alternative but to attack the source of aggression.

The enemy took advantage of the truce to strengthen his base of aggression. The enemy used this time to prepare for further aggressive action against the peaceful Vietnamese people and against American soldiers stationed in Vietnam for peace and to prevent the spread of war.

Having returned from Vietnam only last week, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you this is welcome news to the American men at the fighting front and to freedom fighters of all nationalities. We cannot permit sanctuaries free of attack when aggression is spawned and nurtured against freemen from those sanctuaries. We must destroy those bases of aggressions and international crime. We are in war and every means at our disposal should be used to insure final victory over the forces of tyranny and evil oppression. We must protect

our men with every means at our command. We should barricade the coast of North Vietnam and prevent their instrumentalities of death from reaching our boys at the fighting front. We should destroy the airfields, generating plants, and industrial complexes of North Vietnam. The President's action will encourage the Koreans, the Thais, the Philippine people, the Republic of China, and the forces of freedom all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, our men in South Vietnam from General Westmoreland to the private in the foxhole, the Vietnamese military, news correspondents, and civilians in every walk of life are virtually united in their desire to see victory in the cause of freedom in southeast Asia.

Upon my return from South Vietnam, I, along with others, made this recommendation to the President. President Johnson has my support in his heroic effort to halt Communist aggression and restore peace to the world.

YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday, January 29, I had the pleasure of viewing Edwin L. Weisl, Jr.'s appearance on Theodore Granik's award-winning "Youth Wants To Know." In these crucial times when the need for a better understanding of the critical issues of the day is so vital to our very existence, including the conservation of our natural resources, it is gratifying to know that WABC–TV regularly presents to the greater metropolitan area of New York City this splendid public affairs television series, "Youth Wants To Know."

Edwin L. Weisl, Jr., Assistant Attorney General for the Lands and Natural Resources Division of the Department of Justice, was quizzed by a panel of high school students about subjects of concern to all Americans. The questions and answers about water and air pollution, proposed Federal legislation affecting the individual States, water resources and conservation in general proved so dynamic and spirited that I commend the full text of the transcript of Mr. Weisl's appearance for reading by all Americans. Mr. Weisl's articulate and down-to-earth answers to the students' provocative questions on the activities of the Department of Justice's Land and Natural Resources Division was an enlightening experience for all. The conservation of America's natural resources is of particular critical concern to her young people and this lively question-and-answer session permitted the students, the ones most deeply and directly concerned, the opportunity to discuss conservation and its importance to them with an expert in this field.

Edwin L. Weisl, Jr., was named as Assistant Attorney General for the Lands Division by President Johnson in March 1965. He came to this important post with the Department of Justice from the private practice of law in New York. Mr. Weisl graduated from Yale with a degree in political science and philosophy in 1951. His education for the next 2 years was interrupted while he served his country as a lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy, first on destroyer duty in Korea and later at the Pentagon. Following separation from service, he attended Columbia Law School in New York where he won the Harlan Fiske Stone moot court honor argument. He received his degree and passed the New York bar in 1956 and joined the firm of Simpson, Thatcher & Bartlett, where he served until his appointment by President Johnson to the Department of Justice. In 1957 and 1958 Edwin L. Weisl, Jr., served as assistant special counsel to the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee during its investigation of our Nation's missile, satellite, space, and defense program.

Mr. Weisl, while he practiced law in New York, was also actively involved in politics and charitable work. He was the campaign director for the Democratic Party throughout the State of New York in 1964. He is the director of the International Rescue Committee, a trustee of the 92d Street YMHA and YWHA, and a member of the corporation of the Presbyterian Hospital of New York.

Mr. Weisl's appearance on "Youth Wants To Know" was prerecorded on video tape at the educational television studios of WETA–TV in Washington, D.C., for telecast by WABC–TV in New York. The program is also seen and heard in other cities throughout the country on various commercial and educational stations. The radio version of the program is broadcast by Armed Forces Radio to American servicemen throughout the world.

At this time, I should like to include in the recording a complete transcript of Mr. Weisl's appearance on "Youth Wants To Know":

YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW

(Created and produced by Theodore Granik, Jan. 29, 1966)

"Youth Wants To Know" presents Edwin Weisl, Jr., Assistant Attorney General for the Lands Division, Justice Department.

Mr. WEISL. One of the reasons that I changed our name this year was the very fact that most people don't know about us and what we do. We call it now the Land and Natural Resources Division. I think in a sense this explains it. We represent the United States in litigation involving water rights and water resources, air pollution, oil, gas, and mineral claims on the public lands, which result in lots of actual suits in court. We acquire land for the Government when it needs it for various projects. And also we do some work in both representing Indian tribes and defending claims by the tribes against the United States.

MODERATOR. We're talking about the Lands Division of the Justice Department with Edwin Weisl, Jr., who is Assistant Attorney General for that Division in the Justice Department, and we'll begin our questioning in just a second.

* * * * *

MODERATOR. Now let's continue our questioning with our guest today who is Edwin Weisl, Jr., whom President Johnson named as Assistant Attorney General for the Lands Division in the Justice Department in March 1965. He came to the Department of Justice from private law practice in New York City. He graduated from Yale with a degree in political science and philosophy in 1951. The next 2 years Mr. Weisl served as lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy, first on destroyer duty in Korea and later at the Pentagon. He received his degree and passed the New York bar in 1956 and immediately joined the firm of Simpson, Thatcher & Bartlett, where his father, Mr. Weisl, Sr., had been a partner since 1935, and he remained in that position until his appointment to the Department of Justice. And while he practiced law in New York, Mr. Weisl was also actively involved in politics and charitable work. In 1964 he was campaign director for the Democratic Party throughout the State of New York. Our discussion today primarily, I think, as well as other areas, will center around the Lands Division and his work, which he described to us a moment ago. Mr. Weisl, it's a pleasure to welcome you to, I think, your second appearance on Theodore Granik's "Youth Wants To Know."

Mr. WEISL. I'm very glad to be here.

MODERATOR. Thank you. And we look forward to an interesting program. Who would like to begin the questioning?

Question. Mr. Weisl, how can we prevent water shortages, such as the one that just occurred in New York City?

Mr. WEISL. Well, of course, there are a number of ways. The first thing we can do is figure out a way to get it to rain a little more than it does. Seriously, that's something at the moment we can't do much about, so we've got to look elsewhere. The principal problem in New York's water shortage is that you have a city of nearly 8 million people with fresh water in tremendous quantities flowing by it every day that you can't possibly use, because it is in such a polluted state. So one of the first things we must do to prevent water shortages around the country is attack the problem of pollution in an all-out effort to abate it.

Question. Sir, what prospects do you see now in the area of desalinization of water?

Mr. WEISL. Well, scientific research is going forward. We know we can produce fresh water from the sea. We can't produce it at a cost that makes it reasonable for really mass use as yet. The great hope is for either a breakthrough or engineering improvements, which I think will come, so that we can use it.

MODERATOR. Do we really have to do this? Is it urgent?

Mr. WEISL. I would say yes. After all, there's only so much water in the world. On the other hand, every day there are more people, and there are simply more demands on existing supply. You just can't create water that doesn't exist.

MODERATOR. Eventually we're going to have to bring water in from the sea; is that correct?

Mr. WEISL. I would think that is going to be essential.

Question. Mr. Weisl, what power does the Justice Department have right now to prevent water pollution?

Mr. WEISL. We have power, but only after a very lengthy administrative process has been gone through involving the State, private industry, and what have you. This is one of the difficulties in bringing about quick enforcement of the water pollution laws. We have to wait 6 months while the interested parties confer, and then we have to wait 6 months while the State water pollution authorities decide what they're going to do. And if ultimately nothing has been done or adequate steps haven't been taken, then we can come in and sue.

Question. Mr. Weisl, do you find that most manufacturers will willingly cooperate with

you in these plans to eliminate water pollution?

Mr. WEISL. In many cases, we've received excellent cooperation, yes. And in many cases, no. Actually, you know one of the real pollution problems comes from municipal wastes. It is the cities and towns who in many ways justifiably say we can't afford to build a sewage treatment plant. The Federal Government's grants are not adequate to enable us to build it. Therefore, what are we to do? Well, what we're to do, of course, is to change the law, I hope, so that grants to these municipalities will be adequate. Then we'll try to get the industries to hook up to the cities' sewer system, and take advantage of the municipal facilities, at the same time paying for the right to use these sewers for their wastes.

Question. Is anything being done on the national level about air pollution?

Mr. WEISL. Yes, indeed. It's just beginning to get into high gear, because it is a very difficult problem to determine whether air pollution is interstate and what have you, but a division has been set up in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. I think in the next few months you're going to see a lot of activity.

Question. Do you have much problem with getting together with the State governments on this air pollution?

Mr. WEISL. Most States have started the establishment of their own department of air pollution control. But they are often poorly funded, they're often a sort of stepchild of State government. So the department itself may be very anxious to step in and get to work, but their resources are inadequate to do the job because it is tremendously expensive. It really takes lots of people to monitor, to test, to watch for pollution, and, also, at the same time, takes a lot of scientific technology and research to find out how to prevent it.

Question. Mr. Weisl, what kind of cooperation have you had from private industry, and especially automobile manufacturers in the area of air pollution in making sure that there is none from cars?

Mr. WEISL. Well, as you know, in the last session of Congress a bill was passed enabling the Secretary of HEW to impose standards on automobile exhaust systems. Within a few years every Detroit car will have some system on it. The exact nature of them is not yet fully determined, but each company is working. They're going to have to do it anyway because California, as you know, pioneered in it and made it a requirement of the State law, to have a device, and their sales in California are big enough so they'll now start putting them on all of their cars, I'm sure.

Question. Will the consumer have to pay for this eventually?

Mr. WEISL. I would assume we would have to pay in part for it; yes. The consumer has to pay for the steering wheel. I don't know why he shouldn't have to pay this.

Question. What is the role of your department in the administration of the beautification project?

Mr. WEISL. Well, we have two roles in it. One is when a decision is made to go ahead and buy and acquire interest in land, we do it for them, as the legal representative. Secondly, we have an active role in preparing new legislation and trying to generate ideas on what can be done.

Question. I'd like to know what plans are underway to clean up the Potomac River and its basin?

Mr. WEISL. Well, there is a new bill called the Water Quality Act of 1965, which enables the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to set standards of water quality, and I think extensive studies are going on as to what the Potomac ought to be like, how clean should the water be. And from that point they're going to start going to towns and industries and telling them what has to be done in order to meet the standards. If not, it will end up over in my law office, which none of us expect and none of us really want.

Question. Sir, how long do you estimate it will take to clean up the basin?

Mr. WEISL. Well, current estimates are about 5 or 6 years. The reason is, of course, that you don't want to dislocate the economy of all the States that are on the river. You could tell these plants to shut down tomorrow and, of course, the river would clean up. But it takes time to build sewage treatment plants. It takes time to build waste disposal plants. Personally, I think we've waited too long, and now that we're at this stage, and we're determined to go forward, we might as well do it with a minimum of economic dislocation.

Question. Can our waterways really be cleaned up, or isn't part of the effort just to stop further pollution at this point?

Mr. WEISL. No, I think our waterways, in large measure, can be cleaned up. There's no excuse, in my mind, for a city not having at least secondary sewage treatment today. And we're going to have to see that that comes about.

Question. Can this be accomplished in 2 years or in 20 years?

Mr. WEISL. No, it's a long-range program. I personally think it could be accomplished in 15 or 20 years with a vigorous program, that means the Congress willing to grant the Federal Government the kind of authority it needs to do the job.

Question. Do you feel that Congress is aware of the problem as you see it or as other conservationists see it?

Mr. WEISL. Yes, because I think the people are finally becoming aware of it, you see. Up till only a few years ago, a few ardent conservationists were talking about water shortages and pollution and nobody paid much attention. But when you see something dramatic like the crisis in New York, then people wake up and are demanding it.

Question. Well, sir, recently the National Government paid about a half a million dollars in order to get scenic rights for the Merrywood Estate along the Potomac River. Do you foresee this possibly being a problem for the National Government wherein the local governments may be able to collect money just by threatening the building of high rise apartments in scenic areas, while still retaining control of the land?

Mr. WEISL. I think you're quite right. This is very dangerous and there is only one thing to do about it, and that is to go about acquiring these interests in land at the earliest possible moment before that happens. The Federal Government traditionally has never done anything like Merrywood until the last minute when the bulldozers are there and you pay top value. I've just sent in a report of a task force on how to acquire this kind of land at the earliest opportunity without paying these top prices.

Question. Is anything being done about billboards on highways, and things like that that Lady Bird wanted?

Mr. WEISL. Yes. A bill was passed under the President's leadership last year called the Highway Beautification Act, and this requires States to pass antibillboard laws within a few years or lose a large percentage of their Federal highway funds.

Question. Mr. Weisl, do you think that with the talk of assigning priorities to all the bills in Congress this year because of the importance of the war in Vietnam, and other things, that such things as conservation programs and billboard programs might fall by the wayside?

Mr. WEISL. I really don't. I think that President Johnson is going to be known for a lot of good qualities and one of them is going to be one of the greatest conservationists this country has ever had, perhaps the greatest since Theodore Roosevelt. And I don't believe that this part of his program is going to be sidetracked. Besides, Mrs. Johnson is very much for it, and I think that might have some influence.

Question. Sir, I'd like to change the subject a little. I'd like to know, they're planning to make Assateague Island a national park. I was wondering, wouldn't this deprive the farmers of Chincoteague from their income that they get from pony penning day every year?

Mr. WEISL. I understand, but I really don't know that that will be allowed to continue. You can't be sure of that. It is possible that it will. This is one of the prices you have to pay for preserving the country, and it's a high price, I agree.

MODERATOR. You were talking about the interests of Congress a moment ago. Actually the first bill passed in this session was a conservation bill in effect, just a few days ago—the wild rivers.

Mr. WEISL. Yes. Has it been passed? I think it is being debated today.

MODERATOR. It's certainly the first action anyway in this Congress.

Mr. WEISL. Yes.

Question. Mr. Weisl, what are the other areas in the United States that right now are in for the same treatment as Assateague and Chincoteague? Could you tell us something about that?

Mr. WEISL. Well there are only at the moment two very large projects of that sort—Fire Island in New York and Point Reyes, North of San Francisco—principal seashore developments right now that are being acquired. There may be others. I just may not be aware of them.

Question. What about the dunes in Oregon—I mean, there is such a public and private interest conflict there? Are you doing anything about that? What is happening?

Mr. WEISL. That I believe is under consideration by the Interior Department and I don't know what is happening. I can't tell you. I'm sorry.

Question. Well, this is again changing the subject. I believe your department has control over Indian reservations and things like this.

Mr. WEISL. We have no control over anything. We act as lawyers for the people that do, however.

Question. Yes. Well, what opportunities are there for Indians now? Are there any barriers to opportunities in the United States? What are they?

Mr. WEISL. Well, of course, there is the usual barrier of any nonwhite in America, that of race prejudice. There is a second barrier of the quality of education they've had. But as far as legal barriers, there are none at all. Any Indian living on a reservation is free to leave it and take up employment anywhere he likes.

Question. Sir, what is being done to improve the quality of education of the Indians?

Mr. WEISL. Well, there is a large effort being undertaken by the Interior Department to upgrade their education. In a lot of areas where there are reservations, it's curious, but the quality of education on the reservation, being Federal, is better than what you get in the poor Southern States—that is, the non-Indian citizen. But there is a massive effort going, inadequate as it has always been and probably will continue to be, because not enough people in the Congress are excited about providing for the Indians.

Question. I'd like to ask you, is the land of the Indian reservation—is this being taken away or are the Indians going to continue to stay on the reservations if they please?

Mr. WEISL. Well, there is a long range program in the Interior Department to integrate the Indians with the rest of American citizens if they want. And if this would occur,

I suppose the Indians would then be free to sell their reservations, but as far as ownership is concerned, they are, in effect, owned by the Indian tribes, and theirs to keep for disposal as they wish.

Question. Is there any direct tie-in with the land activities of Interior, or do you simply represent Interior in Government cases—any direct tie-in with your Department and the Interior Department?

Mr. WEISL. We don't manage land; no. We help them in the legal work of disposing of it and what have you. We work very closely on making decisions, I think.

Question. Do you find that most Indians today are merging into American society more?

Mr. WEISL. No, I don't at all. There is a real tendency to remain on the reservations for various reasons. It would depend very much on the tribe in order to give you those reasons.

Question. What are most of those reasons, in general? I mean are there any that apply to most Indian tribes, or are they different for each tribe?

Mr. WEISL. I would say they are different for each tribe. For example, the Apaches in Arizona are staying on the reservation because they have discovered a way to make it into a very fine economic entity. They're developing lakes and rivers on it so that they can use it for recreation. They've put on motels and are going to make a lot of money out of the land there—something that never happened before, so their incentive to stay is great. On some of the other reservations there isn't that much incentive, but there is a tremendous psychological pull to remain in the tribe.

Question. Sometimes when it seems that there is a profit available on the reservation, is there any effort to take it away, as has sometimes been done with oil discoveries?

Mr. WEISL. Not any more. Up until 50 years ago, certainly that was done regularly and very unfairly. Now, no. For example, the Navaho Indians, which were among the poorest in the country 20 years ago, are among the richest because of oil discoveries on the reservation.

Question. Is there any attempt to repay those tribes which lost out because of unfair——

Mr. WEISL. Yes, yes there is, and that's one of the things we do. I have been sounding like a great conservationist and liberal. We do defend these claims when the Indians bring them, because their lawyers, of course, like all lawyers, tend to overclaim. But, yes, Congress in 1946 passed the Indians Claims Act which allows them to go over these past wrongs. They can go back to the date of the formation of the Union or quite recently.

Question. To move on to another area, Mr. Weisl, do you see in our major cities any interference between urban renewal projects and the concept of eminent domain?

Mr. WEISL. No, I don't think there has been any problems. There's been a lot of public annoyance with eminent domain because no man likes to have his land taken away by the Government, but beyond that we've had no conflict.

Question. Well, there's been quite a problem between persons who must be displaced, while their land is being rebuilt, and there has been quite a bit of public agitation over this. Does this fall under your jurisdiction?

Mr. WEISL. It hasn't so far. There is legislation in this session of the Congress to help pay moving expenses and help pay relocation expenses, help get people set up in new businesses when they are forced to move, something I would support very strongly. Yes, there is.

Question. Mr. Weisl, you mentioned legislation pending; exactly what legislation?

Mr. WEISL. Well, there is a bill which, among other things, relates to the Federal Government's land acquisition policies, in general, and among other things, provides for increased relocation payments, moving expenses, and what have you for people displaced by urban renewal. That's in general what it does. Many of these things are already done. I think this increases the payments and what have you. It makes it simpler to get them. This urban renewal, I might say, is done by a city or a State with Federal money, so that the Federal Government can't control the manner it does—in which these people are taken care of.

Question. Do you anticipate any additional activities because of the formation of the new Cabinet post and more activity perhaps in our urban area than there has been?

Mr. WEISL. Yes. There's no question that that is one of the No. 1 tasks today.

Question. Can our cities really be cleaned up?

Mr. WEISL. Once again I think this country can do anything that it really wants to and is willing to spend the time and money on; yes, they can be.

Question. Sir, I'd like to know if there is any consideration given to taking land from these urban renewal projects and making sure that they are dedicated for either schools or recreation facilities or parks?

Mr. WEISL. Yes. I think that's going to be one of the requirements for Federal assistance in these areas is that recreation and education uses are considered. I see you shake your head, but I know that this is implicit in the planning that the urban renewal administrators are working on. Yes, because in the past they haven't considered these things.

MODERATOR. If I might, I'd like to say something here, and I'd like to take a minute to do it. So if you'll hold your questions and excuse us for just a second, Mr. Weisl, we'll continue our questions in just a moment.

* * * * *

MODERATOR. All right now. Let's continue our questioning.

Question. Mr. Weisl, is it very often the case that there is conflict between conservation programs and other land use programs, such as in the case of the Florida Everglades where——

Mr. WEISL. Yes, there is, and the tendency has been for the agencies building the project to work as if it were a loan, you know. The Army Engineers think about flood control. There is no overall planning, and look to the consequences as a whole.

Question. Is there any prospect that there will be any agency which will coordinate all this so that there isn't this conflict?

Mr. WEISL. Well, Harold Ickes started to try to do that in about 1933, and there isn't one yet. There is a bill in Congress this year which no one expects to get very far, which would place all of this kind of planning in one agency. I think it would be called the Department of Natural Resources. It seems to me to be a very splendid idea, one that has very limited chance of success.

Question. Sir, I'd like to ask you if you could explain just briefly what this wilderness bill in Congress is designed to do?

Mr. WEISL. Well, that's to acquire and preserve areas in the country that are still in their virgin state, essentially is what it does. I think it is an important bill. I think you've touched on something that I feel very strongly about. We have a lot of wilderness in the country that's likely to stay as it is. We've got a lot of cities that don't have anything at all in terms of adequate recreation and open space facilities around them, and I wish we'd spend more of our time concentrating on that than on the wide open spaces in the West.

Question. Mr. Weisl, there's been talk on and off over I think about the past 20 years of the possibility of ceding some of the Federal lands, like the national forests back to the States. Has this received recently any serious consideration? Is this likely ever to happen?

Mr. WEISL. Well, there is right now a very little known body that has been set up by the Congress called the Public Land Law Revision Commission. It is just beginning to get off the ground and start deliberating. And questions such as these are very likely to come up before the Commission. I think this is a Commission that could do a very useful job and it's one that we ought to keep a good eye on because who are going to be the people that really influence that Commission is going to be the lumber companies, or is it going to be the public interests? Not that they necessarily conflict. In fact, usually they don't.

Question. Going on with what John said, then if the wilderness bill passes and the Federal Government begins acquiring lands for park uses, you know, to preserve them, will these be eventually going to the States?

Mr. WEISL. There certainly is no plan that they will, although a lot of the Federal legislation provides money for the States to do the job, you know, where the States in some instances would acquire it themselves, but they would have to hold it in its natural state.

Question. Mr. Weisl, do you think that the States would really do a good job of administering public lands in this area, because a recent editorial in New Republic mentioned that the States contribute about 2 cents to every Federal dollar in the area of conservation and really are hesitant to contribute much more?

Mr. WEISL. I agree. Of course, the answer is some States would and some States would not. You've got to remember, this is something we all forget about the public lands, that the States get most of the income from them anyway, as you know. I think somethink like 37½ percent goes directly to the State treasuries; that is, the moneys collected from Federal oil and gas leases and mining and grazing. Another almost 50 percent or perhaps a little bit more goes to the reclamation fund, which is largely spent in the same State where the public lands are. And only 10 percent of all the moneys—revenues from most of the public lands goes into the Federal Treasury. How this happened is lost in history. I think it is rather surprising and a bit shocking when you first hear it.

Question. We have just been through a, what seems to be kind of annual flooding in California. What can be done about this to prevent this constant flooding in one particular area?

Mr. WEISL. Well, nobody ever believed out in California they'd have these kind of rains, of course. Now that they know, they've simply got to undertake a dam building and flood control project. It is a disgrace that these floods happened, because here is a State with tremendous water shortages, and then every year half the annual rainfall washes out to sea wasted and unused. So that it is just going to cost money.

MODERATOR. Panel, I'm afraid our time is up. And I want to thank Mr. Weisl for being our guest. It's been most interesting.

Mr. WEISL. It was a great pleasure to be here.

MODERATOR. If we may, we'll extend an indefinite invitation for you to return.

Mr. WEISL. I'll be delighted to come back.

MODERATOR. Thank you very much, sir. And thank you, panel, for your interesting questions. And I hope you'll come back too. And thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for being with us. I hope you'll join us next week and each week at this same time for Theodore Granik's "Youth Wants To Know."

Mr. Speaker, station, WABC–TV and Mr. Theodore Granik, producer of the program "Youth Wants To Know," have

rendered and are continuing to render a unique public service by bringing to the attention of our citizens the position which our youth take on the vital issues of the day. Of particular interest to the citizens of the Fifth Congressional District of New York, which I am privileged to represent, was this program dealing with the subject of conservation and preservation of our natural resources and questions and answers dealing with water and air pollution.

My constituents are now engaged in debating H.R. 11236—Tenzer bill—to establish a Long Island National Wetlands Recreation Area on the south shore of Nassau County.

Another very important subject of discussion in New York State is the preservation of the Hudson River Highlands. I have joined my colleague, the gentleman from New York, RICHARD OTTINGER, of the 25th District, on H.R. 4813.

