

June 27, 1966

wards, not only to our citizens but to people the world over. It has strengthened our defense and contributed to the peace of the world. And we are still very early in the growing stage. The future is unlimited.

Our space program is certainly one of the most successful of the wide-ranging and constructive undertakings in our history. We cannot jeopardize its future or allow it to falter.

Satellites provide instantaneous communication over vast portions of the globe, promote our defense, and further the cause of understanding between nations. Weather satellites photograph cloud cover all over the world and make the meteorological information available to all nations. Scientific satellites return information about the universe that man has sought throughout history and enlarge our knowledge not only of the sun and stars and planets, but of our own earth and immediate environment. Man himself, in our manned space program, has at last ventured away from his gravity-bound existence.

The space program has provided work for 400,000 men and women working in 20,000 plants across the country.

In my own State of Louisiana, the development of the Saturn facilities at Michoud has proved of the greatest importance to the economy of the State. The plant there that had built boats and other war items during World War II and tank engines during the Korean conflict had largely been idle since 1954. It was acquired for NASA at no cost to the Government, and using it represented great savings in taxpayers' dollars. Today Michoud is a vital part of our program to reach out in space as far as the moon. Not only has it provided work for nearly 10,000 people, but it has attracted the kind of employees that today's economy, oriented to science and technology, requires. It has created thousands of other jobs for all of the service personnel required by this employment—for homebuilders, storekeepers, and schoolteachers. Space agency contracts amounted to more than \$355 million in Louisiana in 1965.

All of the Deep South has benefited from the space program—indeed, the area stretching from Houston, Tex., to Cape Kennedy, Fla., has come to be known as the Space Crescent.

Our conquest of space is a tribute to the economic and political system of the United States and the American way of life.

We responded to the challenge of Sputnik with Explorer I. We countered Gagarin with Glenn, Leonov with White, and Luna IX with Surveyor.

We have an edge on the Soviet Union in many regards. We have chalked up more man-hours in space. We have had a high degree of success with our planetary probes and scientific satellites. But we have no reason for complacency. Our position as leader of the free world demands that we forge ahead at a pace consistent with our needs and our resources.

President Johnson prepared an austere budget for the space agency. He pared

it down from an already tight request prepared at NASA after much painful scrutiny.

The request for funds for fiscal 1967 was \$5.012 billion—down \$163 million from the \$5.175 billion of fiscal 1966. NASA under this request is being asked to do as much or more than in the past, with less money. Less funds put strong pressures on the core of NASA's effectiveness, its dedicated personnel that man the centers and laboratories and facilities that make our participation in the space age possible.

The program as presented allows no margin for insurance, and no room for error. Surely no businessman would invest tens of thousands of dollars in a locomotive and then allow it to rust in the yards for lack of a \$5 part. Neither can we invest tens of billions in a space program and leave it to falter for the lack of funds.

We cannot put important elements of our capability into mothballs. We must use it or see it rust. Retrenchment puts us in the danger of seeing the Soviet program surge past us again as it did in 1957. If we cut back we may not be able to develop the scientific information and advanced technology required for the needs of U.S. industry and Government. Critical reduction in funds will not allow us to continue to energize large segments of the scientific community or bring our resources to bear on the critical problems of the modern world.

It is likely that any major setbacks at this point, or any cut below the present frugal level of funding, would require an assessment of all of our target dates, not only for the lunar mission in manned flight, but for a host of other highly important unmanned projects.

Weather information from space can be increased until it will be possible to program the earth's entire atmosphere on a computer and to make long-range weather forecasts for the entire world.

Some inkling of the importance of weather forecasting can be gathered if you consider that it has been estimated that the construction industry in the United States could save up to \$1 billion a year by using the weather information now available. Consider how much more can be saved as our weather-forecasting tools improve.

Multipurpose communications stations can provide TV and radio broadcasting to the entire world. Satellites can serve as control towers in space to handle the increasing speed and volume of traffic on the world's airways. Satellites show promise in such various areas as oceanography, studying water resources, and detecting diseased areas of forests.

I do not believe that anyone can predict or even imagine the uses to which our space program can be put to improve the lot of mankind.

We can move ahead with our space program toward these goals only if we make a prudent investment. And President Johnson's request for funds for 1967 is indeed prudent. The Congress would be shortsighted in the extreme if it failed to meet these minimum needs to carry our space program forward.

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

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

FREE ELECTIONS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a concurrent resolution identical to that sponsored by my very able colleague, Congressman ROBERT E. SWEENEY, to express the sense of the House of Representatives in support of free elections in South Vietnam and to urge the sponsorship of these elections under an impartial international body.

A critical look at the current situation in Vietnam can only relay to us a feeling of caution regarding the meaningfulness of the election in September. In any nation when leaders are chosen by the electoral process, there needs to be a basic stability, a culture which supports the ideals and mechanisms of representative government. In a time of internal turmoil, in a nation which has a previous history of subverted elections, it is naive to expect an election to be a fair reflection of the desires of the people.

International supervision of the elections in South Vietnam is of utmost import, therefore, as at least a partial balance to other factors jeopardizing this effort to create a more popularly based civilian government. A serious obstacle is evident in the events of recent weeks in Hue, Danang, and Saigon. The suppression and arrests of Buddhist leaders by the Ky government forecasts little likelihood that the dissent which exists will be allowed and expressed. Difficulties exist as well in the South Vietnamese election law. Candidates are denied the right to campaign as an organized slate. In some situations, the same representation would be given districts with 25,000 people as districts with 125,000 people.

Neither is Vietnam's past experience with the electoral process encouraging. Eleven previous times, the people of Vietnam have participated in elections which have been corrupted and manipulated to insure a particular result. To call for elections means nothing if what follows is a hollow mockery of the entire process. The inevitable consequence is a cynical distrust and confusion and, moreover, an understandable refusal to accept the results.

The opportunity lies ahead. Under the circumstances which I have discussed, there is no guarantee that the election will be a fair reflection of Vietnamese thinking. There is no guarantee that it will not. However, the probability of fair elections is enhanced with supervision by an international body such as

June 27, 1966

State and county	Number of hospitals	Number of beds	Average daily census	Percent occupancy	Percent medicare recipients	Rank	State and county	Number of hospitals	Number of beds	Average daily census	Percent occupancy	Percent medicare recipients	Rank
Alabama: Shelby	1	55	55	100.00	8.5	18	Illinois:						
Arkansas: Ouachita	1	156	156	100.00	9.4	16	Montgomery	1	68	62	91.18	16.0	35
Florida:							Rock Island	3	713	660	92.57	10.1	73
Okcechobec	1	25	25	100.00	6.4	15	Woodford	1	31	-29	93.55	11.4	92
Washington	1	52	52	100.00	11.0	19	Indiana:						
Georgia:							Clark	1	173	157	90.75	7.2	75
Bulloch	1	94	93	98.94	8.0	88	Hendricks	1	70	65	92.86	7.9	41
Camden	1	25	24	96.00	5.3	46	Jefferson	1	70	64	91.43	12.6	52
Cobb	1	280	263	95.00	4.8	50	Monroe	1	120	111	92.50	7.2	53
Gwinnett	3	86	86	100.00	7.1	10	Orange	1	36	34	94.44	13.2	29
Houston	1	53	53	100.00	3.2	11	Porter	1	230	207	90.00	7.2	90
Laurens	1	100	97	97.00	8.4	34	Starke	1	31	29	93.55	12.0	31
Wayne	1	74	73	98.65	5.8	32	Tipton	1	79	74	93.67	11.9	85
Iowa:							Iowa: Davis	1	74	68	91.89	14.8	65
Clarke	1	32	31	96.88	16.8	25	Kentucky: Letcher	2	118	107	90.68	6.7	91
Dallas	1	16	16	100.00	14.6	9	Michigan:						
Palo Alto	1	45	43	95.56	11.5	36	Oakland	3	712	672	94.38	5.5	23
Kansas:							Ogemaw	1	50	46	92.00	13.3	67
Allan	1	42	42	100.00	17.5	6	Ontonagon	1	37	34	91.89	10.7	63
Grant	1	37	36	97.30	4.4	4	Mississippi:						
Marshall	1	36	36	100.00	17.1	12	Jasper	1	30	27	90.00	10.0	44
Kentucky:							Pontotoc	1	60	56	93.33	12.1	51
Allen	1	46	45	97.83	14.1	22	Missouri:						
Caldwell	1	39	42	107.69	14.8	1	Grundy	1	52	49	94.23	20.2	37
Laurel	1	28	31	110.71	9.8	3	St. Charles	1	175	161	92.00	7.3	76
Louisiana:							New Jersey: Ocean	3	371	338	91.11	11.8	60
Sabine	1	32	31	96.88	11.8	20	New York:						
St. Tammany	2	104	108	103.85	8.2	2	Jefferson	3	444	414	93.24	12.4	64
Terrebonne	1	100	103	103.00	4.9	4	Putnam	1	51	47	92.16	9.9	38
Maryland: Calvert	1	67	64	95.52	7.9	7	North Carolina:						
Minnesota: Carlton	1	22	22	100.00	10.5	7	Avery	2	135	122	90.37	8.8	94
Missouri: Dade	1	26	25	96.15	18.2	26	David	1	35	33	94.29	9.0	30
North Dakota: Towner	1	26	25	96.15	9.3	50	Ohio:						
Ohio: Adams	1	54	54	100.00	14.3	6	Fayette	1	68	63	92.65	12.2	42
South Carolina: Bamberg	1	55	53	96.36	8.3	40	Hancock	1	170	155	91.18	11.0	62
South Dakota: Bon Homme	1	20	20	95.24	13.5	27	Jefferson	3	413	392	94.92	9.3	57
Tennessee:							Lucas	8	2,212	2,021	91.37	9.8	81
Cumberland	1	75	75	100.00	0.2	8	Summit	4	1,610	1,463	90.87	8.2	74
Monroe	1	40	40	100.00	0.2	14	Trumbull	2	479	442	92.28	7.9	55
Rutherford	1	111	109	98.20	7.7	21	Oklahoma:						
Sequatchie	1	30	29	96.67	8.7	49	Cleveland	1	100	90	90.00	8.6	58
Williamson	1	50	48	96.00	9.5	28	Garvin	1	26	24	92.31	10.9	29
Wilson	1	74	71	95.95	11.5	30	Puerto Rico: ²						
West Virginia:							Ponce	4	796	718	90.20	5.6	-----
Mineral	1	63	63	100.00	9.5	13	San Juan	8	1,482	1,375	92.78	5.0	-----
Wyoming	1	60	59	98.33	4.7	23	Tennessee:						
Wisconsin: Pepin	1	35	35	100.00	13.3	17	Bradley	1	152	140	92.11	7.3	80
Alabama:							Gibson	3	139	129	92.81	12.4	43
Franklin	1	74	67	90.54	10.2	69	Texas:						
Russell	1	128	119	92.97	6.7	66	Hopkin	1	65	59	90.77	16.1	48
Tuscaloosa	1	363	327	90.08	7.9	79	Webb	1	150	142	94.67	6.5	45
California: Siskiyou	2	148	137	92.57	9.4	72	Virginia:						
Florida:							Fairfax	1	282	258	91.49	2.8	68
Columbia	2	103	93	90.29	8.7	57	Prince George	1	80	72	90.00	2.9	95
Santa Rosa	1	81	75	92.59	5.5	70	Princess Anne	1	50	45	90.00	3.4	47
Georgia:							Roanoke	5	969	919	94.84	7.5	93
Glynn	1	162	151	93.21	5.9	84	Washington: Jefferson	1	57	52	91.23	11.1	86
Muscogee	2	436	395	90.60	4.7	89	West Virginia:						
Polk	1	46	42	91.30	7.0	77	Hancock	1	175	163	93.14	7.1	83
Rabun	1	32	29	90.63	9.7	78	Summers	1	85	79	92.94	11.7	71
							Taylor	1	52	47	90.38	13.6	61
							Wisconsin: Monroe	2	94	85	90.43	12.5	54

¹ Communities ranked in order of expected difficulty in meeting increased demands for hospital bed space and related facilities based upon the ratio of available beds and the percentage of medicare recipients in the community. All hospitals reported

average daily occupancy rates of 90 percent or higher over the past year. Lowest rank—greatest difficulty in meeting increased demand.
² Not ranked but listed as critical.