A chance to walk, to row a boat, to fish, to hunt, to swim, to picnic, or to merely observe the natural world—all these must be provided for and can be even within close range of the asphalt jungles we know so well. What I am referring to now are human resources. These resources must be protected. Otherwise, what heritage will we leave to our children other than a filled-in bay, a polluted stream, or bone fragments in a museum? Men can do better—men must do better—so let us begin now.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 27, 1966, I was snowbound in southern Virginia while en route to Washington from my district. I was therefore unable to answer rollcalls on that date; and, for the same reason, unable to vote on the resolution appropriating funds for the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Let the RECORD show that, had I been here, I would have voted in support of the resolution. Further it was my intention to address the House for the purpose of complimenting the chairman and the individual members of the committee for the great work of the committee. I think the committee should have the full support of this body. I know the great majority of Americans endorse the committee and its activities.

Mr. Speaker, I cast my vote in favor of House Resolution 665.

CUBA TO RECEIVE UNITED STATES FUNDS THROUGH AN AGENCY OF THE U.N.

Mr. ICHORD. 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. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, the January 24 issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat carried a headline and lead story under the byline of Mr. Edward O'Brien, the Globe's Washington bureau chief. As the story involves our national security and our national integrity, I believe it worthy of the attention of all Members of Congress. The headline, itself, borders on the macabre: "Cuba To Receive U.S. Funds Through Agency of U.N." I include the above-named article as a permanent part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following the conclusion of these remarks.

The substance of the story is outlined as follows:

First. A United Nations agency is planning to give Cuba $3,100,000.

Second. More than half—$2 million—will go to the technological faculty of the University of Havana.

Third. Our share is to be $1,200,000.

Fourth. Ambassador James Roosevelt has indicated that the United States will register an objection on principle, but will not withhold its share nor will we demand rejection of the proposal.

Fifth. The technological branch of the university in question is headed by Russian and Cuban military personnel.

Sixth. Students attending the branch must be either Communist Party members or members of the Cuban "militia."

Seventh. Students will be trained to be proficient in the following areas: computers, electronics, radar, and military communications.

Eighth. Contributions to the fund supplying this aid are strictly voluntary. The United States is under no legal commitment to make the offering.

Ninth. A general program of aid to Cuba amounting to as much as $25 million has been discussed in the U.N.

Tenth. The same project was dumped in 1963 after congressional and State Department opposition.

Eleventh. Less than a month ago, representatives of 82 Communist Parties in three continents met in Havana to organize a more unified effort for the subversion of the Western Hemisphere, Asia, and Africa.

Twelfth. Two primary targets named by that meeting, Brazil and Paraguay, have already objected to the aid program.

Mr. Speaker, if this is carried out, we will be sending American tax dollars to persons dedicated to the overthrow of of this Government and the elimination of all free societies throughout the world.

I sincerely hope that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs will initiate an immediate investigation of the circumstances surrounding the entire matter.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include this headline story with my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CUBA TO RECEIVE U.S. FUNDS THROUGH AGENCY OF U.N.—AMERICAN AID TO TOTAL $1.2 MILLION—ROOSEVELT PUTS TENTATIVE OK ON PROJECT

(By Edward W. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON.—A United Nations agency which receives 40 percent of its money from the U.S. Treasury is planning to give $3,100,000 to Cuba, with more than half of the aid funds allocated to strengthen the University of Havana's technological faculty.

The United States, through Ambassador James Roosevelt, has informed the U.N. agency it will not demand rejection of the project, nor will the United States withhold its $1,240,000 share of the cost.

TRAINS ENGINEERS

The university's technological branch trains engineers and others and is headed by Russian and Cuban military personnel. Only Communist Party and militia members are permitted to attend.

"Cuban technology is specifically oriented toward training in computers, electronics, and other areas of endeavor which Fidel Castro has stated are related to the military potential of Cuba and particularly to radar and military communications," according to the Citzens Committee for a Free Cuba, Inc., an anti-Castro organization of prominent Americans.

In 1963, the U.N. special fund headed by Paul G. Hoffman, proposed an aid project for Castro's Cuba but dropped it after an angry outcry in Congress and State Department opposition.

Last Tuesday, Ambassador Roosevelt, who represents the United States on the U.N. development program governing council that passes on special fund projects, said this Government's opposition in 1963 was a gimmick and didn't mean a thing in the whole concept of the fund.

PUBLIC RECORD

Mr. Roosevelt said he will "place on the public record the Government's objection in principle" to the new project but will do nothing else to block the project or cut off the customary 40-percent contribution by Washington.

U.S. payments to the U.N. special fund are voluntary. The fund will spend over $150 million this year.

Mr. Roosevelt said the United States nominal opposition to the Cuban project is not based on the Castro regime's communism but on the theory that Cuba's shortage of technical experts was caused by the Castro regime itself, which has caused thousands of Cubans to flee.

The new aid project was proposed by Mr. Hoffman, who maintained that U.S. support "must be kept free of ideological and political considerations."

Of the $3,100,000 total $2 million will go to the university and $1,100,000 for an agricultural research station near Havana.

ULTIMATE TOTAL

An ultimate total of $25 million in U.N. aid to Cuba is being discussed. Whether it materializes will probably depend largely on congressional and public reaction to the first portion.

Brazil and Paraguay strongly objected to helping Castro through the U.N. Both countries are among the principal targets of Communist subversion directed from Cuba.

A Communist tricontinental congress of subversion which brought together top-ranking Reds from many countries, ended in Havana less than 2 weeks ago. At the congress, Cuba was formally designated as a headquarters of Communist subversion in Latin America, Asia and Africa. The citizens committee said it is alerting Senate and House Members to the U.N. project in the

hope of bringing about cancellation of U.S. support.

"Should the U.N. proposal be approved, backed by U.S. support and money, we will have succeeded in underwriting the subversion of the Western Hemisphere," the committee has told its members.

ECONOMIC MIRACLE

Mr. STALBAUM. 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. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, some have said it would be a miracle if the United States could afford both guns and butter.

The truth is that the miracle is a reality. The country is strong enough to carry on its overseas commitments and its domestic programs, as outlined by the President.

Columnist Roscoe Drummond, in a column in the Washington Post, stated that the President has a miracle going for him. "The miracle," wrote Mr. Drummond, "is the tremendous and sustained dynamism of the U.S. economy."

Mr. Drummond's article has some very good thoughts and I therefore offer it for the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN MIRACLE—GUNS-AND-BUTTER ECONOMY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

It will be a miracle if the United States can meet the mounting costs of the Vietnam war and the Great Society without large deficit spending.

But the President has a miracle going for him. More than anything else, it can make it possible for the American people to have both guns and butter without economic disaster.

The miracle is the tremendous and sustained dynamism of the U.S. economy.

Time was when the Nation's haunting concern was how to avert depression.

Today's problem is how to manage prosperity for the benefit of everyone.

In the very recent past many experts thought high unemployment was insoluble, was built into the economy.

Today the question is whether industry can find the labor it requires to man the production lines.

Not long ago the admiring eyes of the whole world were on the European economic miracle. The most industrialized countries in Europe, plus Japan and Russia, were sweeping past the United States in annual economic growth.

Today the United States leads every country in growth rate—5 percent last year, probably higher this year.

What we are now witnessing is the American economic miracle and, since the Nation is now into the sixth year without recession, it is time to recognize that this miracle is not accidental.

At a time when communism is still claiming it is the wave of the future—though neither in Red China nor in the Soviet Union can Communist agriculture feed its own people—maybe competitive private enterprise has something to be said for it.

We must be doing something right.

When President Eisenhower submitted a 1958–59 budget of $72 billion, Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey screamed at the White House that such a spending binge would "bring on a recession that would curl your hair." It didn't.

The $112.8 billion budget Mr. Johnson presented to Congress this week is a big budget but, because of the vigor and growth of the economy, it does not dangerously strain the resources of the Nation.

Eisenhower's $72 billion was often cited as the biggest peacetime budget ever. But it wasn't. Not that it wasn't the biggest to that moment, but it wasn't a peacetime budget. It was a peace-plus-cold-war budget.

And Mr. Johnson's $112.8 billion is not a peacetime budget. It is a peace-plus-cold-war-plus-hot-war budget and the President put his finger on its economic soundness when he pointed out in his economic message that, while our defense needs are great, our economic growth is far greater.

There is no doubt that there are large uncertainties in the budget. The uncertainties are the war-cost estimates and the revenue estimates. They could both be wrong. They usually are.

If they prove to be, the President will have to propose higher taxes and cutting back some homefront spending to hold inflation in check.

NEED FOR BAIL REFORM

Mr. SCHWEIKER. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today a bill which will establish for the first time a formal statutory removal procedure to be followed by bail bondsmen and supervised by U.S. judicial officers in the State to which an alleged bail jumper has moved. It is a simplified form of the current extradition process and requires that bondsmen procure an arrest warrant from a U.S. commissioner or U.S. judge and then bring the bailee before that official for a hearing. The Federal officer would issue a removal warrant to the bondsman only after he had satisfied himself that the accused was the person sought, that he had been admitted to bail in another State and had violated the provisions of that bail, and that the bondsman is a valid representative of the bonding company. If the removal warrant was issued, the accused would have to be returned promptly to the State from which he had fled. Bondsmen who fail to comply with these provisions of my bill would be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000, or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

The dangers of the present system have been made clear by the actions of bondsmen in a recent episode involving one of my constituents. Presently, convicted criminals that escape have more rights than alleged bail jumpers who have not been convicted of any crime. At present, the law does not prescribe procedures in this field. In fact, bondsmen today base their actions on a Supreme Court decision handed down in 1872. I believe that the due process of the law can only be assured by enactment of this bill. It will merely require bondsmen to follow the same procedures now used by policemen under similar circumstances. Presently, bondsmen enjoy special powers not given even to the police. I feel that is is imperative that the operations of bail bondsmen engaged in recovering fugitives in another State must be subject to the careful supervision of the courts to protect the basic rights of all concerned.

I am pleased to be joined in this effort by my colleague, Senator TYDINGS, who is introducing this bill today in the Senate.

BENEFITS FOR VETERANS OF CURRENT MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks?

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, much concern has been expressed in recent months over the benefits that were available to veterans of current military service. These men are, of course, entitled to many of the benefits that our grateful Nation has bestowed upon its war veterans. Two notable exceptions, however, are educational benefits and hospitalization for the treatment of non-service connected disabilities.

I have introduced a bill to authorize educational benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and I anticipate that my colleagues in the House of Representatives will soon have an opportunity to vote on a bill on this subject.

I am today introducing a bill making veterans with service after January 31, 1955, also eligible for hospitalization for non-service-connected disabilities on the same basis as veterans of a period of war. We have all seen instances, Mr. Speaker, of men who were separated for disabilities which the Veterans' Administration holds are not service connected. These men, in many instances, are unable to establish the fact that their disabilities originated in service. When they require treatment for such conditions, the existing law prohibits it.

It is my understanding that the Veterans' Administration will accept a veteran applicant for treatment in one of its hospitals until such time as service connection is either established or ruled out. The bill I am introducing today will provide statutory entitlement to this hospitalization with the same limitations regarding the veteran's ability to pay and the availability of a bed as is contained in existing law for war veterans. I urge my colleagues to join in support of this measure.

VIETNAM

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the President has stated some of the compelling

reasons that the United States is again using air power against the Vietcong and their North Vietnamese supporters.

He could have told in more detail how much the bombing pause has allowed the Vietcong to increase their supplies and strengthen their resources. There is no question but that the Vietcong have benefited from a buildup in supplies during the bombing pause. How much this may lengthen the war and how much it will cost in lives no one can say.

This was a decision of the President, and only time will tell whether the pause contributed to finding a peaceful solution to the Vietnamese problem.

What has been most disturbing is the public appeals of several prominent Senators to continue the bombing pause. I do not question the right of these representatives to voice their dissent to the policies of the President, even though they are of his party, but to publicly ask for an extension of the pause after he had already told congressional leaders of the compelling arguments for resumption of the bombing could serve little purpose here and was misinterpreted abroad.

Every time a prominent American suggests a softening of our policy in Vietnam unfortunate consequences follow in Asia. Our friends, the South Vietnamese, are constantly concerned that the United States will pull out of Vietnam and leave them to the retaliation of the Vietcong.

The North Vietnamese and the Chinese take each such statement as further proof that our strength is ebbing and our determination is weak.

The most important factor in bringing the Communists to negotiations is to convince them that we are absolutely determined to see the problem through to a reasonable solution. If they think we are about to withdraw or give up, such misconceptions will only prolong the fighting, causing more American servicemen to be killed, and hamper efforts to find a peaceful solution.

Consequently for several Senators to publicly pressure the President on this subject, even after the decision to resume had been made, was a move unwise in conception and harmful in execution.

If further debate is to be had on this subject, let us try to keep it within the realm of matters which can still be changed, and let us try to phrase our questions in such a way as to leave no doubt of our firm resolution.

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTING

Mr. MATHIAS. 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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to some statistics which I placed in the RECORD on Thursday last, January 27, 1966, which appear on page 1384 of the RECORD. These figures are startling when the proximity of the 1966 congressional primary and general elections is considered.

In my remarks I have pointed out that more than 25 percent of the Members of this House will be affected if a congressional districting bill, already passed here and amended and now pending in the other body, is enacted into law to bring congressional districts to within 10 percent of each other in population. One-fourth of the districts represented in this House would have to be altered to conform to that legislation, and although its effective date may be postponed, its provisions could be influential with legislatures now discussing congressional redistricting.

Mr. Speaker, in my compilation of statistics on that subject I have used the figures which existed in North Carolina prior to the very recent redistricting in that State.

I would like further permission, Mr. Speaker, to note that the figures used in my previous remarks must be adjusted as necessary to reflect the changes in North Carolina districts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. HAYS. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have supported the foreign aid program for 17 years, sometimes somewhat reluctantly, but at the same time I have felt free to criticize the foreign aid administration when I thought they were wrong. They do not like criticism, and consequently I was not one of those who got an advance notice of what they are proposing in a new foreign aid program, nor was I one of those invited down for a briefing yesterday. But if what I hear around the floor is correct, it has taken them 6 or 7 years to approach what I have been suggesting that they do for a long time, and that is quit trying to industrialize emerging nations, nations which have no basis for industrialization, no technical know-how, and no skilled personnel.

We should try to concentrate upon the basic things; namely, teaching them how to feed themselves and how to produce enough food so that they will not be on a starvation diet, and how to start with very basic and elementary education. If the AID agency is sincere in trying to carry forward a program like this, I might find it possible to support foreign aid for the 18th time. But having watched them in action, I will be very careful to scrutinize their requests and ask questions, even if it is at the risk of being left out of the briefings. I think I will be able to survive and get the information anyway.

THE FOREIGN GIVEAWAY

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wondered where one of the previous speakers got so much information about the President's foreign aid program in view of the fact that the White House message has not been read. The gentleman from Ohio, my friend Mr. HAYS, throws some light on the subject. Apparently it was at a closed-door meeting at the White House yesterday.

I would hope that the President, if he is going to ask for a 5-year foreign giveaway program, would let a few more of us in on the takeoff as well as the landings.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I was not concerned about not being invited to the briefing. I just hope that they do not take me off the list when they have food down there. That is what I like to know about.

Mr. GROSS. I was not personally concerned about it either, but I do think that perhaps others ought to be in on the takeoffs as they are staged.

THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 374)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend a foreign aid program to help those nations who are determined to help themselves.

I recommend a program to help give the people of the less developed world the food, the health, the skills and education—and the strength—lead their nations to self-sufficient lives of plenty and freedom.

I propose to carry forward the best of what we are now doing in the less developed world, and cut out the worst. I also propose to make the basic changes the times demand.

My recommendations are grounded in the deep conviction that we must use foreign assistance to attack the root causes of poverty. We must concentrate on countries not hostile to us that give

solid evidence that they are determined to help themselves.

This is the lesson of the past. It is the hope for the future. It is the guiding principle for a nation ready and willing to cooperate with the industrious, but unwilling to subsidize those who do not assume responsibility for their own fate.

During the past year I have given our foreign assistance program the most sober and searching review. I have questioned the merit of each program. Special groups have concentrated on the particular areas of food, education, and health. A Cabinet committee has examined the details of our general economic and military assistance.

Thus, the steps I recommend today have been developed in the light of advice from senior officials in the executive branch, congressional leaders, and experienced advisers from outside Government. They also have been developed with full recognition of our balance-of-payments situation.

They emerge from a rigorous examination of our past experience.

They are informed by compassion and shaped by the history of two decades.

They are the proof of our devotion to the works of peace.

They reflect our vision of a world free from fear and ripe with opportunity.

They will shape the legacy we leave our children.

I

The quest for peace is as old as mankind.

For countless centuries man struggled to secure first his home, then his village, then his city. It is the unique heritage of our century that men must strive for a secure world.

Peace, plenty, freedom—our fathers aspired to these as we do now. But the fateful truth of our age is that all our personal and national hopes hang in a balance affected by events and attitudes half a world away.

We have paid a fearful price to learn the folly of isolation. We have learned that the human misery which infects whole nations with a thirst for violent change does not give way to mere slogans. We have learned that the works of peace require courage and foresight. The need knows neither national boundary nor narrow ideology.

We have demonstrated this understanding in many ways over the past two decades. Our military strength has protected many countries threatened by invasion from without or subversion from within. Our economic assistance programs have rebuilt Europe. We have helped untold millions to gain confidence in peaceful progress, where there has been neither peace nor progress for centuries.

We will never know how many crises have been averted, how much violence avoided, or how many minds have been won to the cause of freedom in these years. But I believe we have many such achievements to our credit.

Yet today the citizens of many developing nations walk in the shadow of misery: half the adults have never been to school; over half the people are hungry or malnourished; food production per person is falling; at present rates of growth, population will double before the year 2000.

These are the dominant facts of our age. They challenge our own security. They threaten the future of the world.

Our response must be bold and daring. It must go to the root causes of misery and unrest. It must build a firm foundation for progress, security, and peace.

II

Although we recognize the shortsightedness of isolation, we do not embrace the equally futile prospect of total and endless dependence. The United States can never do more than supplement the efforts of the developing countries themselves. They must supply most of the capital, the know-how—and the will to progress. If they do we can and will help. If they do not, nothing we can supply will substitute. Nothing can replace resources wasted in political or military adventures.

For the essence of economic development is work—hard, unremitting, often thankless work. Most of it must be done by the people whose futures and whose children's futures are directly at stake.

Only these people and their leaders can invest every possible resource in improving farming techniques, in school and hospital construction and in critical industry; make the land reforms, tax changes, and other basic adjustments necessary to transform their societies; face the population problem squarely and realistically; create the climate which will attract foreign investment, and keep local money at home.

These are just a few of the steps on the road to modernization. They are far from easy. We would do well to remember how difficult many of them were for us. But they are absolutely necessary. Without them, outside help is wasted. Neither we nor they can afford waste, and we will not continue any partnership in which only we recognize that fact.

As I said last October, "Action, not promises, will be the standard of assistance." It must be clear that the principle of our assistance is cooperation. Those who do not fulfill their commitments to help themselves cannot expect help from us.

III

In this spirit of cooperation, I propose that the United States offer to join in new attacks upon the root causes of world poverty.

The incessant cycle of hunger, ignorance, and disease is the common blight of the developing world. This vicious pattern can be broken. It must be broken if democracy is to survive.

The problem of hunger is a continuing crisis. In many parts of the world we witness both the ravages of famine born of natural disaster and the failure of food production to keep pace with rising needs.

This is a catastrophe for all of us. It must be dealt with by all who can help. In many other countries food output is also falling behind population growth. We cannot meet the world food needs of the future, however willing we are to share our abundance. Nor would it serve the common interest if we could.

The solution is clear: an all-out effort to enable the developing countries to supply their own food needs, through their own production or through improved capacity to buy in the world market.

I will shortly send to the Congress a special message which will recommend new legislation to redirect and strengthen our food aid programs to induce greater agricultural self-help abroad; make food aid a more integrated element of general programs of economic cooperation; move as quickly as our mutual interest permit toward harder financial terms, thereby adding to our commercial markets and a favorable balance-of-payments result.

In addition, I propose that the Agency for International Development increase its efforts in the field of agriculture by more than one-third, to a total of nearly $500 million. One-third of this total will finance imports of fertilizer from the United States. The remainder will finance transfer of American farming techniques, the most advanced in the world; improvement of roads, marketing and irrigation facilities; establishment of extension services, cooperatives and credit facilities; purchases of American farm equipment and pesticides; research on soil and seed improvements.

These programs will also have long-range benefits for our own farmers. Higher incomes abroad mean greater exports for our highly efficient food producers.

To combat ignorance, I am proposing a major new effort in international education. I propose a 50-percent increase in AID education activities to a total of more than $200 million. Shortly I will transmit to the Congress a special message proposing an International Education Act which will commit the United States to a campaign to spread the benefits of education to every corner of the earth. Nothing is more critical to the future of liberty and the fate of mankind.

To fight disease, I will shortly propose an International Health Act which will provide for extensive new programs at home and abroad.

We now have the capacity to eliminate smallpox from the list of man's natural enemies; to eradicate malaria in the Western Hemisphere and in large areas of Africa and Asia; and to relieve much of the suffering now caused by measles, cholera, rabies, and other epidemic diseases.

I will propose a two-thirds increase in fiscal year 1967 in AID support of health programs, to a total of more than $150 million. In addition to financing disease eradication, we will step up our program to combat malnutrition. We will expand help to community water supply projects. We will finance the training of more doctors and nurses needed for new health centers and mobile health units.

I also propose to provide nearly $150 million in food-for-work programs, and more than $100 million in contributions to international organizations to further support the war on hunger, ignorance, and disease.

IV

We stand ready to help developing countries deal with the population problem.

The United States cannot and should not force any country to adopt any particular approach to this problem. It is first a matter of individual and national conscience, in which we will not interfere.

But population growth now consumes about two-thirds of economic growth in the less-developed world. As death rates are steadily driven down, the individual miracle of birth becomes a collective tragedy of want.

In all cases, our help will be given only upon request, and only to finance advisers, training, transportation, educational equipment, and local currency needs.

Population policy remains a question for each family and each nation to decide. But we must be prepared to help when decisions are made.

V

In many areas, the keys to economic and social development lie largely in the settling of old quarrels and the building of regional solidarity. Regional cooperation is often the best means of economic progress as well as the best guarantor of political independence.

I propose that we continue and enlarge our support of the institutions and organizations which create and preserve this unity.

Last April I pledged full U.S. support for regional programs to accelerate peaceful development in southeast Asia. We have already begun to implement this pledge by support to the Nam Ngum Dam in the Mekong Basin and to other projects.

In my legislative proposals, I am requesting new and specific authority to carry forward this support for regional progress.

We must make it clear to friend and foe alike that we are as determined to support the peaceful growth of southeast Asia as we are to resist those who would conquer and subjugate it.

These efforts in Asia will be further enhanced by the formation of the Asian Development Bank, which was the subject of my message to the Congress of January 18. I am confident that this Bank will be a major unifying force in the region, and a source of vital development capital invaluable to our mutual interests.

In Africa, we look forward to working closely with the new African Development Bank as its programs materialize.

We also look forward to progress toward an east African economic community and other subregional common markets on that massive continent. As these institutions and arrangements develop, the United States intends to make greater use of them as channels for our assistance. We will move in the direction of more regional administration of our bilateral programs.

We have recently extended our ongoing commitment to the Alliance for Progress, which includes strong support for the successful economic integration of Central America. The movement toward greater cooperation among all Latin American economies will gain momentum in the years ahead. It has our strong support.

The United States will support the proposal of the Inter-American Committee of the Alliance for Progress and the Inter-American Development Bank to establish a new fund for feasibility studies of multinational projects. These projects can be of enormous value to countries which share a river valley or another natural resource. They are sound combinations of good economics and good politics.

VI

I propose that the United States—in ways consistent with its balance-of-payments policy—increase its contributions to multilateral lending institutions, particularly the International Development Association. These increases will be conditional upon appropriate rises in contributions from other members. We are prepared immediately to support negotiations leading to agreements of this nature for submission to the Congress. We urge other advanced nations to join us in supporting this work.

The United States is a charter member and the largest single contributor to such institutions as the World Bank, the International Development Association, and the Inter-American Development Bank. This record reflects our confidence in the multilateral method of development finance and in the soundness of these institutions themselves. They are expert financiers, and healthy influences on the volume and terms of aid from other donors.

I propose that we increase our contributions to the United Nations development program, again subject to proportionate increases in other contributions. This program merges United Nations technical assistance and preinvestment activities. It promises to be among the world's most valuable development instruments.

VII

We will expand our efforts to encourage private initiative and enterprise in developing countries. We have received very useful advice and guidance from the report of the distinguished Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid. Many of the recommendations of that report are now being put into effect.

We will review frankly and constructively with cooperating countries the obstacles to domestic and foreign private investment. We will continue to support elimination of inefficient controls; formation of cooperatives; training of labor and business leaders; credit facilities and advisory services for small and medium-sized farms and businesses.

The U.S. Government can do only a small part of the job of helping and encouraging businessmen abroad. We must rely more and more on the great reservoirs of knowledge and experience in our business and professional communities. These groups have already provided invaluable service and advice. We in Government must find ways to make even greater use of these priceless assets.

I propose to: continue our support for the International Executive Service Corps; increase the AID authority to guarantee U.S. private investments in developing countries.

VIII

To signify the depth of our commitment to help those who help themselves, I am requesting 5-year authorizations for our military and economic aid programs.

For development loans and loans under the Alliance for Progress, this is merely a reaffirmation of the principle adopted by the Congress in 1961 and 1962. It will not impair the ability or the duty of the Congress to review these programs. Indeed, it will free the Congress from the burden of an annual renewal of basic legislation, and provide greater opportunity for concentration on policy and program issues.

Annual congressional consideration of both economic and military programs will be maintained through full annual presentations before the substantive committees, if they so desire, as well as through the annual appropriation process.

The military and economic authorization requests are contained in two separate bills. I believe this is a forward step in clarifying the goals and functions of these programs in the minds of the public and the Congress.

IX

I am requesting a total appropriation of $2.469 million in fiscal year 1967 to finance programs of economic cooperation. As in the last 2 years, I am requesting the absolute minimum to meet presently foreseeable needs, with the understanding that I will not hesitate to request a supplemental appropriation if a clear need develops.

Aid to Vietnam: The largest single portion of my request—$550 million in supporting assistance—is to support our effort in Vietnam. Our help to the Government of Vietnam in carrying forward programs of village economic and social improvement is of crucial significance in maintaining public morale in the face of the horror of war. With the help of AID advisers, who often serve at great personal risk, the Vietnamese Government is patiently building the foundations of progress in the rural areas.

Other supporting assistance: The remainder of my request—$197 million—is for aid to countries whose security is directly threatened. This is concentrated in programs for Laos, Korea, and Thailand. Each country is a key link in our defense system. Each lives in the shadow of great and hostile powers. Each is well worth the investment.

Alliance for Progress: I am requesting a total of $543 million in fiscal year 1967 appropriations for the countries cooperating in the Alliance for Progress. Of this total $88 million will be used to finance technical cooperation.

At the Rio Conference, the United States announced its intentions to support this great hemispheric effort beyond 1971. Our ultimate goal is a hemisphere of free nations, stable and just—prosperous in their economics and democratic in their politics.

We can cite many indications of heartening progress:

In 1965 alone, Chile settled about 4,000 families on their own land, about as many as had acquired land during the preceding 35 years.

Brazil, as a result of courageous economic policy decisions, has reduced its rate of inflation, restored its credit, encouraged private investment, and modernized many of its economic institutions.

In only 2 years, the five members of the Central American Common Market have increased intramarket trade by 123 percent. These are not isolated or exceptional examples. The keynote of the Alliance for Progress has always been self-help. The pattern of our assistance—65 percent of which is concentrated in Brazil, Chile, and Colombia—demonstrates our determination to help those who help themselves.

Most heartening of all, a new generation has risen to leadership in Latin America as the Alliance for Progress has taken hold. These young men and women combine a belief in democratic ideals with a commitment to peaceful change and social justice. We are happy to welcome them as leaders of great nations in the community of freedom.

Development loans: Nine-tenths of the $665 million requested for this account is for five countries—India, Pakistan, Turkey, Korea, and Nigeria.

We have long recognized the importance to all the world of progress in the giant nations of south Asia. But in the past year we witnessed a tragic confrontation between India and Pakistan which forced us to withhold all new assistance other than food. We will not allow our aid to subsidize an arms race between these two countries. Nor can we resume aid until we are reasonably certain that hostilities will not recur. The progress of reconciliation—first at the United Nations and then at Tashkent—holds promise that these two great countries have resolved on a course of peace. My request for development loan funds is made in the hope and belief that this promise will be fulfilled.

Turkey has continued her steady progress toward self-sustaining growth, and has remained a staunch NATO ally. She deserves our continued support.

Korea has made similar economic progress and has shown her dedication to the cause of freedom by supplying a full military division for service in Vietnam.

Nigeria has recently suffered a painful upheaval, but we are hopeful that she too will maintain her responsible and progressive course.

The uncertainties of world affairs permit no guarantees that these hopes will be fulfilled. But I do guarantee the Congress and the American people that no funds will be used in these or other countries without a clear case that such expenditures are in the interest of the United States.

Technical cooperation: This request—$231 million—will finance American advisers and teachers who are the crucial forces in the attack on hunger, ignorance, disease, and the population problem. The dollar total is relatively small. But no appropriation is more critical. No purpose is more central.

Contributions to international organizations: I am requesting $140 million for these contributions in fiscal year 1967. The majority of these funds will support such efforts as the United Nations development program and the U.N. Children's Fund. The remainder represents our share of the cost of maintaining essential United Nations peacekeeping and relief activities in areas of tension and conflict.

Other: The remaining $142 million of my request is distributed among the contingency fund, AID administrative expenses, and support of American schools and hospitals abroad.

XII

In making these requests, I assure the Congress that every effort will be extended to minimize the adverse impact on our balance of payments. I think the record is proof of the sincerity of these commitments.

AID procurement policies have been tightened to the point that, with minor and essential exceptions, all funds appropriated to AID must be spent in the United States for American goods and services. As a result, offshore expenditures of AID funds declined from $1 billion in 1960 to $533 million in 1964.

Further steps have been taken. I now expect that the figure will drop to about $400 million in fiscal year 1967. Receipts are expected to rise to $186 million in fiscal year 1967, yielding a net outflow of only $214 million.

XIII

I am transmitting the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1966 as separate legislation. This new act will provide a 5-year authorization for the program which strengthens U.S. security by building the strength of others to deter and resist aggression.

The new act will provide:

Effective coordination between our economic and military programs: I request the Congress to retain in the new act those provisions which place responsibility for continuous supervision and general direction of all military assistance programs in the Secretary of State.

Greater emphasis on self-help: As with economic aid, we must condition our military aid upon commitments from recipients to make maximum contributions to the common defense.

Greater emphasis on civic action programs: We shall give new stress to civic action programs through which local troops build schools and roads, and provide literacy training and health services. Through these programs, military personnel are able to play a more constructive role in their society, and to establish better relations with the civilian population.

Emphasis on training: One of our most effective methods of building free world security is through the training provided foreign military personnel. Today, 8,500 foreign trainees come to this country each year and a similar number are trained at our service schools overseas. They return to their home countries with new professional skills and a new understanding of the role of the armed forces in a democratic society.

Continued shift from grant aid to military sales: We will shift our military aid programs from grant to sales whenever possible—and without jeopardizing our security interests or progress of economic development. Military sales now exceed the dollar volume of the normal grant aid program. This not only makes a substantial favorable impact on the balance of payments, but it also demonstrates the willingness of our allies to carry an increasing share of their own defense costs.

I am requesting new obligational authority of $917 million for military assistance in fiscal year 1967. This is the bare minimum required if we are to keep our commitments to our allies and friendly armed forces to provide the equipment and training essential to free world defense.

The military assistance request for fiscal year 1967 does not include funds for support of South Vietnamese and other allied forces who are engaged in the crucial struggle for freedom in that country. Financing for this effort will come directly from Department of Defense appropriations.

Almost three-fourths of the total program will go to countries adjacent to the borders of Soviet Russia and Communist China. The armed forces of such countries as Greece, Turkey, Iran, and the Republics of China and Korea are effective deterrents to aggression. The balance of the funds will strengthen the capacity to maintain internal security in countries where instability and weakness can pave the way for subversion.

XIV

Americans have always built for the future.

That is why we established land-grant colleges and passed the Homestead Act to open our western lands more than 100 years ago.

That is why we adopted the progressive programs proposed by Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt.

That is why we are building the Great Society.

And that is why we have a foreign assistance program.

We extend assistance to nations because it is in the highest traditions of our heritage and our humanity. But even more, because we are concerned with the kind of world our children will live in.

It can be a world where nations raise armies, where famine and disease and ignorance are the common lot of men, where the poor nations look on the rich with envy, bitterness and frustration; where the air is filled with tension and hatred.

Or it can be a world where each nation lives in independence, seeking new ways to provide a better life for its citizens: a world where the energies of its restless peoples are directed toward the works of peace; a world where people are free to build a civilization to liberate the spirit of man.

We cannot make such a world in one message, in one appropriation or in 1

year. But we can work to do this with this appropriation in this year. And we must continue to build on the work of past years and begin to erase disease and hunger and ignorance from the face of the earth.

But the basic choice is up to the countries themselves. If that choice is for progress, we can and we must help. Our help can spell the difference between success and stagnation. We must stand ready to provide it when it is needed and when we have confidence that it will be well used.

This is the price and the privilege of world leadership.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 1, 1966.*

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the President's foreign aid message makes abundantly clear our determination to help South Vietnam preserve its integrity. It also underscores our determination to help the Vietnamese people build a better life.

The Agency for International Development will provide more economic assistance to South Vietnam during the coming year.

With almost three-quarters of a million men under arms—about 5 percent of the Nation's population—South Vietnam is carrying by far the greatest burden in this battle against aggression. It is a burden that, without our help, would become intolerable.

Growing warfare has turned more than half a million people out of their homes and into refugee camps.

Communist interdiction has turned the rice bowl of southeast Asia from an exporter of rice to an importer.

Bombs and bullets have blasted the country's normal exports, so that Vietnam can no longer afford to buy the cement and steel, the fertilizer, or the books its people need. In all these areas, U.S. aid is necessary.

Our aid is also building institutions vital to progress and stability. The National Institute of Administration, built with AID funds, now graduates 350 trained Government officials each year. The $4½ million University of Saigon Medical School is helping meet some of the great need for doctors.

U.S. aid is helping Vietnam's villagers build things a man will fight for: 9,000 elementary classrooms, 1,900 new fresh water wells, 12,500 health clinics in villages that never before had a chance at education, a safe water source, or a place to go when illness struck. U.S. aid has helped Vietnam establish 780 manufacturing plants in South Vietnam, most of them small and all of them a solid hope for the future.

Our aid is now helping the Government of Vietnam train some 40,000 persons to serve in the newly established people's action teams and new life hamlet programs. These cadres will move into villages, help to establish local security and expand constructive work in agriculture, health, and education.

The purpose of our nonmilitary aid to Vietnam is to help the people of that country—especially the peasant in the village—along the road toward a decent life.

These programs are as important to the long-term prospects of peace in Vietnam as the current military resistance to aggression. They deserve our full consideration and support.

TEXTURED OR TEXTURIZED YARNS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith, in accordance with section 2 of Public Law 89-229, a report concerning the feasibility and desirability of separate classification in the tariff schedules of the United States for those articles of manmade fibers commonly referred to as textured or texturized yarns.

The report concludes that such separate tariff classification for textured yarns is feasible but not desirable in view of the current situation.

Textured yarn production in the United States has been rising steadily in recent years, from 74 million pounds in 1960 to over 250 million pounds in 1965. During this period, the independent throwster industry, which processes a major portion of textured yarn, has had rising employment. At the same time, imports have been declining. The Tariff Commission has estimated that the annual imports of textured yarns declined from more than 2 million pounds in 1962 to less than 1 million pounds in 1965, representing less than one-half of 1 percent of the domestic market.

However, the representatives of the domestic industry have argued that a serious threat of injury looms in the future. In part because of this concern, the report recommends that more accurate import data for textured yarns be provided in the future, so that Congress, the executive branch, and the industry can keep close watch on import levels and consider additional measures should they be warranted. I am therefore directing that steps be taken to obtain more accurate data on imports of textured yarns.

I am also transmitting for the information of the Congress the report of the Tariff Commission on textured yarns which I requested.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 1, 1966.*

EMPLOYEES TRAINING ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 18(c) of the Government Employees Training Act—Public Law 85-507, approved July 7, 1958—I am transmitting forms supplying information on those employees who, during fiscal year 1965, participated in training in non-Government facilities in courses that were over 120 days in duration and those employees who received training in non-Government facilities as the result of receiving an award or contribution.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 1, 1966.*

IMPORT RESTRICTIONS ON RESIDUAL FUEL OIL

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include a letter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in 1959, import restrictions on residual grade fuel oil were imposed. In 1959, I began my fight for the removal of those restrictions.

In December of last year Interior Secretary Udall announced a relaxation of the import restrictions for the remainder of the fuel oil year. But, I shall not relax my fight against these restrictions.

My fight was not for a relaxation of these unsupportable restrictions: my fight is for their complete removal. So long as any quota restriction exists, no matter how liberalized or relaxed, it effectively inhibits free market in this vital commodity.

My attacks on these restrictions have been met by horrified cries of national security. This economic millstone around the neck of my district, my State, and all of New England has thus been rationalized—but never justified.

In a letter, written yesterday to Buford Ellington, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, I have asked one more time for that justification. I have asked for access to the facts and details, which have not been made available to the public of the study made by OEP resulting in only token expansion of the existing quotas. I feel it is not only my right, but my responsibility to know what facts there are which support a recommendation for only partial relief, as one who represents an area embracing a great many users of this commodity.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this time to have the full text of my letter to Director Ellington printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I call once again for the support of my colleagues to

bring a fight, which has taken much too long to win, to the victory that does not stop short of complete removal of these restrictions, essential to return this vital commodity to the free market.

JANUARY 31, 1966.

Mr. BUFORD ELLINGTON,
Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ELLINGTON: As you are no doubt aware, I joined with other members of the Massachusetts and New England congressional delegations in welcoming the announcement late last month by the Secretary of Interior concerning the relaxation of controls on imports of residual grade fuel oil.

You will also recall that I expressed deep disappointment at the same time on two counts: first, because it had taken the administration so long to accept certain facts and conclusions which have been obvious to me from the beginning, and second, because the Secretary's action was still far short of what is both necessary and feasible. That is, the complete removal of the import quota system.

I have led the fight over the years for full and complete elimination of this needless and unjustifiable millstone around the economic neck of my district, my State, and all of New England. I would not repeat the exhaustive arguments I and my distinguished colleagues have made in this regard except, perhaps, to stress once more that only the full and complete removal of this discriminatory quota system can solve our problem.

So long as any quota restriction exists, no matter how lax or "liberalized," it effectively inhibits free market in this vital commodity. It prevents users from selecting their own distributor and compels them to pay a single, fixed price with no opportunity to shop around. Under such conditions, the law of supply and demand does not exist and the cost-minimizing influence of a free market is not present.

I need not stress these and other facts which I have stated in the past. I am sure they are well-known to you as, indeed, they are to the Secretary of Interior who has already publicly affirmed the correctness of my arguments.

My purpose now is to determine the nature of findings by the Office of Emergency Planning which prompted your recommendation to the Secretary on December 18, 1965, for the relaxation of controls. Your letter to the Secretary on that date, later made public along with the Secretary's proclamation, stated that "a thorough consideration of all issues covered by my residual oil investigation indicates that control of these imports could be substantially relaxed without impairment of the national security."

You further recommended in that letter that the import level should be "increased substantially" for the rest of the current fuel oil year and should be set "as high as possible" for the next fuel oil year.

As one who represents an area embracing a great many users of this commodity in the form of public schools, hospitals, multifamily apartment dwellings, industries, and similar large-scale institutions with large-scale heating problems, I feel I do not only have a right but a responsibility to know what facts and conclusions exist in support of a recommendation for only partial relief; relief that may have a constructive influence on the shortage of residual oil but which can have no effect whatsoever on the price which these consumers must pay.

I feel I have a right and responsibility to know why it is necessary to retain any quota system at all, if, as you recommend, the quotas can be "set as high as possible * * * without impairment of the national security."

I suspect, as I have all along, that the national security excuse has been merely a coverup for concessions granted to the coal industry lobby. I strongly suspect that the action granting only token relief is an attempt at compromise between the demands of the coal industry lobby and the economic facts of life facing New England users. If a reasonable argument can be raised in defense of continued restrictions, either on the grounds of national security, public interest or any other, it would seem to be to the advantage of the administration to reveal those arguments. If, on the other hand, no such arguments can be justified, then surely we are imposing an outrageously unfair burden on the users of this commodity.

This has been the focal point of contentions made by myself and other members of the New England congressional delegation since these restrictions were first imposed in 1959. We have demonstrated facts and figures over and over in opposition to the quota system. We have yet to hear a reasonable counter-argument; only that continued restrictions are necessary in the interest of national security or that unlimited imports would hurt an industry that priced itself out of the New England fuel market many years ago.

I feel the American public, in particular the residents of the New England States and Florida for whom residual oil has become a major fuel commodity, are not being treated fairly or forthrightly by their Government in this situation. I feel a deep responsibility in their behalf to know why only token relief has been granted and to demand access to the facts and details of the study made by OEP which resulted in only token expansion of existing quotas.

I had hoped that this study would have been made public in the weeks since Secretary Udall's announcement. Apparently, however, there has been no intent on the part of the administration to do so. I must, therefore, respectfully request that it be released as soon as possible. I shall appreciate hearing from you in this regard at your earliest convenience.

With sincere best wishes, I am
Cordially yours,

SILVIO O. CONTE,
Member of Congress.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY CONCERNING THE REFERENCE OF BILLS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALL. Referring to the first of the Presidential messages today, the one on foreign aid, in view of the last paragraph of article VIII on page 7, as continued further on page 10, concerning the submission of two separate bills, my parliamentary inquiry would involve two questions: First, would reference of the President's message to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House automatically involve reference of bills referred to therein to the same committee of this House?

The SPEAKER. It would depend upon the nature of the bill. The answer as to one does not necessarily follow as to the other. On the other hand, the provisions of the bill and the Rules of the House would govern.

Mr. HALL. I thank the Speaker.

The second portion of my parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, if I may continue, is this: In view of the fact that the military and economic authorization requests are to be contained, according to the President's message, in two separate bills—again, for the first time in some years—would the military authorization part thereof, when submitted, apparently by the administration, per this message, be referred to the Legislative Committee on Armed Services of this House, or would it go to the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not prepared to answer that inquiry at the present time, because the answer to the second inquiry would relate back to the first inquiry made by the gentleman from Missouri, and the response of the Chair to that inquiry.

In the opinion of the Chair, the second question is related to the first question, that question being answered that it does not necessarily follow that specific legislation would be referred to the committee to which the message would be referred.

Mr. HALL. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Therefore, the Chair does not feel able to pass upon the second inquiry until the Chair has had an opportunity to observe the provisions of the bill.

Mr. HALL. I thank the Speaker.

I submit that this is a point which has long been of vital concern, the subject of much colloquy and even some contention on the part of Members of the House. I know the Speaker will use good grace and background, and that of the Parliamentarian, as to reference of this bill, which will be of vital concern, as two separate bills for the first time in many years.

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. CURTIS. 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. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Economic Committee presently is holding hearings on the economic situation of the country.

I am most pleased to see in the President's foreign aid program, on which he has just given a message, this statement:

> I propose to carry forward the best of what we are now doing in the less-developed world, and cut out the worst.

I believe we are all agreed on that. If we do that, I suspect we shall reduce the level of foreign aid expenditure from around $3 to $4 billion to about $1.2 billion, and perhaps we will zero in on the problems implicit in the disturbing fact that we lost $1.7 billion in gold in year 1965.

This is a most serious question, and I wish the administration would direct its attention to it instead of sweeping it under the rug.

On page 151 of the President's 1966 Economic Report is the following statement:

> Nevertheless, if a deficit (balance of international payments) continues too long or

becomes too large, the strength of the country's currency can be impaired. There is, in fact, an absolute limit of any country's ability to continue in deficit; eventually, it must run out of reserves as well as borrowing capacity.

The tragedy is that the President, having made this wise observation, fails to act. He continues to cash in on the future to buy time in the present. By treating the symptoms instead of the disease, which is another way of stating the administration's policy, the disease flourishes under cover of the palliatives applied.

RESUMPTION OF BOMBING IN NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. PICKLE. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday when President Johnson reported to the people of the United States that he had directed bombing to be resumed in North Vietnam, he had the prayers and the understanding and the support of the American people. This was a difficult decision, but I think it was the right decision.

No nation has ever made a more genuine or valiant effort to bring peace to a troubled world than the United States in its peace negotiations concerning Vietnam. Every effort has been made to bring the participants to a conference table. Literally dozens and dozens of other nations have been asked to urge a peaceful negotiation. No stone has been left unturned in an effort to find an honorable and peaceful settlement. It is obvious to everyone that Hanoi and Peiping do not want peace. As these bombings then are resumed, the whole world knows now that the aggressor is not the United States but instead is the Communist world, particularly Red China.

President Johnson should be commended for his great search to find a solution to this problem, and he is especially to be commended for continuing his efforts now to find peace before any interested group. Again, this shows to the world that our President and the American people want peace on honorable terms.

Mr. Speaker, I would also point out that a great disservice has been rendered this country by a handful of Senators and Congressmen and other public figures who try to second-guess the actions of the United States in matters of foreign affairs, particularly when matters of military action is required. This Congress has authorized the President to take all necessary means to protect American lives and to insure the independence of the people of South Vietnam; and the manner in which this is carried out is a matter for the President and his Cabinet and advisers to determine. When public figures view with alarm, participate in appeasement talk, criticize their Government, and cast doubt—without ever offering a concrete solution—then those people are undermining the policy that has made this country great. To me it has been a regrettable display of weakness to see some officials gain headlines simply because they feel a little heat from home, and they start retreating. These are the times when we need strong leaders—not weak ones; when we need strong spokesmen for the United States—not apologizers; when we need to support our Government—not undermine it. If these kind of men could direct the course of the conflict then we might as well say to future generations that no President can be an effective leader in time of international crisis.

Fortunately, the American people will not listen to these appeasers. We know that the President is right, and we support him in his determination to find peace, but only on honorable terms that freemen everywhere will recognize.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the call of the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

MRS. MARIA FINOCCHIARO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4211) for the relief of Mrs. Maria Finocchiaro.

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

Mr. TALCOTT and Mr. HALL objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENZO (ENZIO) PEROTTI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4926) for the relief of Enzo (Enzio) Perotti.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without projudice.

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

There was no objection.

MARY F. THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3758) for the relief of Mary F. Thomas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3758

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to Mrs. Mary F. Thomas, of Yonkers, New York, the amount certified to him by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs pursuant to section 2 of this Act. The payment of such amount shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration of the said Mrs. Mary F. Thomas for dependency compensation for the period beginning on October 17, 1942, through December 3, 1961, on account of the death of her son, Curtis S. Thomas (Veterans' Administration claim number XC 3 115 076). No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

SEC. 2. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount that Mrs. Mary F. Thomas, of Yonkers, New York, would have received under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration as dependency compensation for the period beginning on October 17, 1942, through December 3, 1961, on account of the death of her son, Curtis S. Thomas, if she had filed a proper claim for such compensation on November 24, 1943.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3: Strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

OSMUNDO CABIGAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5838) for the relief of Osmundo Cabigas.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

FRANK E. LIPP

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1407) for the relief of Frank E. Lipp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1407

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any statute of limitations pertaining to suits against the United States, or any lapse of time, or bars of laches or any prior judgment of the United States Court of Claims, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim of Frank E. Lipp arising out of his service with the United States Armed Forces from the years 1940 to 1946.

SEC. 2. Suit upon any claim may be instituted at any time within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States. Except as otherwise provided herein, proceedings for the determination of such claim, and review and payment of any judgment or judgments thereon shall be had in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASHMORE

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASHMORE: Page 1, line 8, and on page 1, line 11, strike "any" and insert "the".

The amendment was agreed to.

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.

MORRIS L. KAIDEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6728) for the relief of Morris L. Kaiden.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6728

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Morris L. Kaiden, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 401(c) of the Nationality Act of 1940 and section 349(a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, may be naturalized by taking prior to one year after the effective date of this Act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337 of the said Act. From and after naturalization under this Act, the said Morris L. Kaiden shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

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.

VIVIAN COHEN KAIDEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6729) for the relief of Vivian Cohen Kaiden.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6729

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Vivian Cohen Kaiden, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 401 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, may be naturalized by taking prior to one year after the effective date of this Act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337 of the said Act. From and after naturalization under this Act, that said Vivian Cohen Kaiden shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

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.

FREE ENTRY OF GLASS FOR CONGREGATION EMANUEL OF DENVER, COLO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4599) to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass for the Congregation Emanuel of Denver, Colo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4599

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to admit free of duty any stained glass or any prefabricated panels consisting of stained glass set in reinforced concrete with fastening devices which may have been imported before the date of the enactment of this Act for use in the construction of a new synagogue and auxiliary buildings for the Congregation Emanuel of Denver, Colorado.