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

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

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

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

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

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

ANOTHER SUCCESSFUL LAUNCH IN THE FAMILY OF ORBITING GEOPHYSICAL OBSERVATORIES

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the period recently past has been a time of high adventure in space for the United States. We have been witness to another successful launch in the family of orbiting geophysical observatories—this one carrying 21 experiments out as far as 76,000 miles from earth to investigate portions of the earth's environment never before studied. We followed the flight of Gemini 9, shared the astronauts' frustrations and their triumphs.

I am sure you were as elated as I with the amazing success of the Titan III launch of our Department of Defense communications satellite system—eight relay stations in space from the power

of one rocket—and of the first Surveyor flight. The specialists working on the Surveyor project are reported to have estimated the odds against accomplishing a soft landing on the first attempt at better than 100 to 1. Yet it was achieved and Surveyor's camera has sent back more than 10,000 photos of the moon's surface. The detail of these pictures show objects as small as a twentieth of an inch can be seen. Remarkable as these pictures are, it is perhaps more important that Surveyor has validated the concept that is under development for a manned lunar landing and ends doubt about the adequacy of the bearing strength of the lunar surface for the manned mission.

These dramatic successes confirm me in my belief that the exploration of space is one of the most rewarding and exciting programs ever undertaken by the United States. It has challenged our imagination, developed our resources in manpower and material, and reaped re-

the United Nations and I urge that we take action to support as a collective body this course of action.

(Mr. EDWARDS of California (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. EDWARDS of California's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

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

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

ON THE PASSING OF EDWARD J. REARDON

(Mr. JOELSON (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have to inform my colleagues that last week Edward J. Reardon passed away. Ed Reardon was for many years a respected member of the House press corps and was a beloved figure in the Capitol. He possessed unusual integrity and was a newspaperman's newspaperman.

The core of Ed Reardon's work was fairness and honesty. He never broke a confidence and he never wielded a poison pen.

Ed reported the news in such a way that the public could always depend on the truth of his reports and on the decency of his motives.

He served the Herald News, which is published in the congressional district which I represent, faithfully, and I am sure that he will be missed by his many friends on the staff of that fine newspaper.

I personally have lost a dear friend whom I shall never forget, and whose memory I will always revere.

INDEPENDENCE DAY—MALAGASY REPUBLIC

(Mr. CONYERS (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the Malagasy Republic celebrates its sixth anniversary today as an independent nation. This day is indeed a proud and an important one in the colorful history of this island country. The people of the United States are proud to join with the many friends of the Malagasy Republic in paying tribute to the Malagasy people and government on the joyous and memorable occasion. To His Excellency, President Philibert Tsirana and His Excellency, Mr. Louis Rakotamalala, Ambassador to the United States, I wish to

extend warm congratulations and best wishes for continued progress.

The Malagasy Republic, formerly Madagascar, is not a new country to the people of the United States. Trading first took place between the two countries during the last years of the 18th century when an American buccaneer ship brought the first Malagasy rice to the State of North Carolina. Some 30 years later, our first American "ambassador", Trader Marks conducted a lively trade in Malagasy goods. His small trading operation was to herald the increased commerce between the two countries. In 1881, Malagasy and the United States signed a treaty of commerce and friendship. Today, the United States continues a close trade association with Malagasy. As Malagasy's second best customer, the United States purchases almost 18 percent of her exports.

However, the interest of the United States in the Malagasy Republic is not limited to the area of trade. Although, American investment is not large, substantial amounts of U.S. technical and economic aid demonstrates the strong American concern for this developing country. In agreement with the Malagasy Government, a strategic tracking and data gathering station, part of the American space program, has been built by the United States on Madagascar island.

The island of Madagascar, fourth largest island in the world and four other small islands comprise the Malagasy Republic. They are located in the Indian Ocean 250 miles across the Mozambique Channel from the southeast coast of Africa. More than 6 million people make up the 18 different ethnic groups. The Merina closely resemble the first non-African inhabitants of the island and are thought to have come from the southwest Pacific area several centuries after the birth of Christ. They hold leadership positions in the government and professions. President Tsirana belongs to the Côtiers, a coastal people who are an admixture of Arab and Negroid blood. In addition, the large number of Indians, Chinese and Indonesians who have settled in Malagasy make this island nation truly "Afro-Asian." The language spoken throughout the republic is of Malayo-Polynesian origin.

The economy of Malagasy is heavily agricultural with such principal crops as sugar, manioc, coffee, tobacco, and vanilla. Several disadvantages such as shortage of skilled technicians and low world market prices for Malagasy have restricted the expansion of the economy. To meet this crucial problem, the Government has initiated a new 5-year plan that emphasizes commercialization of agricultural production in livestock, sugar and coffee, and so forth. The United States in accordance with these goals will provide aid for agricultural expansion, police communications, maintenance of roadbuilding, and ground water development.

The United States is very proud of its long tradition of friendship with the people of Malagasy and we look forward to the continuing growth of friendly relations between our two countries. We are

also proud of the steady, deliberate progress that is taking place in Malagasy and again wish the people and leaders of Malagasy continued success and prosperity as they celebrate this historic occasion.

EQUALIZATION OF MILITARY RETIREMENT PAY

(Mr. WHITE of Texas (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining a number of my colleagues in introducing legislation to correct a gross inequity in the pay of men and women who served this country bravely and well and have now retired from the military service. My bill would amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of all members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service.