(b) If the liquidation of the entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption of any article subject to the provisions of subsection (a) has become final, such entry or withdrawal may be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty may be made.

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.

FREE ENTRY OF GLASS FOR SEMINARY OF GLENMONT, N.Y.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5831) to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass and cement windows for Our Lady of the Angels Seminary of Glenmont, N.Y.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5831

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty the articles imported for the use of Our Lady of Angels Seminary, Glenmont, New York, which were entered as stained glass and cement windows on October 16, 1961, and February 2, 1962, pursuant to Consumption Entries A-046 and A-096. If the liquidation of such entries has become final, such entries may be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty may be made.

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.

UNIFORMS FOR TROUBADORS CORPS OF BRIDGEPORT, CONN.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8647) for the relief of the Troubadors Drum and Bugle Corps of Bridgeport, Conn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 8647

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty parade uniforms for the use of Troubadors Drum and Bugle Corps of the Explorer Scout Post Numbered 152, Bridgeport, Connecticut (care of Lawrence Mak).

SEC. 2. The first section of this Act shall apply to the articles described therein whether such articles were entered before the date of the enactment of this Act, or are entered on or after such date. In the case of any such article entered before such date, the entry involved shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any other provision of law, be liquidated or reliquidated in accordance with the provisions of this Act, and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, before the period insert "which have been imported before July 1, 1965".

Page 1, strike out line 8 and all that follows down through line 5 on page 2 and insert:

"SEC. 2. If the liquidation of the entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption of any article subject to the provisions of the first section of this Act has become final, such entry or withdrawal shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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 Private Calendar.

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, a few short years from now, between 1973 and 1983, we will be celebrating the 200th anniversary of the American Revolution, and the bicentennial of our national commitment to the principles of liberty and equality set forth in the Declaration of Independence.

There is no question that this bicentennial will be marked across the land by countless local, State, National and international activities, stretching through a full decade, under the auspices of innumerable public authorities, learned societies, and historical, civic, patriotic, philanthropic, and professional organizations and groups.

There is no question that we will enjoy a great range of conferences and convocations, scholarship and analysis, and pomp and pageantry.

There is no question that this bicentennial will be the greatest celebration in the history of our Republic—but there is no assurance that it will be as great, as thoughtful, and as mature as the occasion requires. I personally believe that it is the ideals rather than the relics of the Revolution that we should emphasize.

Given the magnitude of the bicentennial, and the wealth of talents and resources involved, careful planning and comprehensive coordination are both difficult and essential. In my judgment, the job can only be done by a blue-ribbon national commission with ample time and authority, and with the confidence and cooperation of the many groups and agencies involved.

Last week the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] and I introduced identical bills, H.R. 12252 and H.R. 12260, to establish an American Revolution Bicentennial Commission as the best agency for this tremendous task.

The Commission we propose would have 31 members, including the President, Vice President, and Speaker of the House; 4 Senators and 4 Representatives; the Secretary of State, the Secre-

tary of the Interior, the Librarian of Congress, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and the Chairman of the Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities; and 15 members from private life, appointed by the President. The President, Vice President, Speaker of the House, and the five executive-branch officials designated would be ex-officio members of the Commission.

Because the full dimensions of the bicentennial cannot be determined at once, the Commission would devote its first 2 years to comprehensive planning. During the first year of its existence, the Commission is directed to convene a national assembly of representatives from the Federal Government, the States, and all interested groups. This assembly would discuss possible bicentennial activities and make recommendations to the Commission.

Based on the assembly's conclusions and its own preliminary work, the Commission would submit a full report to Congress within the first 2 years of its existence. As described in our bills, this report would include discussion of a great range of possible activities; recommendations for the allocation of financial and administrative responsibility among various public and private authorities and groups; and such legislative enactments and administrative actions as the Commission considers necessary.

In fulfilling its broad responsibility to plan, encourage, coordinate, and conduct bicentennial activities, the Commission would be authorized to consult, cooperate with, and seek advice and assistance from all appropriate Federal departments and agencies, State and local public bodies, learned societies, and historical, patriotic, philanthropic, civic, professional, and related organizations. Conversely, all Federal departments and agencies are authorized and requested to cooperate fully with the Commission, with more specific directives being given to the Secretary of the Interior, the Chairman of the Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities, and the Librarian of Congress, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and the Archivist of the United States to develop appropriate activities and projects in their respective fields.

Mr. Speaker, I would emphasize that the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission is not designed nor intended to preempt the field and preclude, or even monitor, local and private efforts. Its goal is just the opposite: To encourage all interested groups, to offer information, to help provide advice and technical assistance, and to orchestrate a vast collection of activities and projects into a bicentennial of unprecedented scope, depth, and quality.

Toward this goal, the planning procedures established under this bill are especially important, for all possibilities must be surveyed and studied before final recommendations are made and final arrangements begun. The continuity of leadership provided by this Commission will be vital, too, for without it, the most careful planning could be for naught.

In developing this legislation, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] and I have consulted with many interested individuals, and have studied the experience of previous commemorative commissions, particularly the Civil War Centennial Commission. In the weeks ahead, we will be seeking the advice and counsel of many groups and individuals throughout the Nation. We hope to obtain the interest and support of many of our colleagues in the House, so that an early hearing on this bill can be obtained.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON IMPORTANT NATIONAL ISSUES SENT TO RESIDENTS OF THE EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF OHIO

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, in December 1965, I mailed approximately 150,000 legislative questionnaires to constituents and to date about 18,000 have been returned.

The space for "Comments" was used extensively. People who were unable to answer "yes" or "no" to some questions used this opportunity to comment. Some used the space to qualify "yes" or "no" answers. This was particularly true on Vietnam, foreign aid and Federal aid to education. For this reason, it should be borne in mind that the tabulation of answers does not reflect these reservations and explanations and that on questions where the questions were close—these comments could tip the scales either way.

A majority of those who commented said they approved of the questionnaire. A few thought the questions were slanted, although I did my best to make them objective. Quite a few felt that some of the questions were impossible to answer "yes" or "no." And, I am inclined to agree with them. I tried to phrase the questions so they could be answered "yes" or "no" but I know now that to do this is extremely difficult if not impossible. In another questionnaire I would try to make the questions simpler.

The results of the tabulation are as follows:

	Percentages		
	Yes	No	Undecided
NATIONAL ECONOMY			
1. Do you favor setting aside a small percentage of revenue each year to reduce the national debt?	92.5	5.4	2.1
2. Do you favor Federal control and regulation of agriculture?	11.8	85.1	3.1
3. Do you favor a reduction in spending to produce a balanced Federal budget?	91.0	7.0	2.0
4. Do you believe that the administration's antipoverty program will substantially reduce poverty in the United States?	10.8	85.5	3.7
5. Do you favor income tax credits for parents paying expenses of children in college?	69.2	27.6	3.2
CONSTITUTION AND BALANCE OF POWER			
6. Do you favor Federal aid to education?	43.1	52.0	4.9
7. Do you think the people of each State should have the right to determine their own kind of legislature?	85.9	10.7	3.4
8. Do you feel that the Federal Government is taking away the power of States and local governments by assuming too many responsibilities which should be handled at State and local levels?	86.5	10.5	3.0
9. Should the Federal Government prohibit State right-to-work laws?	17.5	75.4	7.1
10. Should the Federal Government set standards for the States in the field of unemployment compensation?	25.6	68.3	6.1
11. Do you think further protection of civil rights should be left to:			
A. The Federal Government?	41.1	40 8	18.1
B. Private education, religious and social programs?	48.3	24.7	27.0
FOREIGN AFFAIRS—NATIONAL SECURITY			
12. Do you think the United States should be fighting in Vietnam?	57.2	33.0	9.8
13. Do you favor expanding our trade with Soviet Union and with other Communist nations?	23.9	69.9	6.2
14. Do you favor continuing our present foreign aid program?	18.8	73.5	7.7
15. Do you favor admitting Communist China to the United Nations?	14.9	80.4	4.7
16. Do you favor U.S. intervention in Cuba?	66.6	25.6	7.8

MILWAUKEE: CANDIDATE FOR THE BASEBALL HALL OF FAME?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, last August I took the floor of the House to point out to my colleagues that Milwaukee and Wisconsin were determined to stop organized professional baseball in the "big steal" of the Braves' franchise from Milwaukee.

At that time I said: "The baseball bullies have picked on someone big enough and tough enough to fight back this time."

The truth in those words is rapidly coming to be recognized by both the American public and the major leagues.

Both sides have had several innings in court. The score: Milwaukee, three; Organized Baseball, nothing.

The three scores are the three orders issued last Thursday by Circuit Judge Elmer W. Roller, in Milwaukee, ruling in the antitrust suit brought against the Braves management and the National League by Milwaukee County and the State of Wisconsin. Judge Roller, a distinguished jurist, has ordered that—

First, the Braves must not enter into any contract or other obligation for the 1966 season in Atlanta;

Second, the team must make all necessary preliminary arrangements to enable them to play their home games in Milwaukee during the 1966 season, and thereafter if so ordered by the court;

And third, the National League was directed to make plans for expansion of the league in order to permit major league baseball to be played in Milwaukee in time for the 1966 season.

The National League owners, however, have voted to defy the court and have committed themselves to Atlanta in preference to Milwaukee. While this action is regrettable, it is fully understandable: Major league baseball owners have generally considered their operations to be above the law.

But no one should believe for a moment that this game is over. The entire case is almost certain to be appealed to the Wisconsin State Supreme Court and from there to the Supreme Court of the United States.

The people of Milwaukee would welcome the chance to bring their case before the highest tribunal of the land. They recognized that injustices which have been perpetrated affect not only their own community, but also the welfare of baseball fans all over the Nation.

They seek to right these wrongs through the courts. They are confident, as I am confident, that the Supreme Court will overturn its 1922 decision which permits organized professional baseball an exemption from the Nation's antitrust regulations.

If it was not clear in 1922, it is today that big league baseball is a business and must be regulated in the public interest.

I look forward with much anticipation to that fateful day when the high tribunal will strip organized professional baseball of its privileges—privileges, incidentally, that no other organized professional sport enjoys.

The baseball owners will be scrambling up Capitol Hill with the agility of infielders to seek legislation which will allow them to continue their business as usual.

Thus will come the moment when the Congress of the United States can preserve the great American pastime for the people and protect the public interest against the owners' rapacious appetites for profit.

Undoubtedly our esteemed colleague, the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], would be most pleased to take the lead in shaping legislation which would save the game for the American people.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that these badly needed reforms in organized professional baseball hardly would be possible without the dogged determination of the people of Milwaukee.

For that reason, I hereby place Milwaukee County in nomination for the Baseball Hall of Fame.

If elected to that institution of distinction, Milwaukee County might fittingly be represented by a framed copy of Judge Roller's ruling and a plaque reading: "In Tribute to Milwaukee County, the Community that Saved the Game from the Carpetbaggers."

Mr. STALBAUM. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, a year ago this past week I introduced H.R. 3412 to place organized baseball under antitrust laws. This bill was identical with one which was introduced by my esteemed Wisconsin colleague, CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI.

Today I am pleased to commend Mr. ZABLOCKI for his remarks, which have just been presented to you, on the latest shenanigans of the baseball owners and the avarice which motivates them.

One year ago when I authored my bill, I commented that it was done to "show Congress that there is wholehearted support among Wisconsin Representatives of Congressman ZABLOCKI's efforts."

My remarks today are for the same purpose. They are being made to show that more than Milwaukee is concerned. All of Wisconsin is justifiably showing marked interest.

In fact, all sports fans are concerned.

And, it is about time the baseball powers were concerned. How long do they think they can flaunt court orders, as they are now doing? How long can they get by with the two-faced posture of being above and beyond the law on one side and yet sell America that they are something which gives moral leadership to our youth?

Right now America is starting to realize that they are more often Mr. Hyde than they are Dr. Jekyll.

While Milwaukee is making its point, it is not alone. For it is the State of Wisconsin, through its brilliant young attorney general, Bronson La Follette, which is providing the legal challenge.

Speaking as a Wisconsin Congressman from outside of Milwaukee this is as it should be. For all of Wisconsin, not just Milwaukee, is disturbed by the brazen acts of the Braves' owners. And as I read other sport columns so, apparently, are sports lovers everywhere.

GI BENEFIT BILL IS NEEDED NOW

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in the past I have strongly advocated legislation to provide for a permanent GI bill as long as there is compulsory enrollment of men in the military of our country. During the 1st session of the 89th Congress, I introduced two bills to provide educational and training allowances for ex-servicemen.

Following my tour of active duty with the Navy last November, I realize as never before the importance and necessity of such legislation. I have restudied the situation and am today introducing another bill that will in no way limit any of today's fighting men from receiving the same advantages that were made available to those who served in World War II and Korea. Those benefits did not discriminate between servicemen regardless of their assignments, and to do so at this time would have the effect of downgrading the contributions of many of those who are in uniform today.

The toll of the holocaust is not at issue. I pray that casualties will never again approach the horrible levels that persisted for so very many days in Europe, in the South Pacific, and at other scattered battlegrounds from December 1941 into September 1945. However, the human element remains unchanged in any conflict. Young men are separated from their families and many are sent to the far corners of the world, subject to the orders of a military command. While only a comparative few actually face enemy fire, all are on call at all times for their service wherever the need arises.

Whatever his duty, the man in uniform—unless he has chosen a military career—must interrupt his civilian pursuits and sacrifice his education, his training, his work. Whatever the length of time involved, that period of life is beyond recovery, and the Government should do everything possible to help our veterans pick up where they left off. To the average person, picking up a course of study after being out of school over a prolonged span is not an easy achievement, nor is it always possible to return to a job with the same efficiency after a lengthy absence.

Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed at the administration's proposal to economize by categorizing men in service in such a way that some would be denied the benefits that should be available to all. Reeducating and retraining members of the military forces should be included in the cost of war, and shortcuts from this philosophy would blemish the tradition of a grateful nation.

Granted, the U.S. Government must do everything possible to hold down expenditures, particularly when involvement in the Vietnam conflict requires increasingly greater expense; but the place to initiate fiscal responsibility is on the homefront where extravagance has become a commonplace in the Great Society. We must be prepared to spend whatever amounts are needed to provide our men with the finest equipment and to make their lot as safe and livable as warfare will permit regardless of monetary considerations.

When the job has been completed and our fighting men return to their homes, the Nation cannot be satisfied until every last veteran has been offered an opportunity to pick up where he left off and to readjust to civilian life as quickly and as efficiently as possible. His GI bill of rights must be waiting for him, and Congress will be remiss if necessary legislation is not enacted in the weeks ahead.

Mr. Speaker, my bill will provide a program of education and training for veterans of current service.

Service requirements: More than 6 months' military service between February 1, 1955, and the date of termination of compulsory military service.

Duration of education or training: Education or training time shall be

earned at the rate of 1½ days of education for each day of military service during the specified period. The period of education or training to which an eligible veteran shall be entitled shall not exceed 36 months.

Time limitations: Education or training must be initiated within 3 years after the veteran's discharge or release from active duty or 3 years from date of enactment, whichever is later. Veterans who have been unable to initiate programs of study within 3 years of separation because of the nature of their discharge shall be permitted to initiate a program of education or training within 3 years after the nature of the discharge was corrected or changed to make him eligible.

Expiration of education and training: No education or training shall be afforded an eligible veteran beyond 8 years from discharge from active duty or 8 years from enactment of this law, whichever is later. The entire program of education and training shall terminate 8 years after the date of termination of compulsory military service.

Payments to veterans: Each eligible veteran pursuing a program of education or training shall receive an education and training allowance to meet in part the expenses of his subsistence, tuition, fees, supplies, books, and equipment. The following allowances are payable:

Educational institution training:

Full time, 14 semester hours: $130 monthly, no dependents; $160 monthly, one dependent; $190 monthly, two or more dependents.

Three-quarters time: $95 monthly, no dependents; $120 monthly, one dependent; $140 monthly, two or more dependents.

Half-time: $60 monthly, no dependents; $75 monthly, one dependent; $90 monthly, two or more dependents.

Less than half time: Allowance computed at the rate of the established charges or $130 per month for full time course, whichever is the lesser.

Institutional and on-the-job training: $105 monthly, no dependents; $130 monthly, one dependent; $150 monthly two or more dependents.

Apprenticeship or on-the-job training: $80 monthly, no dependents; $100 monthly, one dependent; $125 monthly, two or more dependents.

Institutional on-farm training: $110 monthly, no dependents; $130 monthly, one dependent; $150 monthly, two or more dependents.

Miscellaneous provisions: Educational institutions which qualify to participate in this program include public or private elementary school, secondary school, vocational school, correspondence school, business school, junior college, teachers college, college, normal school, professional school, university, scientific or technical institution or other institutions furnishing education for adults.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I would like to include a press statement issued on January 25 by all Republicans on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee:

PRESS STATEMENT

A group of Republican Congressmen today charged that President Johnson had waited too long and offered too little in educational benefits for servicemen and veterans.

The GOP legislators, all members of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, met on the eve of committee deliberation on cold war GI bill legislation. The group included E. ROSS ADAIR, of Indiana; WILLIAM H. AYRES, of Ohio; PAUL A. FINO, of New York; JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania; CHARLES M. TEAGUE, of California; SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York; ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, of Kansas; and JOHN J. DUNCAN, of Tennessee.

Terming the administration backed bill, H.R. 11985, "a Great Society nightmare," the group said, "This bill would divide the program between two Federal agencies, with a small portion being administered by the Veterans' Administration and the balance going to the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This is ridiculous. We have traveled this route before. Back in the early thirties, prior to the creation of the Veterans' Administration as a one-stop agency for veterans benefits, we witnessed inefficiency, overlapping, duplication, and mismanagement as veterans programs were spread among several agencies. More recently, we have seen the various housing and urban development programs of the Federal Government merged into a single agency. Just the other day, the President called for the creation of a single Department of Transportation to administer all Government transportation activities now administered by 35 agencies. It would appear that the President, flushed with a singular lack of success in distributing the poverty program among several agencies, has the same fate in store for veterans education.

"While the education and career plans of thousands of young Americans were being interrupted by military service," continued the Republican lawmakers, "and while Members of Congress, veterans organizations, labor unions, school and educational associations, and servicemen themselves were clamoring for a veterans education program, administration spokesmen voiced strong opposition to such a program. Now, belatedly, they have endorsed a measure that will provide education for only a small fraction of those who served valiantly and were ready to risk their lives for our Nation. The administration would deny education to those who were discharged prior to October 1, 1963, even those who risked their lives in Vietnam and other hostile outposts.

"The administration would deny job training, farm training and apprentice training to the limited number slated for participation in their proposed program.

"The administration would place a premium on service in areas of hostility by offering more liberal benefits to men who have served in such areas. This represents a departure from the traditional concept of veterans education as a readjustment benefit. Instead, it represents a bonus or form of hazard pay. We submit that servicemen have no choice of duty stations and the serviceman stationed in Tokyo requires the same readjustment assistance as the serviceman stationed in one of the world's hot spots.

"We call upon the President, leaders of his administration, and our colleagues in the Congress to support an educational benefit program similar to that provided for World War II and Korean conflict veterans.

"The cost of this program for the servicemen of today must be viewed as one of the necessary costs of war. Preparing the serviceman returning from war to take his place in our civilian economy is as essential to our national interests as was the task of preparing him for military duties through basic training.

"If we can provide billions of dollars to educate various segments of our society, we can afford no less for the youth who is risking his life to preserve our way of life."

Mr. Speaker, the House Republican policy committee has adopted a resolution supporting a GI bill that would provide a program of education and training for veterans of military service, and the text of the statement adopted January 26, 1966, follows:

The House Republican policy committee urges the immediate enactment of a bill that will authorize a program of education and training for veterans of military service.

Unfortunately, the administration opposed legislation of this type last year. Certainly, preparing the serviceman returning from war to take his place in civilian life is as essential to our national interest as was the task of preparing him for his military duty. This should be viewed as one of the costs of waging war against the challenge of Communist aggression in Vietnam and elsewhere throughout the world.

We urge the administration to support this legislation, and we urge the Congress to enact into law a program of education and training for veterans as quickly as possible. Due to the administration's opposition, 1 year has now been lost. In all fairness to our servicemen, this situation should not continue.

SPEECH BY THE HONORABLE TOM ADAMS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the able secretary of state of Florida, the Honorable Tom Adams, addressed a regional waterways meeting in Little Rock, Ark., on January 16, in his capacity as president of the National Waterways Conference, Inc. I commend Secretary Adams' comments on the importance of our waterways to my colleagues, as follows:

REMARKS OF HON. TOM ADAMS, PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL WATERWAYS CONFERENCE, INC., AT REGIONAL WATERWAYS MEETING, HOTEL MARION, LITTLE ROCK, ARK., JANUARY 19, 1966

Water is the single most beneficial yet most destructive substance known to man.

Added in proper amounts to the most arid desert, it can transform the burning sands into a Garden of Eden. Driven before the winds of a hurricane or compounded by a cloudburst, this same lifegiving element can, and often does, spread death and destruction. The time and space in which we all live is locked within this paradox.

These, of course, are the extremes. Fortunately, we live on a rather wide median between these extremes with water in an acceptable abundance. Our United States, generally speaking, is referred to as one of the best watered nations in the world. We are a far cry from the tiny nation of Kuwait, next to Arabia on the Persian Gulf, which has not a single river, stream, lake, or pond within its borders and little or none beneath its parched sands. Nor are we like the equatorial countries where rainfall is measured in feet instead of inches.

But still, the wise and efficient use of our water resources is one of the most far-reaching and challenging problems facing us today. Many regions already have serious water problems. And these problems are

compounding. Just consider the effect of our rapidly expanding population—not in terms of schools, or highways or hospitals—but with respect to the ever-growing domestic and industrial demand for fresh water.

Fortunately, we in the South are blessed with an abundance of water resources. In large measure, water is part of the real wealth of this region. It is a priceless asset. But its value lies in its protection, preservation, and proper use. This is what water resource development is all about—putting water to work, and getting the most out of it, for the benefit of everyone.

In a way, development of the rivers and waterways has been forced upon us. To save the land from rampaging floods, levees and revetments were built. Dams were constructed to provide a dependable water supply, to generate electricity, or to regulate the streamflow. Often as not, navigation was a result of such improvements. The navigable channels afforded low-cost water transportation which, in turn, served to spur riverside industrial growth.

This pattern of waterway development is on the order of a chain reaction, with the same waters serving many useful purposes and benefiting many different segments of the economy.

As strange as it now seems, this multiple-use concept of water resource development was slow to catch on. Before it did, flood control proponents were continually at odds with navigation proponents, and both saw red over reclamation projects. If you wanted a waterway improvement in your State, it was assumed that you had to work against those in every other State. And almost everyone, it seems, was "at sixs and sevens" over which project was to get priority. As a result, there was more confusion than coordination in the early development of our water resources.

It is to the great credit of the regional development organizations like the Mississippi Valley Association and the Arkansas Basin Association that waterway proponents began to see the light. Instead of fighting each other, they joined hands and began to work together to bring about the orderly, regional development of our water resources. Thus was born, only a decade or so ago, the concept of comprehensive development—development not just for a single purpose, but for multiple purposes, including flood control, navigation, and water supply, for stabilized streamflow, pollution abatement, and reclamation, for fish and wildlife conservation, recreation and, in some instances, for hydroelectric power. Each of these purposes affords certain benefits, and all are taken into account in considering the feasibility of proposed developments.

In most projects, the benefits are so interlocking that it is virtually impossible to separate them. Take the Missouri River, for example. This is a development primarily for flood control, but the upstream reservoirs impound about 75 million acre-feet of water, allowing for the irrigation of many thousands of very fertile but dry acres of cropland. The reservoirs furnish recreation for literally millions of people. In addition, the release of water from these same reservoirs produces a great deal of electricity, and together with the levees and bank stabilization works, makes the river navigable. The stabilized streamflow not only allows navigation but also aids pollution abatement. Consequently, much fresh water is available from this source for year-round use.

This, then, is an excellent example of multipurpose water resource development. In one well-planned, forward-looking undertaking, the Missouri River has been turned from an instrument of disaster, with either too much or too little water, into an even-flowing artery of commerce, pumping new life and prosperity into the vast mid-continent of our Nation. It is this complete transformation, in a single comprehensive program, which makes the multiple-purpose concept so intriguing and promising.

In my view, it is the only plan to follow in working to conserve and utilize our water resources. The multiple-purpose concept benefits municipalities and industries who need more water. It benefits the fish and wildlife people and those who like the water for sport or recreation. It benefits the people who must have protection against floods and all those who want low-cost water transportation. In fact, it is of great benefit to everyone.

With its great abundance of water resources, the South today claims many far-sighted multipurpose projects. Among the most important are those in the Ouachita River basin, the Red River basin, and the White River basin. One of the largest yet undertaken is the development of the Arkansas–Verdigris Rivers which, when finished, will have a 450-mile, 9-foot-deep navigation channel, with the many related multiple public purposes thus created throughout its entire length.

Navigation, however, is the critical factor in each of these developments. For whether or not they are to be built depends, in large measure, on the transportation savings which low-cost navigation will provide, and the benefits that thus can be assessed. Waterway transportation is important, therefore, to the future of these and other water resource development projects.

Keeping this important relationship in mind, let me alert you to a strong and well-financed campaign which is now in progress and aimed at destroying our system of inland waterway transportation. Navigational development has become the whipping boy for certain shortsighted and self-serving special groups—groups who want to stop the use of public funds for projects related to development of water resources. It's a case of divide and conquer as far as multiple-purpose programs are concerned.

Developing rivers and river basins is really a very complex and complicated undertaking, and it cannot be denied that the general public benefits immeasurably from these developments. This is why the Federal Government takes the lead, at this time, in multipurpose developments. Let me warn you that if anything happens which hurts the navigational potential, then all the people interested in recreation, flood control, stream stabilization, and other benefits in a comprehensive program will be left hanging on a limb.

The role of water transportation is essential not only to most multipurpose programs but also in its low-cost impact on the national economy. Barge transportation, of course, is ideal for moving raw materials in bulk—commodities like petroleum, coal, iron and steel, grain, chemicals, sand and gravel. When we talk about the cost of transporting these basic products, we are talking about something which affects almost every home and business. Every year, more and more shippers are discovering that the floated ton is the most economical ton of transportation. Water rates are only a fraction of those of other modes—one-fourth the rail rate and one-tenth the truck rate. It is significant and revealing that inland waterways annually carry about 10 percent of the Nation's freight for about 1½ percent of the total freight bill, a clear demonstration of the importance of barge transportation in the movement of massive quantities over long distances.

Who benefits the most from low-cost water transportation? Not just the water carrier, in view of the great rivalry for barge business. Not just the shipper, when his success depends on a competitive economy. The consumer is the primary benefactor whether he knows it or not—and I suspect that a great many usually well-informed citizens are unaware of the beneficial effect of water transportation on their lives.

It holds down the cost of electric power, of gasoline, grain, aluminum, paper, steel, and chemical products—all of which are basic to the American economy. Any upward adjustment in water rates would certainly be reflected in the monthly electric bills in vast sections of the Nation—at the service station, the meat market, the drug store, and at the office. In short, the American public enjoys the dollars-and-cents dividends of the inland waterway system.

Many shippers who never use the waterways also benefit. Historically, low-cost water rates have served as an anchor on freight costs, restraining the rates charged by competing modes of transport.

Let me give you one brief, very meaningful example that has recently occurred in Florida. Lake Okeechobee, in the south central part of our State, is connected by the St. Lucie Canal to the Atlantic on the east, and through the Caloosahatchee Waterway to the gulf on the west. The sugar industry around Okeechobee, in that rich area of the Everglades, has grown tremendously since the Cuban crisis curtailed sugar imports. But the growth of the sugar industry in Florida was literally being stifled by transportation problems. Trucks were unable to haul the volume and the bulk of the cargo. Railroads imposed exhorbitant rates. The sugar industry around the lake, therefore, looked to water transportation. A single barge landing was constructed on Lake Okeechobee. Though it has been used but once, one sugar company on one shipment of equipment saved $85,000. Last year, it was estimated that the annual freight savings to the sugar industry, and other shippers around Lake Okeechobee amounted to some $600,000 because the threat of a commercial waterway forced other modes of transportation to adjust their freight rates to meet the threat of competition.

It is regrettable that the older a government becomes the more regulated become the lives of those it governs. And overregulation, through many related activities, has rendered our merchant marine not only noncompetitive but also very nearly nonexistent. And what does remain of it, under this system that has developed, is subsidized by the people of this Nation to the tune of 70 percent.

Overregulation of independent water carriers will eliminate the only truly competitive aspect of our transportation system. And free enterprise will literally be lost in the transportation industry. When that day arrives and transportation is completely controlled, we will see a managed economy in the very real sense of the word.

Opponents of the waterways are working at this time to overturn the national waterways policy and to inaugurate a system of waterway user charges for the first time in our history. The national administration has gone to bat for user charges, and we fully expect hearings on this issue in the current session of Congress. As a matter of fact, President Johnson has already recommended a waterway fuel tax of 2 cents a gallon. It is evident that this is intended as only the opening wedge. Once the so-called user-charge principle is established on our waterways, periodic increases and extensions will surely follow. In fact, the asserted logic of such a user charge is the recovery of Federal waterway costs—which would require a fuel tax of at least 25 cents a gallon.

Toll-free waterways are particularly vital to this region. More than two-thirds of all freight carried on our rivers and canals is southern in origin or destination. Industrial development throughout the South is largely oriented to waterway development. Therefore, the future growth and prosperity of this area, in particular, is necessarily dependent upon new programs of broad water

resource development. There is no doubt that if inland waterway transportation were to be burdened with tolls or taxes, the South would be hit harder than any other section of the country.

Proponents of waterway tolls conveniently overlook the disastrous effect which such an imposition would have on the development of the Nation's water resources.

Simple economics tells us that imposition of unprecedented user charges can only have the effect of discouraging waterway traffic—and waterway development. Increased water rates, which tolls would bring, would necessitate adjustments in the benefit-to-cost ratios of projects under consideration. Water resource developments are expected, of course, to pay their own way in terms of economic return to the national economy. It is only through waterway use that this can be accomplished.

Yet the proposed toll on waterway use—and let us never deceive ourselves that the 2-cent tax proposal is but the starter—will inevitably result in a loss of waterway traffic. The benefits of navigation will therefore be diminished, with the result that few navigation projects could meet the feasibility requirements.

Should this occur, the loss to the country would be incalculable. It could well be described as a case of the Federal Government being penny-wise and pound-foolish, for in the final analysis, the contribution made to the national economy by the development of our water resources far outweighs any consideration put forward by waterway user charge proponents.

In addition, the introduction of waterway tolls would adversely affect multiple-purpose water resource development since flood control, water supply, and other such benefits are usually dependent upon the inclusion of navigational benefits. If navigation is burdened with a user charge, the beneficiaries of all these other phases of water resource develepoment are also going to suffer.

Unfortunately, the imposition of waterway user charges could bring an early end to the orderly development of water resource at a time when they have never been more important.

The tremendous potential of the Red River, Ouachita River, Arkansas-Verdigris River, and White River basins would never be realized. This section of the country would be denied economic growth that it needs and deserves.

Nevertheless, the narrow special interests behind the user charge campaign are pressing ahead with their drive—regardless of its possible consequences on water resource development and the overall national economy. I believe that our States and Nation should long continue to share in the blessings which come from systematic development of our once bountiful but now rapidly disappearing water resources. I believe that the national interest demands adherence to America's established toll-free waterway policy. I believe, further, that it remains for those of us who are concerned over the future course of waterway development to recognize the dangerous and far-reaching implications involved in this user charge proposal—and do something about it.

This, as you may know, is the principal objective of the National Waterways Conference, Inc. It is our desire to create a better public understanding of the value of waterway development and to show how the general economy benefits. The economic impact of river development is by no means limited to transportation savings. Navigable waterways open up new markets, attract more industry, provide new jobs and payrolls, enlarge the public tax base, and play an important role in overall growth and economic development. These are sometimes called secondary benefits, but they are of primary importance in stimulating the general economy.

So what we are talking about here today is not confined to the area of transportation alone. Neither are we advocating one particular mode of transportation over all others. We enthusiastically endorse a strong national transportation system, and it is our contention that the Nation's waterways are an integral part of that system. We know what the availability of low-cost water transportation means to regional development, and we want to make sure that the waterways are not restricted or impaired. If waterway user charges should be imposed in any form or amount, the economic future of many areas of our country could be jeopardized. I do not believe that user charges on the waterways would serve the best interests of our people or of our Nation.

In a sense, low-cost water transportation is like money in the bank: you have to work to get it and you have to work to keep it. It is the responsibility of organizations like yours, and like the one I represent today, to remain ever alert to dangers lurking ahead. Let us hope that the development of this Nation's water resources, including rivers and harbors, is not slowed down one minute by restrictive Federal policies. It is up to us, I believe, to utilize our natural resources to the fullest extent possible, to put them to work for all of the people, and to enjoy the benefits which they provide. It is also up to us to jealously guard and preserve these resources and to resist any and all schemes which would impair their full potential and development.

NEED FOR LIBERALIZATION OF INCOME LIMITS UNDER VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION PENSION PROGRAM

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce H.R. 12427. My bill will keep the veterans' pension program current with changes in the standard of living in this country.

As you are aware, the amount of annual income of a veteran determines the amount of non-service-connected pension which he receives. The current earnings limitations in the law have remained unchanged since 1959. During this period there have been substantial increases in both wages and prices, and the figure established 7 years ago can hardly be considered realistic. During this 7-year period, in comparison, the earning limitations—retirement test—in social security has been liberalized 3 times and now is 25-percent higher than it was in 1959. I suggest similar treatment for veterans pensions.

H.R. 12427 amends the annual income schedule which determines the amount of non-service-connected disability of veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict and their widows and children. The increase provided in the schedule is about 20 percent. For instance, a single veteran would be able to have an income of $720 a year or less and still be entitled to a $100 a month pension. Under existing law, the pension is reduced when his income exceeds $600 a year. Similar changes are made in the other limits provided in the law.

My bill will take care of a distressing situation which has plagued every congressional office. As you are aware, the increase in social security benefits provided by Congress last year has had the effect of reducing the VA benefits of some 30,000 veterans and widows. On two occasions last year the Senate passed an amendment which would have exempted the social security increases for VA pension income purposes. This would have meant that these veterans would have gotten their social security benefit increase without any loss of pension payments. The Veterans' Affairs Committee on both occasions objected to the Senate legislation. Chairman TEAGUE pointed out that this approach was discriminatory in that it exempted income from only this one source and that it ignored the legislation passed in 1964 which exempted 10 percent of private and public retirement income for VA pension purposes. You will recall that the 1964 legislation was in anticipation of the social security benefit increase of that year, but the social security bill died in conference late in the session. Mr. TEAGUE explained on the floor:

> The first thing that is evident in this allegation of some pensioners that they have been mistreated is that the 10-percent exclusion is greater than the 7-percent increase.
>
> The second thing that need be said is that most of the people who are complaining today about having to take a reduction in their Veterans' Administration pension as a result of moving from one income bracket to another have enjoyed a higher rate of pension for 9 months, higher than they would have received had the Congress not enacted Public Law 88-664.
>
> Other additional factors need to be made crystal clear at this time. These are that in comparing 1964 with 1965: Every person gets more pension; everyone gets more social security; a few, approximately 1½ percent, got an additional windfall; everyone continues to get more pension and more social security than they got in 1964; everyone in 1966 will get more pension than he did in 1964.
>
> The amendment added by the Senate would protect forever this discriminatory windfall for these favored few 30,000 pensioners.
>
> It has been the consistent policy of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to recommend to the House, and I am glad to say that the Congress has followed this policy, of endeavoring to make uniform all of the benefits applicable under the pension and compensation programs. We pay these benefits on the basis of proven need and proven disability. If this amendment should be written into law it would be grossly unfair, in my opinion, to the thousands of others who are on the pension rolls who are receiving civil service retirement; railroad retirement; city, State, or county retirement; retirement from a teaching position; or retirement from one of the corporations that has its own retirement program. These programs are, as we all know, increased from time to time. Inevitably such change makes a man who is receiving a pension under the Veterans' Administration pension

system move from one bracket to another automatically when a change in his income occurs with the resultant reduction in most instances of his Veterans' Administration pension because of increased income from other sources.

It is the policy of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to periodically review changing economic conditions as they affect both pension and compensation. The bill which we are considering today can be said to have resulted in many of its provisions from changing economic conditions. Pension bills have been enacted such as the existing basic law on this subject, Public Law 86-211, in an effort to modernize this system and bring it up to date based on the economic factors of life. This has been reviewed in the immediate past through the enactment of Public Law 88-664, and in the 2d session of the 89th Congress, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will review the pension program again. However, I am sure that when this review takes place the committee will follow its historic policy in regard to widows and veterans of seeing that any new limitations which may be enacted apply to one and all on an equal basis. It is inconceivable to me that after reviewing such a program that the committee would recommend preference to a few. Rather it will make recommendations to treat everybody in similar circumstances in the same way.

My bill, I believe will break this parliamentary impasse. It is consistent, I believe, with the criteria handed down by Chairman TEAGUE in that it is nondiscriminatory—treating all veterans and all types of income alike—and is justifiable on the basis of the economic facts of life. On the other hand, it will avoid the reduction of the VA benefits of some 30,000 people which, perhaps justifiable in theory, is almost impossible to explain to them.

I urge early consideration of H.R. 12427.

TRIBUTE TO JOE YANCEY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today in the era of the Peace Corps, good-will ambassadors overseas, and the war on poverty and Juvenile Delinquency Control Act at home, there are persons who singularly have long symbolized all of these efforts by their professional activities.

Such a person is Joseph Yancey, outstanding and brilliant track and field coach.

Mr. Yancey, whom all New Yorkers affectionately call "Joe," has been coaching the Pioneer Athletic Club since 1936 which he cofounded with Bob Douglas and Bill Culbreath.

It is impossible to estimate the thousands of young kids who spent their summers with Joe developing their athletic skills on the track instead of getting into trouble on the streets. By himself, Joe was a personification of the success of our efforts to help young people become something in life.

But Joe was more than just a one-man juvenile prevention bureau. He was also one of the greatest good will ambassadors this country has ever had. Wherever he has traveled he has made innumerable friends for America. When the State Department employed very few Negroes overseas in responsible positions and there were no Negro ambassadors in the foreign service, there was a Joe Yancey, traveling around the world, spreading good will and proving by personal example what a great place this country is.

There are reports that the State Department does not intend to make future use of Mr. Yancey because he has allegedly made too many trips. I hope this is not true. The question can be posed: When should we stop utilizing the services of a good man as long as that man is still willing, able, and in the case of Joe Yancey, anxious to serve his country?

As one who has known Joe Yancey most of his life and been proud to call him a constituent, I am honored to be able to salute him today. I would also like to read into the RECORD today articles from newspapers all over the world which commend Joe Yancey's untiring efforts in the service of the world's young people. These newspapers include one of the largest and most distinguished Negro newspapers in America, New York Amsterdam News and the Panama Tribune, the Ceylon Mainichi, the Jamaican Daily Gleaner, the London Sunday Pictorial, and the Ceylon Observer.

I also wish to read into the RECORD a commendation to Joe Yancey from the Catholic Interracial Council of New York when he received the 1952 James J. Hoey Award for Interracial Justice, the highest award the council gives yearly. A 1965 letter from a Department of State official commending Mr. Yancey on his dedicated work completes the record.

In this country, there are perhaps hundreds of Joe Yanceys who have given large measures of their lives to youngsters so that these same youngsters could go on to become useful citizens. In the final analysis, the success of these kids in later life is the best tribute that could be paid to Joe Yancey and a living monument to his good works.

[From the New York Amsterdam News, Oct. 23, 1965]

PIONEER CLUB'S JOE YANCEY "UNSUNG HERO"

Internationally famed track and field coach Joseph Yancey has been chosen by the Amsterdam News and Ballantine Scotch as their unsung hero for the month of September.

Yancey, coach for the Pioneer Athletic Club which he cofounded with Bob Douglas and Bill Culbreath in 1936, is looking for the club to have another banner year on the indoor track.

Born and raised in New York's Hell's Kitchen, Yancey ran for the Mercury A.A., Virginia State, and in Saratoga, N.Y., where he spent several years as a youth.

Although the U.S. Olympic Committee has not seen fit to utilize the coaching ability and experience of the soft-spoken Yancey, the Government of Jamaica, West Indies, recognized his talents and commissioned him to coach the island's Olympic teams in 1948, 1952, and 1956. In 1960 he coached the Bahamas and British Guiana Olympic teams.

Yancey has toured the world both as a lecturer and track coach. He recently returned from an 11-month tour of Latin America and the West Indies for the State Department, conducting track and field events.

The Pioneer Club, according to Yancey, is an organization of all races and creeds. The homeless club has aided many boys to walk straight, he points out. Among the graduates of the Pioneers are Reggie Pearman, Tom Carey, Roscoe Browne, Harry Bright, Warren Bright, Hugo and Richard Maiocco, Gordon McKenzie, Elliot Denman, and Meredith Gourdine.

The club practices nightly at the 369th Regiment Armory and at Macomb's Dam Park. Its members compete all over the world.

Yancey, who is employed by the Department of Internal Revenue, is also an undertaker like his father. One of his daughters is also an undertaker.

[From the Panama Tribune, Jan. 9, 1965]

YANCEY DOING FINE JOB FOR UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

(By George W. Westerman)

Joseph J. Yancey—plain "Joe" Yancey to track and field enthusiasts of four continents—is perhaps the greatest nonsalaried, globetrotting athletic coach and track technician in the world today.

This is not because the famous organizer, director, and perennial coach of the New York Pionner Club has circled the globe no less than four times, but because wherever he has gone he has preached physical fitness with marked eloquence and has shared with thousands the secrets of how to become successful athletes. It is also due to the fact that he has produced many champion athletes for U.S. Olympic teams and other international competition.

Mr. Yancey's track and field coaching assignments have taken him on extended trips as far away as Australia, Japan, Africa, Scandinavia, Europe, and the United Kingdom. In this hemisphere he has traveled widely in South America and throughout most islands in the Caribbean area.

He left Panama on Thursday after a 5-week visit among us giving demonstrations and clinics of his specialty, as well as lectures on athletics. Over 50 teachers of physical education with the Ministry of Education have benefited from his seminars and deep insight about athletics. He has now proceeded on his way to Trinidad, British Guiana, Barbados, Colombia, San Salvador, Paraguay, Uruguay. He came to Panama from Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and the Dominican Republic.

After achieving outstanding successes as a football tackle, basketball guard, half miler, weight thrower, and amateur boxer, Joe Yancey abandoned personal competition and turned to coaching youngsters. His keen appraisal of athletic talent, his fond attachment to sport, and his wide knowledge of athletics fitted him admirably for developing the careers of youngsters.

A quarter century ago he became an organizer of the New York Pioneer Athletic Club. While laying the groundwork for outstanding athletic development with this club, he spearheaded the movement of interracial cooperation in sports. Without endowments or any special pecuniary contributions, Mr. Yancey has made his organization into one of the finest athletic groups known throughout the United States.

He was most flattered when the Pioneer Athletic Club was once chosen by the State Department to appear on the "Voice of America" broadcast as an example of the democratic way of life in the United States.

Under his leadership the pioneers have achieved numerous track and field records.

Mr. Yancey's superlative work in the field of interracial activities has not gone unrewarded. Among his souvenirs are treasured

awards from the New York Track Writers' Association, the James J. Hoey Award of Inter-Racial Justice, the Lane Bryant 1953 Award, New York Press Club Award, Vulcan Society Award, Catholic High School Athletic Association Marion Award, Internal Revenue Service Brotherhood Award, and others.

In December 1940 Mr. Yancey entered the employment of the U.S. Internal Revenue Service. Repeatedly since then he has been granted leave of absence, upon the behest of the U.S. State Department, to serve his country as a goodwill emissary of track and field.

He reflects with an aura of pride upon his achievement as coach of the Jamaican Olympic teams of 1948, 1952, and 1956. It was his coaching that produced Jamaica's flying quartet of Herb McKenley, Arthur Wint, George Rhoden, and Leslie Laing, which clocked a new world's record of 3:03.9 in the 1,600 meter relay of the 1952 Olympic games at Helsinki. Rhoden and McKenley also set an Olympic record of 45.9 seconds for the 400-meter flat race. The performance of Yancey's Helsinki athletes who won five gold medals was said to be the most spectacular Olympic coaching job witnessed up to then.

In 1960 he coached the Olympic team for the Bahamas and introduced many promising athletes to the Olympiad competition. A few years before he was appointed national coach of Ceylon. One of his athletes won the high jump in the Asian games of Tokyo, the first Ceylonese to earn a gold medal.

This marks the sixth junket since 1951 on which Mr. Yancey has gone on behalf of the U.S. Department of State as a coaching specialist. Here, in Panama, he has won many lasting friendships for his country. No one with his engaging ways, his intimate knowledge of his specialty, and his capacity for hard work could accomplish less.

The Joe Yancey technique is not only on the track and field but is made to extend to all phases of personal human relations; hence his overwhelming success as a goodwill sports ambassador.

[From the Ceylon Mainichi, May 30, 1958]

MEETING THE PEOPLE—JOSEPH J. YANCEY, JR.

(By Stuart Griffin)

When lithe young Ethirveerasingham of Ceylon exploded over the crossbar for a new Asian games record of 2:03 meters in the men's high jump no one was happier than the Ceylonese coach who had brought the youngster to the peak of training perfection that made his record leap possible.

The Ceylonese coach is none other than a native New Yorker, an American by the name of Joe Yancey who has spent his illustrious athletic life in the shadow of great track and field champions.

Joe Yancey, the coach of the famed 1952 Helsinki five-man team from Jamaica—which racked up a fabulous five gold medals—is none other than the celebrated Joe Yancey, organizer, director, and amateur coach of the New York Pioneer Club.

BRINGS OUT BEST

Thanks to his calm coaching, his instinct for bringing out the championship best in an athlete, many a gangling kid has stepped into spikes and thinclads and distinguished himself in national and international competition alike. Joe Yancey, at 45, can look back on a mighty career, on the making of such as Andy Stanfield, James Gathers, Reginald Pearman, Lou Jones, Arthur Wint, George Rhoden, Leslie Laing, and Herb McKenley, Olympic champions all.

The career of this former football tackle, basketball guard, half miler, weight thrower, and amateur boxer is indeed a unique one. Athletics came naturally to a man whose father was a speed skater, whose uncle was a crack bike rider, and whose brother was the celebrated Bill Yancey of the probasketball "Renaissance Five."

But Joe Yancey, destined for greatness in developing other men's greatness, began life as an undertaker, an apprentice in his father's New York City mortuary.

But his amazing career as a coach began soon after.

The present revenue officer of the Internal Revenue Service of the Upper Manhattan district started up the "Sidewalks of New York" club—as the Pioneers are affectionately known—a track and field organization, built on interracial principles, which has grown to a squad of some 300 athletes.

The Pioneers are an amazing lot. Without endowments or large monetary contributions, without physical property, even a clubhouse, the youngsters—each of whom pays $5 dues per year—work out summers at the McComb Dam Park and winters at the 369th Field Artillery Armory at 142d Street and Fifth, in Manhattan. The focal point of the group is the development of interracial understanding, unity, and the democratic way of life, and the development too of a great track and field aggregation.

LANE BRYANT AWARD

Joe Yancey has done his job superlatively well, as the record book will show. A Catholic himself, he has been cited by the Catholic Interracial Council of New York in 1952 and given the James J. Hoey Award for interracial justice. He was the 1953 winner of the $1,000 individual award given each year by Lane Bryant for outstanding service to the community. And the father of three girls and mentor, sponsor, friend to thousands of young athletes was honored by the New York Track Writers' Association for his work as coach and citizen.

Always an unsalaried coach, Joe Yancey has helped the Pioneers achieve their great record; the winners in 1951 of the national indoor track and field championship; winners again in 1955 and against their arch rivals, the Winged Footers of the New York Athletic Club.

On leave of absence from Internal Revenue, and with a passport that reads "coach and lecturer," the Pioneer Club founder has lent his talents to the service of sport on almost every continent. In 1948, 1952, and 1956 he coached the Jamaica, British West Indies track team and was warmed by the stellar performance of the 4 x 4 100 meter relay team and its new 3:03.9 world's record. He has lectured and coached in Cuba, the Bahamas, Trinidad, British Guiana, England, Bermuda, Jamaica, and Ceylon. He was the first figure in sports to go abroad under the specialist program, Exchange of Persons Bureau of the Department of State, sponsor too for his present position as manager and coach of the Ceylon track and field team.

A man who fights for his boys, who has the respect of all for what as been called his "awesome devotion" to sports, Joe Yancey has a simple creed for his athletes.

SOMETHING EXTRA

"I never overmatch a man, and I never humiliate a man," he explains, "and I watch him mentally as much as I watch him physically. I get him loose, limber, alert, and relaxed, and I put him on the field with a little something extra to spare."

Brutus Hamilton, head coach of the U.S. track team called Yancey's Helsinki performance for Jamaica, "the greatest Olympic coaching job I've ever seen."