Under present legislation, Mr. Speaker, military personnel who retired prior to 1962 are being deprived of the benefits of three pay raises which have been given to the military since 1962. Certainly the cost-of-living increases which brought about this increase in pay scales have had the same effect upon retired military people as upon those who remained in service, or those who retired later, with higher retirement pay.

The legislation which I have introduced would recompute the pay of military personnel who retired without the benefit of these recent increases. Even though their service may have been as long, and their rank as high, they are now paid considerably less than those who have retired under higher pay scales. Many of the military personnel who will benefit from this legislation are veterans of both World War II and Korea.

Many of them have chosen my west Texas district as the place of their retirement, and I would like to join in urging the approval by this Congress of legislation which will show our appreciation in a most practical manner.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the Members of the House that tomorrow the continuing appropriations resolution will be called up, and also the four bills previously announced from the Committee on Armed Services: H.R. 5256, H.R. 14741, H.R. 15005, and H.R. 12615.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DE LA GARZA (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the remainder of the week, on account of death in the family.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, for June 28 through June 30, on account of official business.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Georgia), effective to-

June 27, 1966

day, on account of advice of Capitol physician.

Mr. NELSEN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of illness in his family.

Mr. McDOWELL (at the request of Mr. Boggs), indefinitely, on account of illness.

Mr. MAILLIARD, for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. HICKS (at the request of Mr. ADAMS), for June 27 and 28, on account of official business.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), on account of legal business in Erie, Pa.

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

Mr. ROUSH, for 60 minutes, May 28, 1966.

Mr. PATMAN, for 60 minutes, May 28, 1966; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALBERT, for 60 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SWEENEY (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), for 30 minutes, on June 29, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), for 30 minutes, on June 28, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MURPHY of New York (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), for 60 minutes, on July 12, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McGRATH (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), for 60 minutes, on July 12, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. SIKES in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHITENER to revise and extend his remarks on H.R. 15858 and to include a letter from the National Capital Planning Commission.

Mr. EDMONDSON and to include extraneous material.

Mr. MATSUNAGA and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM to include extraneous material in remarks made during debate on H.R. 14904.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. DOLE in two instances.

Mr. YOUNGER.

Mr. ARENDS.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. MATHIAS in four instances.

Mr. QUILLEN.

Mr. CONTE in two instances.

Mr. MOORE in three instances.

Mr. WYDLER in two instances.

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. CAHILL.

(The following Members and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LEGGETT.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN in two instances.

Mr. CRALEY in 10 instances.

Mr. CALLAN.

Mr. ULLMAN in five instances.

Mr. BOLAND in two instances.

Mr. HOWARD in five instances.

Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon in two instances.

Mr. SCHISLER.

Mr. MOORHEAD in six instances.

Mr. WRIGHT.

Mr. MORRISON.

Mr. DYAL in three instances.

Mr. ULLMAN in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. HÉBERT.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER.

Mr. McFALL in two instances.

Mr. TENZER in five instances.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. FASCCELL in four instances.

Mr. EVERETT in two instances.

Mr. KASTENMEIER in three instances.

Mr. LOYE in two instances.

Mr. O'BRIEN.

Mr. BOGGS.

Mr. MILLER in five instances.

Mr. PATTEN.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3005. An act to provide for a coordinated national safety program and establishment of safety standards for motor vehicles in interstate commerce to reduce accidents involving motor vehicles and to reduce the deaths and injuries occurring in such accidents; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3484. An act to amend the act of June 3, 1966 (Public Law 89-441, 80 Stat. 192), relating to the Great Salt Lake relicted lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies of the pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol"; to the Committee on House Administration.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3368. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve Banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 136. An act to amend sections 1, 17a, 64a(5), 67(b), 67c, and 70c of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13431. An act to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951; and

H.R. 13822. An act to provide for an additional Assistant Postmaster General to further the research and development and construction engineering programs of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1582. An act to remove a restriction on certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of California;

H.R. 3438. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to limiting the priority and nondischargeability of taxes in bankruptcy;

H.R. 7371. An act to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956;

H.R. 10721. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to improve its benefits, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12270. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the 12th Boy Scouts World Jamboree and 21st Boy Scouts World Conference to be held in the United States of America in 1967, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 28, 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:

2514. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting reports of violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes, and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1, pursuant to the provisions of section 3679 (1) (2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2515. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to except real property owned by the Government of New Zealand from the provisions of certain laws regulating the locations of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2516. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the fourth semiannual report on the problem of air pollution caused by motor vehicles, and

June 27, 1966

he will shortly renew our urgent pursuit of a treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons.

It is a source of great strength to me to know that, in dealing with this vitally urgent problem, I have the support of the United States Senate.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Mr. President, I have permission to release this letter, and I believe the release serves a useful purpose. I think the Senate should know, and the American people should know—indeed, the entire world should know—that this administration is committed unequivocally to a nonproliferation policy. I am very happy to confirm that commitment, and I am sure the Senate and the people of the world are happy to have this official assurance.

THE TYONEK STORY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, an excellent summary of the good fortune that has befallen an Indian village in Alaska, and the intelligent way in which its people have utilized it, is found in the current July 1, issue of Time magazine.

The second half of this premise—namely, the wise use of the financial windfall that has come to the people of Tyonek—is due in very large part to one non-Indian individual. He is Stanley J. McCutcheon, Anchorage attorney, former territorial legislator, and speaker of the house of representatives in pre-statehood days. As a boy, he played with Tyonek youngsters, had developed a keen affection for these long-disadvantaged aboriginal inhabitants, and later, as an attorney, had given them legal and other advice, free of charge.

When the prospects of oil deposits appeared, McCutcheon moved swiftly to foreclose the inevitable efforts of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to take charge and run the village's affairs which would have spelled the imposition of a wardship that he—and the villagers—considered undesirable and needless restriction on their freedom. It was his legal know-how that secured for the villagers the best possible terms for their oil potential. His efforts have been ably seconded by village chief Albert Kaloa. The gratifying results of self-rule under the enlightened guidance of a dedicated and competent adviser are visible in the fine new homes, the school and other projects for self-help and community improvement and in the evident hope and happiness in the Tyonek villagers' hearts and minds.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled: "Alaska: The Tycoons of Tyonek," be printed at this point in my remarks:

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

ALASKA: THE TYCOONS OF TYONEK

Perched on the rugged shore of Cook Inlet, the remote Alaskan community of Tyonek might well pass for an upper-middle-class Midwestern suburb. Its 60 houses (average price: \$25,000), all equipped with modern appliances and television, stand along winding, tree-lined streets. It has a glistening community hall, its own airstrip and guest-

house. Construction is under way on a modern \$737,000 schoolhouse; in the works are a power plant, fire station and store. Yet Tyonek's conspicuous prosperity is a remarkable recent phenomenon: until the last year or so, the Athabasca Indians who largely make up the village's population of 270 lived in dismal shacks, barely subsisting by trapping and fishing. Just a decade ago, residents recall vividly, donated food had to be airlifted from Anchorage to save them from starvation.

The sudden transformation was wrought by the prospect of petroleum deposits on the Tyonek Indians' 27,000-acre Moquawkie reservation. Even so, the ill-clothed, disease-ridden villagers needed pluck as well as luck to reap the benefits. They also needed the dedicated help of Attorney Stanley McCutcheon, 48, onetime speaker of Alaska's territorial legislature, who, as a young man, had befriended the Indians on business trips to Tyonek, and was determined to keep them from being exploited.

DOWN FROM KILIMANJARO

The villagers' first intimation of possible underground riches came in the late 1950s; in 1962, oil companies moved onto the Indians' ancestral hunting grounds with rigs and drilling permits from the U.S. Interior Department. The Indians, who had not been consulted, countered by winning a court injunction and \$15,000 in fees for the right to drill. But the funds were under the control of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and when the Tyonek village council tried to tap the account for needed improvements, the bureau was slow to respond. The Tyoneks were even more unhappy when the Interior Department in 1963 began soliciting bids for the long-range leasing of exploration rights on the reservation. Though the proceeds were to be held in escrow pending a decision as to whether the Indians legally owned the rights, Tyonek's elders went to court once again and succeeded in stopping the bids.

At one point in the dispute, Village Chief Albert S. Kaloa dispatched a telegram informing Interior Secretary Stewart Udall: "We are not savages but civilized human beings in need. If we were savages, we would have your bloody scalp in the potlatch immediately." Added Kaloa: "We suggest you come down off Kilimanjaro and attend to the needs of the people of Alaska as we pay you to do." Such badgering had its effect: declaring in 1964 that the Indians were the rightful owners of any mineral deposits, the Interior Department provided federal help in working out an economic-development program for the suddenly wealthy village. The windfall: \$11.2 million in exploration rights, plus royalties that could amount to \$50 million a year in case of a big strike.

What followed was a spending spree—but one plotted with care. Tyonek Business Manager Seraphim Stephan Sr. took a course in tribal-business administration in New Mexico. An outside accounting firm was hired. Carefully investing their fortune, the Indians bought into the Anchorage construction firm that built their new homes, are acquiring an interest in an air-taxi service whose owner flew countless mercy missions for them before prosperity struck.

TAKING THE HINT

Having won their struggle with the Federal Government with such heady results, the new-found tycoons of Tyonek were ready for other challenges. When their decision to construct a \$1,000,000 office building in Anchorage was blocked by the city council, the Indians pointedly went to Seattle to buy \$1,500,000 worth of home furnishings. Local merchants took the hint, pressured the authorities in Anchorage into issuing a permit for the building—whose first tenant will be the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Tyonek next outflanked an electrical cooperative that had been pushing for higher rates for serving the

village. By a stroke of luck, gas had just been discovered, and the village decided to use it to generate its own electricity. If all goes well, the Tyonek Indians may become Alaska's biggest power producers.

Even more promising is the emphasis that Tyonek elders have put on education and jobs. The village council authorized a \$5,000 grant for everybody on the tribal roll, specified that most of it had to be applied toward home construction—except when invested in schooling. Already three Tyonek Indians have enrolled to study oil-rig work in California, another has learned diesel engineering in Chicago. Moreover, every construction contract entered into by the village provides for the hiring of local residents, many of whom are thereby learning to be carpenters, plumbers and electricians.

In fact, the Tyoneks expect to fish and trap only for sport in the future. "We will always work," said Village Council Secretary Emil McCord, 33, as his two sons watched a TV Western last week in their new living room. "Of course, it won't be so hard."

EXTENDING BOMBING IS RISKY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, last Wednesday Marquis Childs, the noted columnist, wrote a most discerning column under the title "Mapping the Risk of Wider Bombing." He spoke of the President's press conference and interpreted its "warning that the war may be enlarged" as meaning increased bombing around Hanoi and Haiphong.

As Mr. Childs notes, the American public has not been told the nature and extent of the risk that has been involved, a risk which has been clearly spelled out by Mr. Childs. He notes the specific geography involved, and shows how the involvement may very well increase our encounters with Chinese planes, with resultant pressure on us to strike their Chinese bases over the border.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Childs' article from the June 22 Washington Post may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

MAPPING THE RISK OF WIDER BOMBING (By Marquis Childs)

On the top secret maps in the situation room in the White House are the target areas in North Vietnam. Because the President and the President alone determines the range of the American bombers from day to day, he studies these maps with the intense concentration he brings to every decision large and small.

His press conference warning that the war may be enlarged seemed to mean just one thing: Bombing will strike the industrialized area around Hanoi, the capital, and Haiphong, the port through which military supplies continue to come. This is what the Joint Chiefs of Staff urge with a growing insistence.