Under his vigilant eye, weight men perfect wrist flips and fast glides; runners are taught the graceful art of "floating"; jumpers exercise for bounce and stretch; distance men work on "kicks." Throughout, Joe Yancey stresses the eradication through hard work of weak points. "I never avoid a weakness," he says, "I work to get rid of it."

This idealistic man in 20 years has fashioned the "East's best track team," a team that even has a corner of Madison Square Garden named Pioneer Corner for it.

Said the great Swede Ingvar Bengtsson once: "How could I lose? When I went past that corner (49th and 9th Avenue end of the Garden) I felt a little bit of its spirit too."

The Pioneers have been called a state of mind, since the only property the club owns are the hundreds of trophies its athletes have won. On the verge of brankruptcy often, the Pioneers have been saved time and again by helpful hands, many of them Joe Yancey's own. Quietly, for he is that sort of man, Joe has contributed out of his own pocket, $1,000, $2,000, yearly.

UNIQUE STAFF

The staff is as fiercely loyal as it is unique. One man is a subway money changer, another a policeman, two others public school teachers, still another an accountant. Above them all is the humble and very dedicated ex-mortician and present Government official who has given his life to his ideals.

Married to Josephine Yancey, "a track widow" who heads up the home care program at the Bronx' Lincoln Hospital, Joe Yancey had to travel to Japan for a joyous reunion with his sister, Mrs. Thelma Green, wife of a serviceman stationed at Tachikawa Air Base.

But the man whose blue blazer glows with Ceylon's gold lion, bearing a gold sword on a field of red has friends wherever he goes. And with him goes his great creed, as a man, as well as an athletic coach, the creed that the human race is more important than winning a race, and that work such as that being done, along interracial lines, with the Pioneers, is of benefit to the community, to the country, and to its citizens.

[From the Daily Gleaner, Aug. 23, 1962]

JOE YANCEY, GOOD WILL AMBASSADOR

Joseph J. Yancey, a revenue officer of the U.S. Internal Revenue Service, stationed in the Manhattan, N.Y., office, and a foremost track coach is here to assist in the training of teams which are to participate in the Caribbean games to be held in Kingston. Mr. Yancey was given a leave of absence by the Revenue Service at the request of the State Department, to act as an American track and field coach.

A native New Yorker, Mr. Yancey has dedicated his life to interracial athletics. As a recognized American authority on physical fitness, and noted as a coach with an instinct for bringing out the championship best in his international charges, Coach Yancey has often been called upon by the State Department to lecture and coach abroad.

He has been spokesman and goodwill ambassador in the sports communities of Cuba, the Bahamas, Trinidad, British Guiana, England, Bermuda, Jamaica, and Ceylon, India. In 1956 he was member of the Olympic Committee for the American Olympic team.

Although he never made the American Olympic team himself, Mr. Yancey, who once competed with the Mercury Athletic Club in track and field, has figured prominently in the recent history of the Olympiads.

In the 1952 Olympic games at Helsinki, he was responsible for Jamaica "flying quartet" of Herb McKenley, Arthur Wint, George Rhoden, and Leslie Laing which set a new world's record of 3:03.9 in the 1,600 meter relay.

Mr. Yancey, founder of the New York Pioneer Club 26 years ago, spearheaded the interracial movement in the field of sports. He devotes all of his free time to coaching and guidance activities at the Pioneer Club, a track and field organization built on interracial principles.

Mr. Yancey entered on duty with the Internal Revenue Service in December 1940. He lives in upper Manhattan with his wife, Josephine, and three daughters, Josephine, 20; Michele, 18; and Yvonne, 17.

[From the London, England, Sunday Pictorial, Aug. 10, 1958]

JOE REVEALS HIS SECRETS

(By Vic Selwyn)

Big, tough, genial American, Joe J. Yancey, is a tax collector by profession—but he's also one of the greatest athletic coaches in the world.

Joe trained the fabulous Jamaican team that set up the world record 4 x 400 meter relay at the 1952 Helsinki Olympics.

They were Herb McKenley, Arthur Wint, George Roden, and Les Lang.

MEMORY

Lang was really a sprinter and coach Yancey had only 3 weeks to prepare them. How well he succeeded is in the record books.

Top American sprinters have passed through his hands. Men like Ed Conwell and Mal Whitfield.

He has trained athletes in India and Ceylon—all part of an inspired American scheme to spread good will through the medium of sport.

This larger-than-life character met our Brian Hewson for lunch the other day and passed on some of his secrets.

Yancey, who has a prodigious memory, reconstructed Hewson's recent race against Herby Elliott, in Cardiff, step by step.

At the time, he had no special interest in Hewson—it's just a gift born of his 26 years' experience as a coach.

Joe has a special training plan. People have written from all over the world asking for his building-up formula.

Under his oath of secrecy he passed it on to Hewson to help him in the forthcoming European games in Stockholm.

"I did it to give Brian confidence," says Joe. "That's what he needs.

"A coach must look after more than an athlete's body. The mind and the spirit must be in harmony, too."

Over the years, Yancey has built up a philosophy of running.

"Never worry about anybody behind you," he says. "Take it from me, they're there all right.

"There are two little men inside you when you run. One says, 'Isn't it a beautiful day?' The other says, 'Get on with it.'

"The brainiest people can be the dumbest runners on the track. Everyone can't be a champion."

BEHAVE

This Joe Yancey is more than a coach—he's a psychologist, too.

"Before a race, my athletes like to come to me. I just say a small thing to them.

"Anything, even 'keep straight in your lane.' It helps. They feel they know now what to do.

"Once they put a troublemaker in a team I was taking abroad," relates Joe.

"As we walked up the plane gangway I turned to him and said, 'There's no psychiatrist with this party—just behave yourself.' He did."

Believe it or not, but there's no reason why all our top athletes—and our coaches—should not have the benefit of Yancey's experience—free, gratis and for nothing.

PIONEERS

All the Amateur Athletics Association need do is apply to 41 Grosvenor Square, London, W.1, to the office of the U.S. Information Service.

There they can request the services of Coach Joe Yancey—or any other of the leading American coaches. And America pays.

Will it ever happen? Judge for yourself from the following quotes.

Comments British board team manager, Les Truelove:

"Why send missionaries to the converted? Surely we in Britain have pioneered athletics. We have given the sport to the world.

"True we can always learn something, but good coaches like Joe Yancey can best help the undeveloped countries."

On the other hand, Roly Harper, chairman of the AAA Coaching Committee, holds opposite views.

Roly knows our home coaches have to work on a shoestring.

Even national coaches, developing world-class athletes, can charge only bus fares when traveling to see their men perform on distant tracks.

When Harper heard that Yancey was still in England, he inquired if the American were available to lecture at the A.A.A. Loughborough Summer School.

Unfortunately, Joe will be on his way back to America after next week.

Yancey admits that, 4 years after he began coaching at the age of 19 he had the biggest break of his life.

He married a girl who today knows and loves athletics as deeply as he does.

IDEAL TEAM

Mrs. Jo Yancey is the assistant superintendent of nurses at Lincoln Hospital, New York.

She is studying for her advanced medical degree and lectures on public health.

Joe and Jo are an ideal team.

"Marriage is very good for athletes," says Joe, but only if the girl is keen on athletics.

"If she tugs the other way—the man's finished."

Joe reveals the answer to the question of why America doesn't produce distance runners.

"When they leave college they get married and quit running. They have no time to develop.

"England has a better setup. You have clubs, which people join for life.

"In America, most of the running is done at college. After that it's forgotten."

As I said a reluctant goodby to Joe Yancey, he left me with a typical crack.

"They voted me the most popular tax collector in the States," he said—"when I boarded the plane for Europe."

[From the Ceylon Observer, Apr. 6, 1958]

YANCEY: EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW—NO SHORTCUT IN ATHLETICS

Be proud of it. The man who coached Jamaica's 4 by 400 meters relay team which smashed the Olympic record at Helsinki, Finland, in 1952, Joe Yancey, will soon take our athletics in hand.

Lucky is the athlete who should be associated with this towering giant, both in physique and in coaching. He has turned out the world's greatest athletes, but his modest nature would not allow him to talk of them.

"Your athletes must remember that there is no shortcut to world class. One must give himself the full treatment—think and live like an athlete all the time," he told me in an exclusive interview.

Good, healthy clean living, repetitious work, keeping in conditions all the year round—in season and off season—these make the perfect athletes.

Joe Yancey is coach to the New York Pioneer Club, which made history in 1951 by becoming the first small club to win the championship in the 63-year history of the AAU indoor championships. This club had no clubhouse "except the open air at McComes Dam Park and the sidewalks of New York.

"We make our Pioneer Club athletes work 1 to 2 hours a day, 5 days a week. If it is necessary we train certain athletes twice a day" he said. Ceylon athletes could do well to keep this in mind.

Like to know the ways of Yancey as a coach? Arch Parson, the well-known half-miler who was coached by Yancey in the Pioneer Club has paid this tribute to Yancey: "Joe makes practice enjoyable. He's one of the team and yet he's stern when he needs to be; from the first moment you meet him, you realize that he's not a guy trying to use you and the team for his personal glory, but it's the Pioneers and an ideal."

HOEY AWARD

Good measure of our national athletic coach could be had from the citation made by the Catholic Interracial Council of New York when it awarded him the James J. Hoey Award for Interracial Justice for 1952.

"Less easy to state in bald terms but written large in the memories of his proteges is the remarkable effect of his work upon their character and later careers. Through association with Mr. Yancey, countless young men have gained a moral foothold upon life, and a considerable number have gone on to college and professional studies."

Yancey is versatile in sport—football, basketball, amateur boxing, and athletics—as much as he is broad in outlook. He is hoping to meet as many people as possible, acquaint himself and coach as many young athletes as he could.

"While I am here I shall endeavor with everything in my power to assist raising the track and field athletics standards of Ceylon," he added.

Though he has met only a few since he arrived in Ceylon last Tuesday, he appears to be happy in Ceylon. "For 6 years Ceylon has been trying to get me—and here am I in Ceylon," he cried out in glee.

At the 1952 Olympics, in Helsinki, Finland, Ceylon's team manager, Mr. W. H. D. Perera, made the first approach. Then the Asia Foundation made a specific request for Joe Yancey to come over as Ceylon's coach. But his work in the Internal Revenue prevented him going out on long leave. In 1956 at the Melbourne Olympics, Ceylon's chef-de-mission, Mr. Julian Grero, invited him. Last year Mr. Dalton A. V. Rabot while in the United States as a scholarship, finally persuaded him to make the trip.

Messrs. Rabot and Grero, who were with me, while I talked to Joe Yancey asked him his opinion about the program of work Dr. H. S. R. Goonawardene, assistant director (physical education) was doing and had planned to do to help raise the standards of the village athlete, as set out in the Ceylon Observer under the heading "Be Ready To Salute the Village Athlete."

"It's an excellent idea and should be encouraged. And Ceylon certainly needs a national sports coach. Every other country has."

CATHOLIC INTERRACIAL COUNCIL OF NEW YORK

Countless words are lavished on how to save our youth from the evil influences that crowd in upon them at the most impressionable period of their lives. Home, church, and school have each their say, yet all they can do may be frustrated unless a young man is acquainted with a strong and helpful personality to guide and counsel him in his active social and recreational life.

In the person of today's recipient we honor just such a providential friend of the young people of our metropolitan community. His work is for all who can benefit by the opportunities he has provided, regardless of race, color, or creed. The secret of his work lies in his unstinted genuine affection, and the power of a noble and Christlike example.

Joseph J. Yancey is a founder and coach of the Pioneer Athletic Club of New York, the country's outstanding interracial track and field team. His club, which may boast of many titleholders trained in city parks and armories, won the American Athletic Union championships in 1951. He has toured Europe and Latin America with American interracial teams. In 1952 he coached the Jamaica, British West Indies, team at the Olympics in Helsinki, Finland.

Less easy to state in bald terms, but written large in the memories of his proteges, is the

remarkable effect of his work upon their character and later careers. Through association with Mr. Yancey, countless young men have gained a moral foothold upon life, and a considerable number have gone on to college and professional studies.

Joseph J. Yancey, loyal friend of youth and pioneer worker for high Christian ideals in a unified community, the Catholic Interracial Council of New York is happy to present you as the recipient for 1952 of the James J. Hoey Award for Interracial Justice.

HAROLD A. STERNS,
President.

FLOYD HAWOLL,
Chairman, Board of Directors.

JOHN LA FARGE, S.J.,
Chaplain.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, BUREAU OF EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS,
August 30, 1965.

Mr. JOSEPH YANCEY,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. YANCEY: It was a pleasure having you in the office last week to tell us about your extended trip to Latin America. I am writing at this time to thank you again for the fine work you did for the American specialists program.

We now consider you something of a veteran, for you have been abroad under our program a number of times. In view of your splendid accomplishments in the past we had no doubt that this latest trip would be successful also. Nevertheless, we were still delighted at the laudatory reports of your work that have come in from our Embassies. The reports repeatedly speak of your high professional competence and your friendly, pleasant personality. We are advised that you were very popular with coaches and athletes alike, and that in addition to refreshing track and field knowledge, you also imparted a good deal of new information to the people with whom you worked. The general feeling of the posts may be summed up by the comment from the Embassy in San Salvador which stated: "We would be glad to have him back any time, and heartily recommend him to other posts."

It was indeed generous of you to take such a long leave of absence from the Internal Revenue Service in order to make the Latin American trip. We are most appreciative of your time and effort in so successfully promoting good will toward our country, and we hope you have the feeling of satisfaction that comes with the knowledge of a job well done.

Sincerely yours,

PAXTON B. JOHNSON,
Program Officer, Division for Americans, Abroad.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, as in years past, I once again pay tribute with my colleagues to the Ukrainian people on the anniversary of their independence, celebrated last week. This, of course, represents a hope rather than a fact. For in fact, the Ukrainian people, independent culturally and in spirit, are not the masters of their house. Their struggle over the years to live as a free nation has magnified their cause to freedom loving peoples of the world; their indomitable faith in a world torn by a lack of faith is a superb demonstration that tyranny, in whatever brutal form it manifests itself, cannot conquer the soul of a nation and its people.

The Ukraine, so rich in natural resources, is richer still in that intangible natural resource of human courage under the unobscured overtness of human oppression. This anniversary commemorating the Ukrainian declaration of independence 48 years ago, so valiantly fought for, so long awaited, and so short lived, represents a dream as old as man and one which we can honestly share. For them, as for us, it is an occasion to rededicate ourselves to the ancient proposition on the equality of man.

GI BILL FOR GOOD

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Mr. Speaker, in lieu of the current state of world affairs and the sacrifices our servicemen are being called upon to make, I believe it is important for the Federal Government to provide a plan under which veterans who have served in the Armed Forces will be eligible for educational assistance, death and disability compensation, farm, home, and business loans.

We need only cite the GI bills covering World War II and Korean war veterans to see that they actually saved the United States money. Veterans who availed themselves of these programs—including myself—have raised their income and educational levels. As a result, our society as a whole has improved. The old GI Bill of Rights cost the Government $14.5 billion. However, the persons who took advantage of this bill are now better educated and are returning higher taxes to the U.S. coffers at a rate expected to pay back the amount twice and possibly three times over in the course of a lifetime.

Our draft law is necessary but it does require these young men to serve on active duty in the Armed Forces for a required period of time. These young men have been called upon to make the personal sacrifices associated with military service; yet they have been denied the readjustment aids so vitally needed to help them catch up with those of their contemporaries who were not in service.

Some Members of Congress favor a very limited so-called "hot war" bill but I think this falls short of our needs. The bill I am about to introduce will provide a plan which is coherent and equitable, and applicable to all servicemen without regard to where they may be directed to serve in response to the exigencies of the cold war or crisis situations.

A leading New Jersey newspaper, the Red Bank Daily Register, recently carried an editorial which I hope every member of this House will read. At this point I would like to insert into the RECORD the editorial which recently appeared.

GI BILL FOR GOOD

Long-stymied efforts to enact a new GI bill of rights are expected to succeed early in this year's session of Congress. The administration and its spokesmen in the House reportedly have relaxed their opposition to a measure already passed by the Senate to grant education and home loan benefits to men who have served in the Armed Forces since the Korean war GI bill expired in 1955.

The administration blocked the legislation in the past because of its cost, which is not a sound reason for opposing a program which would be as much in the Nation's interest as that of its individual beneficiaries. The change in attitude apparently arises from the political climate generated by the increasing hazard to U.S. servicemen in Vietnam, which is not the best reason for adopting the program.

There is no better argument for a new GI bill than the experience with the original one for the veterans of World War II. While it was conceived primarily as a way to reward the millions whose lives were interrupted and permanently changed by that great struggle, the Nation as a society got a great deal more out of the program than it put in.

In terms of dollars alone, the return in taxes from the men and women who used the educational provisions of the first GI bill is expected to total 2½ times the $14.5 billion governmental outlay. But more important are the services supplied by the doctors, dentists, teachers, lawyers, clergymen, businessmen, tradesmen, and thousands of others who got their schooling with the aid of the law.

It was the most extensive Federal aid to education program in the country's history, which makes continued carping about the "threat" of such Federal aid the more difficult to understand. Still, that is no harder to understand than arguing against a new bill on the ground that it would cost too much.

By the same token, there is no need to justify support for the legislation as a Vietnamese war GI bill of rights. Regardless of whether the servicemen fighting in the jungles there merit a reward, the return on investment is so promising that the Nation can scarcely afford to pass it up for its own sake alone.

Instead of passing a Vietnamese war GI bill—as there were GI bills after World War II and the Korean war—Congress ought to pass a permanent GI bill.

EUGENE MEYER PAVILION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, January 21, 1966, the Eugene Meyer Pavilion was dedicated at the George Washington University Hospital. The late Eugene Meyer was a great supporter of George Washington University, and as everyone knows, he was very active in the field of business, philanthropy and civil works. The pavilion is a wonderful tribute to his memory and represents the latest of medical equipment, which truly emphasizes the greatness of the late Eugene Meyer. The pavilion, with its excellent medical facilities, will

be of great assistance to the hospital itself, and patients will derive much benefit from the medical improvements.

The George Washington University honored Senator BIBLE and me by presenting to us two very fine plaques, which have been installed in the lobby of the Eugene Meyer Pavilion. On that occasion I had the honor to address the group that was assembled to dedicate the pavilion. In my extension of remarks, I include the speech that I made on that occasion:

Dr. Elliott, president of George Washington University, Mrs. Eugene Meyer, board of trustees, Senator BIBLE, distinguished guests and friends, born of pioneer stock, in the literal sense, Eugene Meyer was to become, in time, a pioneer in his own right, blazing paths of glory in several areas of endeavor, and establishing a record unsurpassed in the field of business, philanthropy and civil works.

Eugene Meyer's father immigrated from France to California via the Isthmus of Panama, settling in Los Angeles, in the 1870's. There he became successful as a commercial banker in the French firm of Lazard Freres.

Young Eugene Meyer was educated in the public schools of San Francisco and spent a year at the University of California, concluding his studies at Yale, from which he graduated in 1895. Six years later he opened his own investment banking house in New York City.

As an investment banker, Eugene Meyer proved an immediate success. In short time he had a seat on the stock exchange and was serving as director of a large number of corporations. When World War I began, he was called to Washington to serve as a member of the War Industries Board. In 1918 he was appointed a special assistant to the Secretary of War in connection with aircraft production, and reorganization of the Department of Production. President Wilson named him Director of the War Finance Corporation of the United States. A few months later he became Managing Director and remained such throughout the life of the Corporation. Retiring from that position at the close of the war, he was rehired in 1921 to fight the effects of postwar inflation, pumping credit into American agriculture.

Under President Coolidge, Eugene Meyer reorganized and held office as Commissioner of the Federal Farm Loan Board. Under President Hoover he became Governor of the Federal Reserve Board. In 1931, in the midst of the depression, he drew up the bill creating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the most useful Federal agency conceived under President Hoover. Indeed, it is history that virtually every financial emergency law proposed by President Herbert Hoover was suggested, in whole or in part, by Mr. Meyer.

In 1933, Mr. Meyer resigned his public office and bought control of the Washington Post, which under his guidance was to become one of the outstanding newspapers of the United States.

As a newspaper publisher, Mr. Meyer did not, however, retire altogether from the political world or forsake the other needs of the community. As publisher, he was not above serving as reporter on occasion, and as an editorial commentator. Meanwhile, he continued to serve as a philanthropist to his city and his country, which tradition he introduced as far back as 1904. In that year, at the age of 29, he donated a considerable amount to Yale University, his alma mater. The same spirit prevailed when, in World War I, at a personal cost of a large sum of money, he brought to Washington men who were vital to the war effort. Still later, in the same vein, he established the Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundation for the support of public services including university scholarships, some of which are awarded to the sons and daughters of public servants. The spirit of philanthropy was ever-present in him. Eugene Meyer was a great American. He had an intense love of his fellow human beings. He was truly "one of God's noblemen."

Many times over the years I have begun speeches by saying I was proud and happy to be wherever I was—and truly so. It seems too easy a formula for this occasion—though I am, indeed, proud and happy. More accurately, I am honored and quite humbled by your generosity.

The current revolution in medicine and the organization of medical care has become almost a commonplace in nonmedical literature in this last few months. Enactment of the medicare program, of course, is the cause of much of this interest. But medicare has grown out of needs and possibilities which, while more keenly felt and clearly enunicated recently than in the past, have been apparent for some years. It is well that the issue is now being dramatized for the American people—for the progress is real and imminent and will touch all of us.

Most immediately it touched you—doctors, nurses, all who staff the Nation's hospitals. For it is you who have urged much of the change in the kind of expert care now available and who will bring it to reality.

The challenges ahead are impressive. To a large extent they demand reconciling goals which—while not precisely conflicting—do have different imperatives. Medicine is increasingly and necessarily dependent on a delicate and complex technology. Now shall this be reconciled with a sick person's need for personal warmth—and our growing understanding of the effect this has on the course of his illness? We are beginning to approach abstruse and thrilling questions about the chemical nature of life and its processes. Can we dedicate the necessary energy and time to this inquiry and still act on our recent awareness of a hospital's broad human responsibility to the community it serves?

These and similar questions resolve into a single, central question: In the light of rapidly changing social, economic, and scientific conditions, how can the most productive relationship between physician, patient and hospital be achieved? The answers carry implications for personnel, administration, construction, research, education—the full gamut of medicine and medical practice.

It is particularly important that university hospitals approach the question imaginatively and vigorously—for they mold the physicians of the next generation and set the example for thousands of other hospitals. Washington is fortunate in having George Washington University Hospital. You are growing, inquiring, learning—expanding your concerns as well as you bed capacity, allying yourself with the future. You have much to be proud of and much to look forward to.

In the effort ahead of you, the Government will support, encourage, aid. Between us we can build a most productive partnership. This plaque is witness to the possibility. But the bulk of the effort—as it has always been—must be yours. Yours is the knowledge, talent and skill. Fulfillment of some of the deepest of men's hopes rests with you, and in this sense, you are doing God's work. I am honored to be associated with your effort.

In closing, may I say that I deeply appreciate and I am very grateful to all those associated with George Washington University in presenting the very fine plaque to me and to Senator BIBLE, which honor Mrs. McCormack and I shall treasure for many years to come.

VIETNAM

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, without the least hesitation I want to associate myself with the fine remarks made by the majority whip, the Honorable HALE BOGGS, yesterday. Additionally, I wish to commend him for the excellent contribution he made as one of the panelists on the CBS special news program of Sunday, January 30, when the question facing this Nation in Vietnam was discussed for 90 minutes.

In my judgment, President Johnson had no alternative but to order the resumption of aerial strikes against North Vietnam. All of us appreciate the sadness the President felt when he announced this action. He and his administration patiently awaited some sign of willingness on the part of the North Vietnamese to negotiate. Through 37 days of forebearance, not one flicker of interest was displayed. Instead rather blunt rebuffs were made to all overtures. The fact that the Vietcong and North Vietnam have rejected every effort for peaceful negotiation has clearly indicated that there is no possibility for peace at this time.

It must be said by any unbiased observer that the efforts of the President have been overwhelming in the pursuit of a peaceful solution. He has gone far more than the second mile. He has repeatedly committed the administration to the principle of unconditional discussions leading to the negotiation of the cessation of hostilities and a peace settlement. He has expressed readiness to utilize mediation efforts by United Nations members, and especially by United Nations Secretary-General U Thant. He has also proposed a billion dollar development fund for southeast Asia.

All of this indicates a deep sense of responsibility on the part of the President to explore every means possible to find a solution to problems in Vietnam.

With his announcement of today, the President has again forcefully asserted his sincerity of purpose by instructing Ambassador Goldberg to immediately take this problem to the Security Council of the United Nations.