But a strike against Hanoi-Haiphong will risk, as has been clearly spelled out in a half-dozen memoranda passing across the President's desk, greatly expanding the war. That risk is one reason the President and Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara have until now resisted the pressure of the joint chiefs.

As with so many aspects of this undeclared war, the American public has not been told the nature of that risk. It is clearly spelled out on the maps the President studies with such care. They show three air bases close to Hanoi and three around Hai-

phong. The largest base, in the Hanoi area, is Phuc Yen, which can handle MIG-21 supersonic aircraft. Phuc Yen is 15 miles north-northwest of Hanoi and 81 miles from the nearest point on Red China's border. That means, at supersonic speeds, that China is only minutes away.

The other two fields are Bae Mai, three miles south of Hanoi, and Gia Lam, two miles south of the capital city. Each has a potential for taking jets, according to intelligence estimates.

Two air fields for the defense of Haiphong are Kien An and Cat Bi. Potentially they can take jets, but it is doubted that either field can handle them at the present time. A third big field, Kep, is in the Hanoi-Haiphong complex, 32 miles northeast of Hanoi along a railroad line. Kep can take jets and probably the advanced MIG-21s. A half-dozen times bridges on the nearby rail line have been hit.

The important fact, however, is that up to now not one of these bases has been hit. Before the oil and other installations in and around Haiphong can be bombed—leaving out Hanoi, with the potential of large civilian casualties—the bases and the related ground-to-air missile sites must in large part be neutralized.

But what happens at the first radar warning of an impending attack on the air bases? The MIGs take off for bases already prepared just across the border in Red China a few minutes away. From there they would have virtually the same capability for attacking American bombers and fighter-bombers. At that point, beyond a doubt, the pressure from the military would be turned on to take out the Chinese bases. And from the viewpoint of military logic, trying to secure the American strike against the Hanoi-Haiphong industrial complex, this pressure would be hard to resist.

That is the warning from those who fear the risk of an enlarged Asian war. They believe that if China received a direct blow, wiping out some of its air bases, it would feel impelled to retaliate with a massive reprisal. What form the reprisal would take they do not presume to say.

The administration line is that discontent over the Vietnam War reflected in the polls comes largely from the "hawk" side, from those demanding expanded bombing on the get-it-over-with-and-get-out theory. This coincides with growing uncertainty over the power struggle inside China. The speculation out of Hong Kong and Tokyo has a familiar ring. Reports of who's up and who's down sound like the theorizing after the death of Stalin as his heirs quarreled over the succession. Much of that speculation was egregiously wrong.

The thesis of China as a helpless giant may have a factual base. But to act on this assumption would seem to be indulging in dangerous wishful thinking. If a widespread power struggle is underway inside China, it could be resolved in favor of the hard-liners in response to an American attack on Chinese bases.

This is, of course, to say nothing about the reaction of the Soviet Union. The extent to which Soviet personnel man the air bases and the missile sites and train the Vietnamese pilots is an unknown "X," with the intelligence estimates of it a carefully guarded secret.

An end to the war by bombing has a popular appeal, as Republicans, notably Rep. GERALD FORD and Richard Nixon, are demonstrating. President Johnson, studying his maps, can feel the hot breath of the bombers—military and political—on his neck.

DOMINICAN "STITCH IN TIME"

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, there has been a continuing expression of editorial praise for the action President Johnson

took in the Dominican Republic last year.

The latest to come to my attention is in the Wyoming Eagle, which recalls that the President was criticized for sending U.S. troops to protect our citizens and frustrate a Communist takeover in Santo Domingo.

But now the Dominicans have held an orderly election and taken an important step along the road to recovery, the Cheyenne newspaper notes. And this, in the newspaper's opinion, adds up to a major victory for the United States and for the Johnson administration.

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

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

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) Eagle,
June 11, 1966]

STITCH IN TIME

There was a very important election the other day—in the Dominican Republic.

Joaquin Balaguer, a conservative, was elected president of that strife-torn Caribbean island in an election that was described as "unusually orderly for Latin America."

His election was seen as an overwhelming rejection of the Communists who have been stirring up trouble in the Dominican Republic for more than a year.

The election was a big step in the direction of political stability.

And it could point toward economic recovery.

Balaguer said his government would concentrate on economic reconstruction to get the nation back to solvency.

Meanwhile, it was announced in the wake of the election that, if all goes well, the 5,700 American peacekeeping troops still serving in the Dominican Republic may be withdrawn by July 1.

The orderly election and the sound rejection of the Communists added up to a major victory for the United States—and for President Johnson's administration.

It will be recalled that President Johnson sent American troops into the Dominican Republic in late April and early May, 1965, to protect U.S. citizens and to prevent the establishment of another Communist regime in the Western Hemisphere.

He declared that what had begun as a "popular democratic revolution" dedicated to democracy and social justice had been taken over "by a band of Communist conspirators."

After arrival of American troops, a cease-fire and "firm truce" were established in the revolt-torn island.

A few days later in May, 1965, the Organization of American States (OAS) voted to send an inter-American peacekeeping force to police the Dominican Republic. Under the resolution, the OAS would be in complete control of the peacekeeping force.

During subsequent months, President Johnson was subjected to considerable criticism for sending American troops into the troubled island.

But his prompt and decisive action did prevent a Communist take-over—and it did point the way toward the day when the citizens of the island, through self-determination, could reestablish a firm government—a non-Communist government.

In effect, President Johnson had given new meaning and new life to the doctrine laid down by President James Monroe on Dec. 2, 1823.

Certainly, no one could say at this point that all of the problems of the Dominican Republic have been solved.

While the election was very encouraging, it by no means guarantees there will be

no more turmoil. The Communists may continue to create trouble wherever they can.

And, even if political stability is achieved, there will be a tremendous job of economic reconstruction ahead.

But, as of now, the Dominican Republic is not another Cuba in the Western Hemisphere.