If the request by the President for the intervention by the United Nations achieves success, we will all rejoice. I join with my colleagues in upholding the hand of the President in this matter and giving him my prayerful support.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY, CYO CONVENTION, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on November 13, 1965, the Catholic Youth Organization of Chicago presented their award "For God and Youth," to Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY for his outstanding work in support of the welfare of our Nation's young. In accepting the award the Vice President addressed the CYO Convention with a most stirring speech. With permission, I would like this speech printed into the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, CYO CONVENTION, CHICAGO, ILL., NOVEMBER 13, 1965

Your excellency, monsignor, reverend clergy, and my friends of the CYO, I am deeply honored to receive this award, "For God and Youth." I favor both.

You young people of CYO exemplify what is right with the youth of America. You are our builders of the future. You will uphold our Nation's best traditions and practice good citizenship and civic responsibility.

You are working, in the words of Pope Paul, to "create a world that is more humane by promoting the common good for all."

We are a young country. And we are getting younger all the time. The average age of the signers of the Declaration of Independence was 45. And that includes Ben Franklin, who was 70 at the time. Thomas Jefferson was only 33 when he drafted the Declaration.

Today the average age of a U.S. Senator is less than 58. The average Representative is about 50. And the average newcomer to the Congress is 44. The youngest Senator is 32; the youngest Representative, 25.

Today more than half of the electorate is less than 35. And by 1966, more than half of our population will be less than 25.

Our own President held his first Presidential appointment at 27 and his first political office at 29.

In America, more than in any other place in the world, a young person can rise as rapidly as his talents and energies allow him. Youth is no barrier.

Eight days before the terrible tragedy of November 22, 1963, President Kennedy addressed your convention in New York and urged you to "give the best you have to the United States because upon our people rests the burden of caring for our own as well as for millions of others around the world who look to the United States."

Today's young people—as students and as citizens—are meeting their responsibilities in carrying that burden.

A poll in a national news magazine recently asked American students how far they would go—beyond mere talk—to support a cause in which they believed. Some 93 percent said they would sign a petition—72 percent had already done so. Some 87 percent said they would contribute money—58 percent had already done so. Forty-three percent were even ready to go to jail.

More than 10,000 young volunteers are now serving in the Peace Corps. Another 3,000 have already returned after tours of duty. But most significant, more than 100,000 have asked to take part in the bold and imaginative experiment.

When VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America—the domestic Peace Corps) was launched, more than 3,000 inquiries were received from young people on the first day of business.

No fewer than one-quarter of the members of our armed services are under 20 years old.

Young Americans today live in a world that has the capacity to destroy itself. And they know that the detonators are in the hands of the older generation. Yet they have responded not by turning selfishly inward, but by personal involvement in the world around them. They have, far better than the older generation, grasped the facts of our time.

We no longer live safe in our continental refuge. There is no place to hide. There is no security in isolation.

While our Nation enjoys the greatest prosperity in history, and possesses unequaled power, we also live in mounting danger and uncertainty.

The world is filled with disorder, violent change, yes, revolution.

We must face the fact that there are modern weapons which can destroy the civilized world in a half-hour's time.

We must face the fact that two-thirds of the world is poor, hungry, and sick—and the gap between the rich nations and the poor nations widens each year. These restless, poor and yet proud people demand, by whatever means, something better. This two-thirds of the world is the target for those who promise quick and easy solution to old and complex problems.

The globe is exploding with people.

We are engulfed in great waves of scientific and technological change which we do not fully understand and which can overcome us or save us.

We must master science and technology so that it may serve man.

We must learn the techniques of defeating the new tactics of aggression.

But we must also learn this truth: The mere existence of deep poverty in the world is not only unjust—it is an invitation to freedom's destruction.

And we must realize that this gigantic task of helping others to help themselves, of resisting aggression and protecting freedom can only be sustained in America, the leader of free nations, is powerful and united.

I know that the vast majority of American young people are united in support of this Nation's policies of commitment to the world—and, specifically, our present role in Vietnam.

I am proud that CYO has endorsed them. Others disagree.

Criticism and debate are vital to a democracy. Nobody denies anyone the right to take issue with the policies of his government.

But the right to be heard does not automatically include the right to be taken seriously. The latter depends upon what is being said.

I salute those young people who not only dissent, but who by the logic and substance of their argument have compelled the citizens of America to pay attention to their views—to take them seriously.

I am also here to say, frankly and critically, that the behavior of some young Americans in recent weeks is not deserving of such attention.

The right of dissent is a vital factor in the health of our democratic order. But there exists an equal obligation for those with responsibility to decide—to act—to choose among conflicting opinions and available options. And these decisions demand a precious combination of courage and commonsense.

Humanity's plea is for peace. Pope Paul dramatized this plea during his historic pilgrimage to the United Nations. And he spoke for all mankind when he told the U.N. delegates: "War never again * * * If you wish to be brothers let the arms fall from your hands."

President Johnson has said the most important word in the world is "peace." We must pursue peace to the end of the earth or face the end of the earth.

But, my friends, we cannot have peace by retreating from our commitments and obligations. We cannot obtain peace by delivering up the people of small or weak nations to tyranny and terror. We cannot have peace by walking away from Communist threats or acts of aggression. Certainly, by now, we should have learned the lessons of the past. My generation witnessed the sacrifice of whole countries in an effort to satisfy totalitarian appetite—and only succeeded in whetting that appetite. The result was that war was not averted—it was made certain.

I believe that peace can be realized in the world. I think that nations can come together to settle their differences around a conference table rather than a battlefield. But the way to peace—the way to avoid the awful alternative of nuclear destruction—can never be to placate aggressors or fail to live up to our commitments.

The pursuit of peace is an act of courage and resistance to aggression is the duty of freemen.

I have faith in you and in your future. You are not complacent. You do not seek your own security. You are filled with a spirit that says: Change what is wrong by doing what is right, give of yourself, be involved, be committed, do not be satisfied with mediocrity—take part in life.

President Johnson has said: "We are grateful for the progress that we ourselves have achieved. We are pleased and we are determined to press forward—not for our gain and greatness alone, but rather for the gain and the good of all mankind everywhere."

It is in this spirit that I call on you today: Have no little dreams. Make no little plans. Reach for the stars. Do not be satisfied with things as they are.

Be remembered, as Toynbee says, not for crimes or even astonishing inventions, but as the first generation to dare to make the benefits of civilization available to all mankind.

And, finally, be firm, be persevering, be devoted to the goal of peace for all men, for all time.

For the pursuit of peace resembles the building of a great cathedral. It is the work of generations. In concept it requires a master architect; in execution, the labors of many. Make the pursuit of peace the work of your generation.

Do these things with faith and labor—so that men in future generations may live as freemen facing days ahead of peace and promise.

AMERICAN ORGANIZATION FOR REHABILITATION THROUGH TRAINING

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLIGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call to the attention of my colleagues an eloquent and perceptive speech by U.S. Supreme Court Associate Justice, Mr. Abe Fortas. He spoke January 23, 1966, in New York to the National Conference of the American Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training. His topic, as I read his speech, was that a new world frontier—people—has

opened and this Nation has an obligation to help them.

Pumping capital goods into underdeveloped nations is not enough. Justice Fortas said:

We have too many examples of substantial investments in capital goods, to which we have contributed, which have yielded negligible results because of the lack of trained people for industry and government. People are still necessary to operate machines; people are necessary to distribute their output; and people are necessary to utilize and convert their product.

This leads Justice Fortas to what I see as his main point:

The need, then, for education and training is acute. The great lack of the nations that are the generative spots of world infection is, I suggest, not only capital investment—perhaps not primarily capital investment—but investment in people—their health, education, and training.

The complete text of Justice Fortas' speech follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. ABE FORTAS, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, TO THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAN ORGANIZATION FOR REHABILITATION THROUGH TRAINING, COMMODORE HOTEL, NEW YORK, CITY, JANUARY 23, 1966

I am glad to have this opportunity to attend the National Conference of the American ORT Federation. ORT—the Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training—is a source of pride to all who believe in man's effort to help others to help themselves. ORT is a source of inspiration to those who believe that voluntary effort can achieve substantial results—the voluntary effort of those whose vision and generosity lead them to provide the facilities for self-help and of those who utilize those facilities.

Through the years ORT has demonstrated that this voluntary effort can be organized on a substantial scale and that its benefits will be eagerly sought and productively utilized in countries of diverse needs and points of view.

It is astonishing to me to read that in 1964, ORT had training units in about 20 nations—ranging from affluent countries like the United States and Switzerland, to nations beset with problems of poverty, like Morocco, India, and Iran. It is surprising, too, to read that ORT's enrollment was over 42,000; almost half being in Israel—the land of miracles.

This is, indeed, an accomplishment of stature. It would be notable as a governmental undertaking. It is spectacular as a private achievement—and particularly as an achievement financed in the main by only a segment of the population—the Jewish community.

ORT, I think, provides an example for the world of a fundamental truth—that first and last, world progress must come through the improvement of the knowledge and skills of people.

We are living in a remarkable age. More remarkable than our opening of new frontiers of scientific knowledge is the emergence of a new concept of human responsibility. We have exploded the atom; we have surmounted the earth's limitations; we have crossed the threshold of outer space; we have developed vast new instruments capable of delivering infinite death or incalculable life. These are fantastic developments in the saga of man.

But I suggest to you that the dimensions of these achievements are rivaled by the emergence and acceptance of the idea that the responsibility of a man goes far beyond his family, his community, and even his nation; and that the responsibility of a nation is more extensive than its people. Responsibility, we have begun to agree, is worldwide. However pragmatic and political the origins of our acceptance of the principle may be, its moral base and implications are profound. The principle will, I think, survive the special circumstances and factors that brought it about. It promises—painfully and slowly—to be the regenerative factor upon which a future of peace and human achievement may be based.

The fact is that a new frontier of the world has been opened. It is not a new frontier of land—it is more important, I think, than the new frontier of outer space or the new frontier lying under the surface of the sea—it is a new frontier of people. In this Nation it is the new frontier of millions of Negroes and poor people who have so long been a neglected national resource. In the world, it is hundreds of millions of people—Africans, Asians, people of Latin America—who have for generations waited, useless and unused, outside of the boundary of modern life and the comforts and opportunities which it offers in such abundance.

This is the new frontier. This is the opportunity and the challenge. In part, our new sense of responsibility is caused by the ferment on this frontier—our response to its rumblings and riots; and in part, our own action is itself a factor producing the demands of the heretofore deprived and neglected people of the world.

Acknowledgement of the need and obligation to aid these people is one thing. However, the translation of our willingness to help into positive action is quite another—and it challenges our ingenuity and statesmanship.

In his recent state of the Union report, the President indicated his intention to propose a shift in emphasis of our foreign aid program. It is his proposal that additional emphasis be placed upon aid to people—upon health and nutrition, and upon education and training. I welcome this, and I think that you who have been engaged in similar work through ORT will share my reaction.

I do not doubt that we must continue for some time to offer aid to less-developed countries for the purpose of capital resource development plants, machinery, and large-scale projects. But I firmly believe that the complex objectives of our aid programs can ultimately be served only by the development of the welfare and skills of people.

Because of the immediacy and urgency of the pressures—political, economic, and psychological—it has been necessary to emphasize large-scale and visible contributions to the nations that we have assisted. But ultimately, our objectives—both political and humanitarian—can be served only as and to the extent that these benefits are conferred upon people—the people of the beneficiary nation. For we seek and we must seek, a better life for them—a life in which hunger, disease, and the lack of opportunity and hope do not drive them to personal degradation—or to embrace the illusory promise of radical solutions—or to desperate action which is both self-destructive and a threat to the peace of the world. This objective can be achieved only by a much greater emphasis upon direct action—upon action directed, plainly, simply, and immediately, to feed, house, educate, train, and heal the people themselves.

I do not underestimate the difficulties; the problems presented by the fact that, after all, the United States does not govern or wish to govern these people; that whatever is done must be done by and through their own governments; and that, in many instances, their own governments are either profoundly uninterested in the welfare of their people or even profoundly opposed to improvement of their education and welfare. But we must begin—for the world will be neither safe nor pleasant until disease, misery, and degradation cease to be the fate of a majority of its population.

My friend, Arthur Goldschmidt, who has devoted many years to this problem as an official of the United Nations, has said that "there is no such thing as an underdeveloped nation. There are only underdeveloped people." Nations with virtually no resources—Denmark is an example—have managed to develop extraordinarily high standards of accomplishment and excellence. Israel, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, are examples of situations where, despite apparently overwhelming difficulties, relatively high stndards of living have been developed in a comparatively short time; and with those higher living standards has come sturdy and unshakeable dedication to the loftiest principles of civilized behavior.

These communities have achieved greatness, not because of natural wealth, but in spite of its absence. They have achieved greatness because they have had the daring and vision to invest largely in the health and welfare, the education and training, of their people.

In contrast, we have too many examples of substantial investments in capital goods, to which we have contributed, which have yielded negligible results because of the lack of trained people for industry and government. People are still necessary to operate machines; people are necessary to distribute their output; and people are necessary to utilize and convert their product. And at each of these stages, education and training are necessary—to do the work, and—no less—to organize and direct the flow and allocation of men and goods and services. Without the necessary skills and training in production, distribution and utilization, and in the mechanism of government, the seed is planted in barren soil.

As David Morse, the director general of the International Labor Organization has said: "We have learned the lesson that although new financial investment is of course necessary in developing countries, it may be ineffective or even wasteful, if there is not the capacity to use capital." And as he points out, the capacity to use it includes, primarily, education and skills in the labor force.

The extent of the problem can be illustrated by a few comparisons: There are more young men and women in institutions of higher education in the United States and the U.S.S.R. than in the rest of the world combined; and twice as many as in the whole of Africa, Asia, and Latin America put together. There are more than 3,500,000 students in technical schools in Japan and West Germany, but in all of South America, with a population almost as large, there are only 500,000.

The need, then, for education and training is acute. The great lack of the nations that are the generative spots of world infection is, I suggest, not only capital investment—perhaps not primarily capital investment—but investment in people—their health, education, and training. Studies by Walter Heller and others, based on the sparse data available, have indicated the somewhat surprising result that a dollar invested in education and training of people yields substantially greater returns than a dollar invested in capital goods—particularly in the less-developed countries.

So I say to you that the road which ORT has pioneered is, I think, the road to the future—to a world of peace and dignity. This is not just because of the material benefits that will be conferred. In this age of awakened hopes—in the day when resignation to slavery and degradation has been displaced by the insistent and forceful demand of those who have begun the painful ascent from the pit of despair—like the Jews of Czarist Russia when ORT was born. In this day it is idle to expect the hungry and hopeless to be peaceful and content; it is day-

dreaming to expect a peaceful world when there are hundreds of millions who live in the black night of despair.

We are, I think, embarked upon the road—the road of rehabilitation of the desperate and destitute through training for life. Salvation through the salvage of people is tedious and laborious. It is neither spectacular nor glamorous. But, ultimately, it is the only way. And it is the way that serves the ultimate value to which this organization and the decent people of the world are dedicated—the welfare of mankind.

I should like to leave with you these words of Edwin Markham:

"Why build these cities glorious if man unbuilded goes?
In vain we build the world, unless the builder also grows."

To you, who are responsible for this remarkable institution which has accomplished so much, I express my admiration and my best wishes for your continued success.

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. ZABLOCKI, for 10 minutes today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SAYLOR, for 30 minutes, today; 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:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Moss) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. NATCHER.
Mr. ABBITT.
Mr. CELLER.
Mr. BRADEMAS.
Mr. GREIGG.
Mr. HENDERSON.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, February 2, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1977. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1965, Tennessee Valley Authority (H. Doc. No. 373); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1978. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on possible savings from improving the management control of projectile fuse covers and other reusable ammunition components, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1979. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the transfer of three paintings to the Federal Republic of Germany in trust for the Weimar Museum; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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. MILLER: Committee on Science and Astronautics. A report on the National Science Foundation, its present and future; without amendment (Rept. No. 1236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ULLMAN: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4665. A bill to amend section 615 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax treatment of exploration expenditures in the case of mining; with amendment (Rept. No. 1237). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 9883. A bill to amend section 1373(c) and section 316(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; with amendment (Rept. No. 1238). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 11927. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to permit deduction by brokers of certain costs and expenses from rental collections on properties acquired under the veterans' loan programs; without amendment (Rept. No. 1239). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 11631. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the training and education of health service personnel; with amendment (Rept. No. 1240). 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. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 12418. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 12419. A bill to enhance the benefits of service in the Armed Forces of the United States and further extend the benefits of higher education by providing a broad program of educational benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and certain members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 12420. A bill to alleviate certain hardships to employees in the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 12421. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 12422. A bill to provide educational assistance to certain veterans of service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 12423. A bill to provide educational assistance and assistance in obtaining home, farm, and business loans to certain veterans of service in the Armed Forecs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 12424. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide education and training for veterans who served in combat or in certain campaigns after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 12425. A bill to amend section 104 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to contempt citations in the case of witnesses before congressional committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 12426. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit certain increased amounts received as a result of enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 to be disregarded in computing income for the purpose of determining eligibility for a veteran's or widow's pension under title 38; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 12427. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, in order to increase by 20 percent the income limitations imposed by that chapter on persons entitled to pensions thereunder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 12428. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Alcoholism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 12429. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 26, 1934, to authorize the overprinting of certain of such stamps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 12430. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to make discrimination because of age in emloyment an unlawful employment practice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 12431. A bill to provide educational assistance to certain veterans of service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.R. 12432. A bill to more effectively prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, sex, age, or national origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 12433. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to make veterans of service after January 31, 1955, eligible for hospitalization for non-service-connected disabilities on the same basis as veterans of a period of war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 12434. A bill to amend section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the dollar ceiling on the amount of combat pay received by commissioned officers which may be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 12435. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize certain grants to assure adequate commuter service in urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12436. A bill to amend section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to the discontinuance or change of certain operations or services of common carriers by rail, in order to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to give full consideration to all financial assistance available before permitting any such discontinuance or change; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 12437. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Nooksack Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 12438. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to permit Federal grants for equipment for the teaching of, and for institutes for teachers of, physical education, health, and recreation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 12439. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 12440. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1948, so as to provide that flagholder type headstones and grave markers shall be made available by the Secretary of the Army to mark the graves of certain deceased servicemen and veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.R. 12441. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 12442. A bill to amend chapter 207, title 18, United States Code, to prescribe procedure for the return of persons who have fled, in violation of the conditions of bail given in any State or judicial district of the United States, to another State or judicial district, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.J. Res. 818. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H. Con. Res. 570. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H. Res. 698. Resolution authorizing the Speaker of the House of Representatives to appoint a special committee to investigate, recount, and report on contested elections and campaign expenditures of candidates for the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 12443. A bill for the relief of Gonzalo Ramirez Villa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 12444. A bill for the relief of Boris Spaleta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 12445. A bill for the relief of Frank J. Kreysa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 12446. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo Cavitolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12447. A bill for the relief of Beatrice Pomilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12448. A bill for the relief of Cateno Villari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Time To Move Ahead on Resource Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a time we needed to protect and develop this Nation's natural resource base it is now. The protracted drought in the Northeast area of our country has concerned many about future water supplies.

Tremendous urban expansion has concerned others about the unnecessary waste of rich productive farmland for nonagricultural purposes.

Each year more than 1 million acres of agricultural land goes out of production to meet our growing population's needs for housing developments, highways, shopping centers, parking lots, and the like. Unfortunately much of this land is our best agricultural land. When it is sealed under concrete and asphalt, it is lost to agriculture forever.

The day is here when we must carefully plan our use of natural resources. For help in this field we need to look no further than the soil and water conservation districts that have almost 3 decades of this work to their credit.

In my congressional district 52 percent of the farmers, operating 53 percent of the land, are cooperators in local soil conservation districts.

Of the 10,500 district cooperators, more than 8,000 have developed basic conservation plans on their land.

Fifteen local groups, operating three-quarters of a million acres of land, have applied for help under the small watershed program so that they might properly develop their land and water resources for the benefit of all the people in the area.

I salute these people for the work they are doing and I urge others concerned about resource conservation to look to their local soil conservation districts for help and guidance.

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY L. GREIGG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, in December I participated in a program at Paullina, Iowa, at which the Des Moines Register and Tribune presented conservation awards to outstanding conservation farmers in my part of Iowa. Similar awards were made in all parts of the State to candidates selected by local soil conservation districts.

It was a rewarding experience to meet and talk with local conservationists and to observe their enthusiasm and their dedication to protect and improve the State's land and water resources. It is worthy of note that their concern is to develop these resources as an integral part of the economy and welfare of the rural community, both agricultural and nonagricultural.

My observations at the awards ceremony prompt me to express tribute to all of Iowa's soil conservationist district leaders and district cooperators who are doing such a magnificent job of caring for our vital natural resources.

Their programs reflect the thinking, experience, and needs of the entire community because all concerned were involved in the making of the programs.

Our growing population accompanied by expanded use of natural resources will demand more complex planning and broader resource conservation and development activities in the future than ever before. Soil conservation districts have accepted this challenge and are armed with the experience of over a quarter of a century They are equipped to deal with the broader resource problems of the future by recognizing them today, and I am sure they will handle them well.

The Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, February 8 will mark the 56th anniversary of the founding of the Boy Scouts of America and to this fine organization we owe an enormous debt. It is a debt that cannot be measured in dollars and cents; nor should it be merely acknowledged and summarily dismissed. For it is a debt of gratitude. It is a debt of appreciation for the solid and stable role that the Boy Scouts of America have played in the development of the strength and character in American youth which these days of our civilization so desper-

ately demand. Perhaps it is a debt that can never be completely repaid, but it is a debt that must be gratefully recognized.

From this great voluntary movement has come a tangible and meaningful contribution to our American way of life. In times of peace and in times of war, in the hours of our national disaster and in the days of our calm, the record of the Boy Scouts deserves our recognition and our fullest support. Clearly theirs is an example that organized youth can be, and often is, a vital force in strengthening the principles and ideals that are so much a part of our great American heritage.

Youthhood is a time of restlessness and change, and this is good. These young energies are among our Nation's greatest resources, and properly channeled and directed, they are one of our most effective means of insuring our dignity among nations, our progress both at home and abroad, and the liberty which we hold so dear. The Boy Scouts of America offer to all boys between the ages of 8 and 21 a constructive and well-planned program that serves as a stimulus to this splendid potential. It has been said that the story of the Boy Scouts is the story of 1 boy and the record of 33 millions of boys, for since its inception more than one-half century ago, scouting has presented a challenging appeal to men and boys alike. Men see scouting as a carefully structured means of encouraging character and citizenship in our youth. But the Boy Scouts of America is essentially a boy's organization and boys see scouting as a marvelous adventure. Indeed, the scout movement combines both these aspects with a well defined program of service—service to God and service to our country. Both in planned good turns and in emergency services, American scouts have proved true to this concept and who among us can enumerate the daily good deeds of individual scouts.

It was in 1910 that this fine organization was established in this country. It was in 1910 that the first charter to a boy's club was granted to Scout Troop No. 1 in Frankfort, Ky. As a Kentuckian, I am understandably proud and I take additional pride in the steady and significant growth of the Scouting movement in my home district, the Second District of Kentucky. Scout participation is at an alltime high and packs, troops and Explorer units operate in virtually every community, town, and city. Nor are their activities confined to local and national boundaries, for Scouting is an international movement and Scouting units can be found in every free nation of the world.

This year, the Scouting program—"Breakthrough for Youth"—will be brought within reach of the boys who until now have not had the opportunity to become Scouts. Today's youth need such influences, for we must never forget that these same young boys will be the men who are to safeguard the future of our country and in a large measure, guarantee the hopes of millions the world around.

For 56 years the Boy Scouts of America have served their God and their country and I wish for them a future of honor, of growth, and ever-increasing stature.

Over 75 Representatives Ask for Arms Balance in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD copy of a letter which was sent to Secretary of State Dean Rusk on January 26, 1966, requesting that effective measures be taken to strengthen Israel's defenses and thus maintain arms balance in the Middle East. Over 75 Members joined in signing the letter. Many of the Members, however, have not had an opportunity to see the text of the letter because it was not sent to every Member of the House for signature. Thus, I insert it in the RECORD so that any Member who wishes, may associate himself with this appeal, by writing in similar vein to the Secretary of State. The text of the letter follows:

Within recent weeks we have become gravely concerned over the new military preparations which the Arab states are making to implement their anti-Israel summit conference decisions.

As a result of these decisions the Arab states are spending millions of dollars to train new brigades and to equip them with new weapons, to be acquired from the Soviet Union and the West.

The arms buildup is a direct result of the policies of President Nasser, who has promised that a war with Israel is inevitable. Arab states acquire arms because they are encouraged by Egyptian promises or because they fear Egyptian expansionism. Consequently, Israel is compelled to increase her defense preparations at great cost to her economy.