The newly-elected President will be inaugurated on July 1, and it may be possible for the peace-keeping forces to be withdrawn, leaving the new administration with complete sovereignty.

The Dominican Republic has taken an important step along the road to recovery.

And, although there are still the critics, it appears that President Johnson's actions more than a year ago may have been "the stitch in time".

JUDGE RUDOLPH I. MINTZ

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, recently one of the outstanding judges in North Carolina received an honorary doctor of laws degree from his alma mater, North Carolina State University. Judge Rudolph I. Mintz is one of the ablest legal craftsmen on the North Carolina bench and bar. He has been honored by his hometown newspaper as the subject of two articles in the Wilmington Morning Star of June 5, 1966.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wilmington (N.C.) Morning Star,
June 5, 1966]

JUDGE MINTZ: A SELF-MADE MAN

(By Jerry Tillotson, staff writer)

Judge Rudolph I. Mintz, Superior Court Judge of the Fifth Judicial District, is a self-made man, but he doesn't tell you this. Yet, it won him sufficient recognition for his Alma Mater to grant him an honorary degree.

You discover it accidentally through conversation with him, with his law cohorts or by researching his professional development.

In a career that began with his job as Brunswick County register of deeds in Southport, he has built himself a position as a leading state figure in educational and legal issues.

Last week he sat in a favorite chair in the study of his home. The room was notable for its distinctive personality reflected in the pipe-rack, the book-lined walls and a crystal jar of jelly beans on the mantlepiece.

Judge Mintz is a slender man of medium height. His face is a plateau of serene lines and deltas.

He was resting up for what he terms the most difficult aspect of his work: traveling.

"There's nothing glamorous about being a judge. It's drudgery but there is some prestige, influence and professional pride that goes along with the job." The smile he flashed took the bite out of his description.

He remarks on the importance of his work that "it's a sizeable decision to determine whether a man or woman retains a child or whether both parents keep him."

When he first started out as judge his reaction toward the plaintiff would shift. He said: "I wondered why a person did what he did. I had to restrain myself from making suggestions or prompting. This mental state didn't last long."

He came from a large family in Brunswick County, the second son of Harry L. and Minta Catherine Mintz. His career began when he entered State College in 1925 on a tuition scholarship.

A PROPOSAL TO SAVE OUR PARKS AND HISTORIC SITES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, an article by the distinguished architectural critic, Wolf Von Eckhardt, in the Sunday, June 26, Washington Post, points out the need for a new policy in highway building which will give adequate consideration to preserving parks and historic sites:

The highway builders won another important battle a few days ago in New Orleans with the approval of an elevated freeway—

Mr. Von Eckhardt writes—

But even so, there is cause for hope that the monstrous concrete ribbon that will recklessly slash through the city's picturesque Vieux Carre might be the last of its kind.

I hope that we may see the day when architects, city planners, and highway engineers can sit down and develop sensible proposals that will help ease our urban traffic problems without making our cities places which are fine for cars but unfit for people.

Toward that end I have introduced an amendment to the Federal Highway Act which would create a national policy that in building highways under the Federal aid highway program "maximum effort should be made to preserve Federal, State and local government parklands and historic sites and the beauty and historic value of such lands and sites." We need such a national policy now, before more irreplaceable parks have been ground to bits under the engineer's bulldozer.

Already New Orleans, San Francisco, Washington, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Boston, Baltimore, and New York have had cause to regret the loss of parks and historic sites to the onrushing freeways.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Mr. Von Eckhardt's article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CITYSCAPE FINDS HOPE: FREEWAYS RUN INTO A BLOCKADE

(By Wolf Von Eckardt)

The highway builders won another important battle a few days ago in New Orleans with the approval of an elevated freeway. But even so, there is cause for hope that the monstrous concrete ribbon that will recklessly slash through the city's picturesque Vieux Carre might be the last of its kind.

There is a revolt against the senseless indignity of urban freeways ruining cities and parks, and on the Federal level, at least, the highway builders are beginning to take it seriously. The revolt started in San Francisco and spread to other cities, notably Washington, New Orleans, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Boston, Baltimore and New York. But what troubles the Bureau of Public Roads is that the revolt is beginning to reach Capitol Hill—the most important place of all to a Federal agency.

Sen. JOSEPH S. CLARK (D. Pa.) told the Senate recently: "It is time that Congress took a look at the highway program because it is presently being operated by barbarians, and we ought to have some civilized understanding of just what we do to spots of historic interest and great beauty by the building of eight-lane highways through the middle of our cities."

New Orleans' Vieux Carre, or French Quarter, is, of course, just such a spot of historic beauty. For years the Louisiana State Highway Department planned an elevated

expressway along the length of this charming tourist attraction, cutting it and, even more disastrously, its charming Jackson Square, from the Mississippi River.

As elsewhere, study after highway department-sponsored study "proved" the infallibility of the highway department's decision. As elsewhere, the city planners failed to do any planning and therefore could not propose any alternatives.

It was a long and bitter battle that attracted national interest because of the Vieux Carre's significance as the legacy of French culture in America.

Those concerned with our cultural heritage felt badly betrayed last winter when the Federal Highway Administrator, Rex M. Whitton, approved the destructive expressway. He had just returned from a tour through Europe where, at the invitation of a private foundation, he and other Government officials studied means of historic preservation.

The pressures won out when the New Orleans City Council voted five to two to go ahead with the freeway. No alternatives were considered; no reprieve for further study was granted.

Whitton however, has said that he is "still open to any consideration to enhance the area." Just what that means, nobody knows, but it seems to hold some faint chance that the Vieux Carre can be saved. The Louisiana highway builders have rejected the idea of tunneling the expressway as infeasible and too expensive. As presently conceived, a 20 foot high structure filled with trucks and cars will blight Jackson Square much as the Embarcadero Freeway blights downtown San Francisco or the Whitehurst Freeway blights Georgetown's waterfront. Our children will not thank us for it.