All of us look forward to the day when the Arabs will decide to end their war against Israel and agree to enter into negotiations for a limitation in their arms and the attainment of a peace settlement. We wish that day could be today.

But, deplorably, the Arabs remain committed to destroy Israel. The United Nations has been unable to challenge this illegal posture, the Soviet Union pours new weapons into Egypt, Syria, and Iraq, and our own Government and the United Kingdom have recently undertaken to increase the supply of planes, tanks and missiles to Saudi Arabia and Jordan.

We are not complacent about any of these developments.

We are aware of our commitment to oppose aggression in the area. But we are mindful that the concentration of hostile and well-equipped armies on all Israel's frontiers presents a constant threat of an attack too swift to be prevented by external intervention.

In view of this continuing danger, we believe it is imperative that the United States take effective measures to strengthen Israel's defenses in order to deter those who menace her security. In our judgment the tactics of indirection pursued in the past are no longer adequate or appropriate.

Israel is a progressive and vibrant democracy, a friend and defender of freedom, with a message of inspiration for all the new nations of Asia and Africa. Peoples everywhere who share her commitment to democracy and freedom also share her anxieties for the future. They look to us to help her to defend herself and, at the same time, to do all in our power to bring about a lasting peace settlement.

We appeal to you, Mr. Secretary, to advance policies which reaffirm in every way our traditional determination to help all the peoples in the Near East to peace and a better life.

BROCK ADAMS, JOHN B. ANDERSON, FRANK ANNUNZIO.

WILLIAM H. BATES, ALPHONZO BELL, JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., PHILLIP BURTON, JAMES A. BYRNE.

ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, EMANUEL CELLER, FRANK M. CLARK, DON H. CLAUSEN, JEFFREY COHELAN, ROBERT J. CORBETT, JAMES C. CORMAN, GLENN CUNNINGHAM.

EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, DOMINICK V. DANIELS, HAROLD D. DONOHUE, KEN W. DYAL.

LEONARD FARBSTEIN, DANIEL J. FLOOD, JOHN E. FOGARTY, DONALD M. FRASER, SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, JAMES G. FULTON.

EDWARD A. GARMATZ, JACOB H. GILBERT, JOHN J. GILLIGAN.

SEYMOUR HALPERN, WAYNE L. HAYS, HENRY HELSTOSKI, CHET HOLIFIELD, ELMER J. HOLLAND, FRANK HORTON, W. R. HULL, JR.

HAROLD T. JOHNSON, EDNA F. KELLY, EUGENE J. KEOGH, CARLETON J. KING, PAUL J. KREBS, JOHN C. KUNKEL, CLARENCE D. LONG.

HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR., THOMAS C. MCGRATH, JR., RAY J. MADDEN, WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, ABRAHAM J. MULTER, LEO W. O'BRIEN, BARRATT O'HARA, THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., RICHARD L. OTTINGER.

EDWARD J. PATTEN, THOMAS M. PELLY, CLAUDE PEPPER, MELVIN PRICE, ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, THOMAS M. REES.

BEN REIFEL, JOSEPH Y. RESNICK, GEORGE M. RHODES, HOWARD W. ROBISON, JOHN J. ROONEY, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, EDWARD R. ROYBAL, WILLIAM F. RYAN.

FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN, WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, JAMES H. SCHEUER, RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, GARNER E. SHRIVER, ROBERT E. SWEENEY, HERBERT TENZER, SIDNEY R. YATES.

Address of Congressman John V. Tunney to the Annual Football Banquet at the University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on December 9, 1965, I had the great pleasure of welcoming to my congressional district in Indiana one of the ablest new Members of the House of Representatives, our distinguished colleague, Congressman JOHN V. TUNNEY of the 38th District of California.

Congressman TUNNEY was the principal speaker at the annual Notre Dame alumni football banquet, an occasion of great importance in my district. At this banquet, held at the University of Notre

Dame, students and faculty of the university joined Notre Dame alumni in honoring the coaches and members of the Notre Dame football squad.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the complete text of Congressman TUNNEY's splendid address on this occasion.

The text follows:

SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE JOHN V. TUNNEY TO THE ANNUAL FOOTBALL BANQUET AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME, SOUTH BEND, IND.

It is a great honor to be here at the annual Notre Dame football banquet.

Tonight I would like to direct my remarks to the football team. You are the ones being honored and deservedly so. The tribute is not being paid just because you had a winning football season; but in addition, because you and the teams before you have always played hard and clean. The tradition of your team is cloaked in honor.

The University of Notre Dame's reputation with the average sports lover throughout the Nation is based primarily on what happens on your football field on Saturday afternoons in the fall. With educators, graduate schools, and future employers, Notre Dame's reputation is based upon high academic standards; but the average sports lover looks only at your football team. Your president and your professors may shudder at the thought of this; it is a fact nonetheless.

Notre Dame's football reputation has through the years been superb. It has been synonymous with skill, sportsmanship and the will to succeed. It has denoted courage, persistence, and resourcefulness. It has imparted the faith that must exist within your student body that in victory, be magnanimous; in defeat, be honorable.

It is my belief that the qualities which make superior athletes and which enable these athletes to band together into a coordinated and effective team, are the same qualities which enable men to excel in their lifetime careers.

Nothing brings out the qualities of leadership, alertness, courage and aggressiveness more than athletic competition. Gen. Douglas MacArthur knew this when he had the following words carved on the stone portals of the gymnasium at West Point:

"Upon the fields of friendly strife are sown the seeds
That, upon other fields, on other days, will bear the fruits of victory."

COURAGE

Courage is a commodity which cannot be purchased in the marketplace. A person either learns to overcome his fear of unknown and future dangers or he does not. Physical courage does not always portend mental and spiritual courage, and it is of course, mental and spiritual courage which are so badly needed in every job and profession throughout one's life. It is clear, however, that the self-confidence that a person acquires by being able to withstand physical pain is an important component in standing up to life's pressures and remaining true to principle.

My father has told me on numerous occasions that the self-confidence and discipline that he learned in the prize ring have helped him in many instances of his subsequent business career. I know that it is not befitting true modesty to talk about one's father in flattering terms, but I hope as athletes, you will forgive this son of an athlete.

My father has felt always that he had his reputation to uphold in everything he did. He had been honored during his boxing days as a clean-living champion. He has never wanted people to say, "You know, Gene Tunney. Once upon a time he was quite a guy." I do not think that anyone will ever say this. Being conscious of having been a champion, my father has always tried to live like one and in more than one instance, he has given up a business deal which he felt would be profitable, but not entirely fair to all parties concerned.

Sportsmanship, like courage, is an essentional ingredient to genuine success on the playing field or in a man's profession. I am reminded of the statement of Grantland Rice:

"When the one great Scorer comes to write against your name;
He marks, not that you won or lost, but how you played the game."

The other day in California, a former professional football player who now holds a rather low-paying job as a shoe salesman was telling a group of high school students who had made Riverside County's all-league football team that they ought to forget all the stuff they had heard about sportsmanship—the only thing that counted was winning. He added, "Everybody loves a winner. If you walk into a clothing store after a National Football League game, the owner gives you, as a winner, a suit. He tells a loser to show his money before he even shows him what there is in stock."

Aside from the natural revulsion that anyone feels in having a man proclaiming such a debasing philosophy to youngsters, I wondered for a while if there were any pragmatic merit in what he was saying. I am convinced there is not.

HONOR

Whatever we do in life, however much money we make or glory we bring to our name, our satisfaction is dependent upon the value we assign to the accomplishment. Its value to us is influenced by what others think. Fortunately, honor is still glorified by most Americans. To reach a goal without honor, is to invalidate the whole purpose of the effort.

Success is sweet not only because of the personal gratification derived from the accomplishment, but also because of the esteem that others have for the victor. The saddest spectacle in the world is the man who rides roughshod over his peers in accomplishing his ends, only to find that at the moment the taste of triumph should be the most succulent, it has turned to ashes in his mouth because people hate the means by which it was achieved.

Perhaps the reason the speechmaker in Palm Springs has not been more successful since he retired from football is that too many people have heard his speech and do not trust him with anything more important than their footwear.

An analysis of the careers of great men in different walks of life shows several factors in common. These factors are found in the careers of great athletes. First, all have the desire to fight their way to the top and have developed their individual talents to the best of their abilities. Second, most have developed quite early in their careers a clear vision of their ultimate goals and have pursued these goals with dedication. Third, almost all have worked harder and longer than their contemporaries, and have persisted when others said that it could not be done. Fourth, all have had an inner faith that they would succeed. Fifth, most have had a unique ability to be honest with themselves while in the ascendancy and are capable of objectively evaluating their talents and deficiencies. Sixth, many great men, even though fiercely proud, have humility in their knowledge that for all their talent, they are beholden to their Lord for all they have.

It is clear to me that you members of the football team have a great headstart over most of your fellow students as you go out from under the shelter of university life.

LEADERSHIP

You have learned to fight and persist in the toughest type of competition. You have developed your leadership capabilities and have seen the value of sportsmanship. Your physical courage has been demonstrated week after week and your faith sorely tested. It is going to be your challenge and your duty to transfer all you have learned to your future vocations.

It can be fairly said that never before in history has our country needed men with your backgrounds more. In the era of technological advancement, urban sprawl, population explosion, social revolution, and confrontation between the West and the East, your particular leadership talents are in short supply. We need intelligent, fair-minded men in business, in government, in positions of community leadership.

There has been much talk in recent years of how America's youth is in revolution. More articles and books are being written now than ever before on the changing face of youth. Many authors deplore what is happening to movies, morals, and manners; and blame it on young adults and teenagers.

SERVICE

I believe that youth today are more committed to a sense of justice, altruism, and service than ever before in history. The record demonstrates this. More than 10,000 young volunteers are now serving in the Peace Corps and another 3,000 have already returned home. More than 100,000 youths have applied for service in this same Peace Corps to promote international cooperation, understanding, and aid.

When the Domestic Peace Corps (VISTA) was launched, more than 3,000 inquiries were received on the first day.

The fierce sense of justice that pervades many segments of youthful America is manifested by involvement in the civil rights movement in our country, dedicated work in political campaigns, and an increasing desire of many students to work with and help the poverty stricken during vacations. I sense an activist commitment to the promotion of social values today that did not exist as recently as 10 years ago when I was going through college.

I have a vague sense that university students today look upon the students of the 1950's as disengaged with the moral and social issues of the day. Whereas I recall that a person was really "in" if he was blase and slid along taking nothing too seriously, it is my understanding that the student of the 1960's is "out" if he is not aware of and interested in the great moral and political challenges of our time.

VISIT TO VIETNAM

I have just returned from Vietnam. While there, I had the opportunity to speak to at least 400 Californians serving in our Armed Forces. I met them as they were going into battle and as they were returning from patrols. I met them in supply depots and in hospitals. In every case, I would ask one question: "Do you feel that we are doing the right thing?" I can report to you that not one man said that he did not feel that we should be in Vietnam. All seemed to know that it was important that the United States turn back Communist aggression in this far-flung corner of the world.

One Marine lieutenant, 23 years of age, had only 2 days before had his right leg blown off in combat, said to me in response to my question as to whether or not our country was doing the right thing in Vietnam, "Congressman, if I had to do it all over again, I would do the same damn thing." It is quite clear that our soldiers understand that although the Communists are not invading our borders today that their assault against the freedom of the South Vietnamese people is a direct assault upon the future freedom of America.

The Communists believe that they will be able to take over the rich, technological nations such as the United States and the Western European countries by first taking over the underdeveloped nations of the world. They believe that by exporting revolution to these underdeveloped countries that automatically, one by one, they shall fall victim to Communist domination. The Chinese Communists believe that it is possible to equate the world to their own experience within China. They believe that once a guerrilla force captures the countryside, the cities will fall like ripe plums into their lap. They envision the underdeveloped areas to be the countryside and the rich, technological nations to be the cities.

According to the Communist theory of inevitability, there is no question but that one southeast nation after another must pass from independence to Communist allegiance. A necessary component of the Communist theory of guerrilla warfare is that in the in-between equilibrium stage of the struggle between guerrilla forces and governmental forces that the will of the government to resist is slowly sapped and eventually is broken. It is for this reason that the Communists look upon the demonstrations in the United States against the Vietnam war as a sure sign that America's will to resist is weakening. The leaders delude themselves into believing that a majority of Americans support these demonstrations. It fits into the formula that America's will should break and the Communists use every mental gymnastic to prove the validity of the formula.

My trip to Vietnam convinces me more than ever before that it is essential that we turn back Communist aggression and prove to them once and for all that national wars of liberation are not the wave of the future. I am also convinced that the young men from America, who have gone so far and who have left so many loved ones, are deeply, personally, and permanently committed to the defense of this little and embattled land. Their strong reaction against the demonstrations and the irritation with which they read reports that peace marches are being held back home is proof of their dedication and fighting spirit.

I know that we will win the war in Vietnam and my on-the-spot investigation has proved to me that we are winning the war now. The Communists are starved for a victory. They have not had a substantial victory over American troops for the past 4 months and nothing would give them greater pleasure than to be able to broadcast throughout Asia and the rest of the world that they were capable of defeating Americans. Our troops have superior firepower and training. They work in close coordination with our airpower. They have demonstrated that the helicopter can be a most important and effective method of increasing the mobility of troops. They have been killing 10 Vietcong to every 1 of our own lives lost in battle. In short, they have proved that they are superior soldiers.

THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN COMMUNISM AND DEMOCRACY

Assuming the war in Vietnam is won, what happens next in the long and titanic struggle between the forces of communism and democracy? Our will and our strength will surely be tested again at other times and in other places. We must be willing, we must be able to respond to the challenge. In the long and in the gray twilight period before our confrontation with communism is resolved, there will be many opportunities for the weak, for the uncommitted, for the selfish to say "Let's give up the fight in the international arena and return to fortress America." As is always the case in any long and strenuous engagement, there are some who are called but who fail to meet the test.

We can, I believe, be confident that our Nation's future is a happy one. In this generation as in all others in the past, we find talent, exuberance, and faith bubbling to the surface of our people, wanting, yes, demanding to be tested. A nation such as ours, endowed by laws such as ours, populated by people such as ours, with a spiritual commitment to democracy such as ours, cannot help in the long run to overcome all obstacles.

America, however, looks to men such as you here at Notre Dame for her future leadership. It is your obligation to serve her well.

Address of Representative Basil L. Whitener, of North Carolina, at Young Democrat Banquet in Gastonia, N.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from North Carolina, Hon. BASIL L. WHITENER, addressed the North Carolina Young Democrats on Saturday, January 29, 1966, at Gastonia, N.C.

In his speech to the Young Democrats he pointed out the necessity for supporting the President in his efforts to halt the spread of communism in southeast Asia. He also reviewed the record Congress has made in behalf of a better America.

I feel that my colleagues in the House will find his speech to be most interesting and informative, and I request that it be inserted in the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF BASIL L. WHITENER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, BEFORE NORTH CAROLINA YOUNG DEMOCRAT CLUB INSTALLATION BANQUET, HOLIDAY INN, GASTONIA, N.C., SATURDAY, JANUARY 29, 1966

I am honored to be with you this evening. As a resident of Gaston County and as Congressman of the 10th Congressional District I welcome our visitors to our county and district.

We can be proud that we are Democrats. We belong to the only political organization in the country that since its beginning under the great Jefferson and Jackson has represented every section of the Nation and all classes of our people. Ours is the political party that has room to accommodate all shades of opinion concerning matters of local and national interest. We can rejoice in the fact that ours is the party which does not demand conformity of opinion or action.

We can be proud that we are not a sectional party. We can take pride in the fact that the Democratic Party is the one political organization in our Nation that has a unity of purpose and a zeal for a better way of life for our people to which no other political party can lay claim.

The interest the Democratic Party has in the common welfare has been manifest since its founding. It was Jefferson who said that: "I consider the people who constitute a society or nation as the source of all authority. I am not among those who fear the people." The Democratic Party has never feared the people. The party has always found its strength in the American people.

On another occasion the great Jefferson said: "Those who labor in the earth are the chosen people of God, if he ever had a chosen people."

Another great Democrat and the other founder of our party, North Carolina's own Andrew Jackson, summarized his Democratic philosophy by saying: "In the full enjoyment of the gifts of Heaven and the fruits of superior industry, economy, and virtue every man is equally entitled to protection by law."

My friends, our party is based upon the political philosophy of those two great Americans. The political ideals and philosophies which they bequeathed to us form the foundation upon which rests our great party.

The American people have always turned to the Democratic Party in times of economic stress and whenever our national security has been threatened. In 1917, it was the scholarly Wilson who led the American people on their first great venture to preserve the principles of democracy for themselves and for our friends across the sea.

After the disastrous economic decade of the 1920's, the American people turned to the great Franklin Roosevelt. He led us out of our Nation's most devastating depression.

Under the dynamic Roosevelt the American people not only conquered economic adversity but went on for the second time to crush tyranny abroad. And when Roosevelt passed away it was another great Democratic President, Harry S. Truman, who successfully piloted the American Ship of State through the treacherous waters created by communism and saved Europe from economic collapse through the Marshall plan and the Truman doctrine.

The booming economies in Europe and the free governments in the Middle East stand today as spectacular tributes to the Democratic leadership of President Harry S. Truman. History will surely record him as one of our greatest Presidents.

Our late President John F. Kennedy halted the spread of communism in the Caribbean through bold military and diplomatic decisions. And today, my friends, another Democratic President is leading our Nation at a time when American liberties are threatened by Communist tyranny on many fronts throughout the world.

Let us consider together some of the efforts that President Johnson and our Democratic administration are making to halt the spread of communism. The American effort to halt the Communist subjugation of southeast Asia is the most challenging opportunity, either domestic or foreign, confronting our Nation today.

There are those who question why we are in Vietnam. The answer is very simple. Our troops are in Vietnam to preserve the political integrity of that small country and, by so doing, to halt the cancerous spread of subversive communism throughout southeast Asia, and, ultimately, into Formosa, the Philippines, and other areas.

Nearly 200,000 young Americans are in Vietnam today. Many others may yet take their places in the battlelines before the Communists can be brought to the conference table. Our commitment will be expensive. Our struggle will be hard and dangerous. Whatever the cost, America must be prepared to pay it if we value freedom for ourselves and for liberty-loving people everywhere.

Our President deserves the support and prayers of our people in his efforts to lead us along the difficult diplomatic and military paths of southeast Asia. As members of a great political party wherein all shades of American public opinion can be accommodated, we, of course, do not expect every American to agree with the diplomatic and military decisions of our President.

One of the glories of our system is the fact that we are a nation which tolerates nonconformists. When the right to differ with the policies of our Government and the decisions of our leaders is abrogated at home,

we will have lost our liberty as surely as if it had perished on the battlefield.

But in the exercise of our right to disagree we should not overlook the fact that if American efforts to contain communism fail, the privilege of free speech and our other treasured freedoms will disappear from the face of the earth.

The majority of the American people support our President. The majority of the Members of Congress support the President and will give him whatever he requests to bring about a just and lasting victory in the Far East.

My fellow Democrats, we are living in a period of economic opportunity and material growth without parallel in the history of the world. Our present progress in every field has been phenomenal. Under the dynamic leadership of our party we have in the past 5 years made unprecedented progress in every phase of our national economic life.

We have better housing, better schools, improved health conditions, more highways, and countless other blessings than was predicted as recently as 10 years ago.

For example, during 1965 American business spent for plants and equipment over $51 billion. In a 2-year period expenditures for this purpose increased over 30 percent. It is predicted that we will have a gross national product this year of over $722 billion.

We have a lower rate of unemployment than at any other time in our history. Employment has risen by over 6 million people since 1961. Unemployment has dropped from 7.1 to 4.4 percent during this period.

New businesses are currently being incorporated at the rate of 197,000 every year. We had only 13,000 business failures last year, and of these 11,000 involved companies of less than $100,000 capital investment.

Common stock prices, earnings, and yields are at a high level. Corporate profits, after taxes, have grown more than 80 percent.

Since 1961 personal income has increased more than $120 billion to an annual rate exceeding $530 billion. The factory worker's wage has increased 20 percent since 1961, and farm income has increased nearly 20 percent.

We often hear the allegation that the Federal Government is getting the greater share of revenue and that State revenue collections are suffering as a result. It is interesting to note, however, that in fiscal year 1964 our booming national economy helped to increase over-all State revenues by 31 percent to an all-time record of $45.2 billion.

Democrats have not lost sight, however, of other important facets of our national life. For instance, 1965 was the greatest year in the American space effort. A Democratic Congress appropriated $5,175,000,000 for our space program.

Our Ranger, Mariner, Gemini, Saturn, Tiros, and Early Bird achievements have been the result of our Democratic administration's drive to make America first in space. President Johnson said recently: "The capacity of this country for leadership in this realm is no longer in valid question or dispute anyplace in the world."

Our present Democratic administration has been aware of the great need to conserve our God-given natural resources. As a result, your Democratic 89th Congress last year passed the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, the Wilderness Act, the Public Land Law Review Commission Act, and, in addition, added nine new areas to our great national park system.

Your Democratic administration is about to conquer the age-old problem of fresh water from the sea. Twenty-three million Americans face a perennial water shortage in the Northeast. The success of our desalinization program alone can add untold billions to our national wealth through the development of arid agricultural lands and increased commercial opportunities.

My friends, I could enumerate many other areas wherein we have pushed on to new heights of achievement for a better life for the American people. A Democratic Congress authorized 3 billion additional dollars last year for Federal aid to the States for the construction of new highways, appropriated billions of dollars for many new programs to combat poverty, to improve the health of our people, and to further education.

It has been demonstrated in the legislative programs enacted in the past 5 years that the Democratic Party is still the party of promise and of accomplishment for the American people. Our party keeps its face turned to the future, full of hope and new ideas.

As an example of the concern that our party has for our people, our national administration has for the first time in our history made a concerted drive to control narcotics and to halt the abuse of drugs.

Ever mindful of the debt our Nation owes to our veterans, the 89th Congress has enacted far-reaching legislation for the benefit of those who have worn the uniform.

The first session of the 89th Congress provided more than $4.1 billion for veterans, more funds for medical care, medical research, compensation and pension than has been provided in any one of the previous 35 years of the history of the Veterans' Administration. Medical care funds alone totaled $1.29 billion.

Our party is making an impressive record in behalf of the American people. As we move along on the high road to a better life we must not overlook, however, the great responsibilities and obligations which have been placed upon this generation of Americans.

In our desire for greater opportunity for our people we must not permit our financial house to fall into disorder. We must bear in mind that a sound and healthy economy and a fiscally sound government are prerequisites to the future well-being of our people. We should not, therefore, demand more of the Government than we ourselves are willing to give.

The Democratic Party holds in its hands the future of our Nation and the future of the free world. We have not shirked the responsibilities history has placed upon us in the past. We shall not falter in accomplishing the great missions of progress and peace that lie ahead.

Young Democrats have a very vital role to play in the building of the great America of the future. I know that you will measure up to the high ideals of our party. In the Democratic Party all people have the best hope of our time and the future.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of the Scriptures, the words of Jesus, John 16: 33: *Be of good cheer; I have overcome the world.*

Almighty God, we worship Thee, humbled by mysteries which we cannot fathom and awed by a love greater than our hearts can know.

At this moment of prayer, we yield our spirits to Thy spirit to be taught Thy truths and to have them translated and touched to finer and nobler issues.

We beseech Thee to quiet our fears, making us to be serene and strong enough to stand alone and to face the day and its duties with new hope and joy, the meaning and measure of which we find difficult to estimate or explain.

Give us the courage to remain calm and steadfast in the midst of the darkness that surrounds us and fill us with a new discovery of Thy abiding presence.

In Christ's name we pray. 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. Jones, one of his secretaries.

THE PRESIDENT SHOULD HAVE POWER TO DEAL WITH LABOR DISPUTES SUCH AS THE RECENT NEW YORK CITY TRANSIT STRIKE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to give the President power to deal with labor disputes such as the recent New York City transit strike.

My bill would permit the President to block strikes affecting major segments of the Nation, in addition to his present authority to intervene in those threatening the entire national interest.

It will be recalled that the Johnson administration did not intervene in the New York transit strike on the grounds that the Taft-Hartley Act does not apply to public employees and that it can be used only in disputes involving interstate commerce.

My bill would overcome this barrier amending the act to permit the President to impanel a factfinding board in strikes affecting commerce of any type, imperiling the health or safety of any substantial portion of population or territory. It would also cover employees of publicly owned transportation, transmission, and communications agencies.

The bill would require the factfinding panel to make public nonbinding recommendations for a settlement, which is prohibited under the present law; and it would permit the President to block any strike while the parties bargained for 30 days on the recommendations.