But Whitton and the Bureau of Roads seem to realize that the battle of New Orleans may be their last victory. They agree with Sen. CLARKE that "we must find new and more imaginative ways to design urban highways and the necessary dollars to finance them."

A test of the Bureau's true willingness to find such ways is now imminent in Philadelphia. There, too, an elevated freeway was to cut a historic area—Society Hill and nearby Independence Hall—from the waterfront. Whitton seemed to feel that the highway builders had made all the concessions they could to beauty and sentiment when they agreed to some rerouting to save historic buildings and to depressing the freeway. The Philadelphia Planning Commission agreed.

But a committee of Philadelphia architects supported by some 80 organizations and no less than 10,000 individuals felt otherwise. The committee has drawn up a well-studied and documented plan whereby the ten-lane Delaware Expressway would be completely covered for six blocks along Society Hill. Thus city and waterfront would be united and the expressway cover would be turned into a handsome 15-acre park with room for playgrounds and other amenities.

Although he feels that urban freeways should enhance areas through which they run, Whitton is opposed to this much enhancement. He fears the expense and is worried about drivers who might feel unsafe in the tunnel and miss the view.

The committee retorts that on the basis of land acquisition cost, increased land values and tourist spending, the long-range economic advantages of the tunnel far exceed the added \$25 million construction cost. As to motorists, the committee asserts that an imaginative tunnel design with improved lighting could be both safe and attractive. It points out that a view from a trench is no prettier than from a tunnel. This is an interstate and commuter freeway and not a scenic recreation facility for motorists.

The question, in short, is whether the

highway builders will seriously consider and accept urban freeway design when it is offered. The American Institute of Architects is discouraged on this point. Citing the New Orleans elevated expressway as an example, AIA's president, Morris Ketchum, Jr., charged that Federal policies on the design of highways within cities are producing disastrous results.

He resigned from the National Advisory Committee on Highway Beautification because AIA could not be placed in "a position of tolerating, or even approving, policies of which it disapproves—policies which are also in direct opposition to those of President Lyndon B. Johnson."

Besides the official beautification committee, Whitton has informally asked eight leading city planners, architects and engineers to advise him on route location and urban freeway design. The group includes outstanding landscape architects Michael Rapuano, Lawrence Halprin and John O. Simmonds and architect Kevin Roche, an associate of the late Eero Saarinen.

The group is now working on a sort of white paper which will set forth design standards and ideas for a new kind of limited access roads in a city.

The group may also recommend a National Design Review board to assist state highway departments with a more creative approach. This thinking coincides with that of the AIA, which may, at its forthcoming convention, urge creation of an advisory task force on urban freeways. It also coincides with recent proposals in Congress, notably those of Sen. CLARK and Sen. CLIFFORD P. CASE (R.-N.J.).

The Bureau of Roads, meanwhile, is doing some hard new thinking of its own. A part of its \$20 million annual investment in highway research is devoted to urban transportation and design problems. Among the emerging new ideas is use of air rights over freeways and the phased redevelopment of entire city blocks in a combination of highway construction and urban renewal to provide housing for those who are displaced.

It is too early to tell, however, just how far and how soon more creative and constructive highway design will come about. Up to now, the state highway departments have largely ignored various missives from Washington urging them to be more responsive to their social and esthetic responsibilities and "to be more considerate of all human values."

Lately, however, the Federal highway builders have been using plainer language. Thomas G. McGarry, Whitton's special assistant, recently told a meeting of public works officials: "We can respond to our responsibilities out of our own initiative and our sincere concern for the public interest, or we can be dragged kicking and screaming to them by legislation."

SAIGON METROPOLITAN WATER PROJECT

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, over many months past, the deep concern which each of us shares over the course of events in Vietnam has been expressed in many different ways. While for the most part reports from that area have been anything but cheerful, from time to time a ray of sunshine does come through which is more than just an expression of hope. It is tangible evidence of the greater promise in store not only for South Vietnam, but for all southeast Asia when peace in that area can be secured with honor.

It is my pleasure to call the Senate's attention to the completion of a water treatment plant for the city of Saigon. On June 18th last, raw water began to

June 27, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

13741

He worked his way through school, holding a number of jobs which limited his time for campus activities.

Upon graduation in 1929 with a B.S. degree in civil engineering, he took a job with Bell Telephone Company of Pennsylvania until 1931.

He returned to Brunswick County to assume the duties of his deceased brother as register of deeds in Southport.

His constant association with lawyers in this job made him think of the possibility of entering law.

"It was in Southport that I got my first taste of law and I like it," the judge said.

He began to study on his own under the guidance of a practitioner and received much professional advice from other lawyers and encouragement from his parents and wife.

He married the former Mary Stuart Cranmer in 1935 and found an understanding ally when it came to talking law. Mrs. Mintz has studied law and has practiced it.

Because of his rigorous studying he successfully passed the Board of Law Examiners in 1939.

"I wouldn't advise anyone else to do it that way," he commented. "It's very, very difficult. A man interested in law today should attend a good school."

He developed his private practice at Southport from 1939 and was admitted to practice in the State Courts of North Carolina.

In 1940 he was admitted to practice in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

World War II interrupted his career.

As a reserve officer he went on active duty in 1941 to 1946 from first lieutenant to lieutenant colonel. He served as commanding officer on three bases in England with the Troop Carrier Command.

He resumed practice of law in Southport in 1946 and ran unopposed for the State Senate for the Tenth Senatorial District, composed of Brunswick and Columbus counties.

In 1947 he served in the State Senate with major committee assignments being the Appropriations Committee, Public Utilities Committee, Judiciary I Committee.

He was also active in the session which established the four-year medical school and Department of Health Affairs at the University of North Carolina and the initial appropriations for the State Ports Authority, and co-author of the "Truck Act."

He practiced law in Wilmington from 1947 to 1951 with the firm of Stevens, Burgwin and Mintz. From 1951 to 1959 he was senior partner in his own firm.

Governor Luther Hodges appointed him as resident judge of the Fifth Judicial District in 1959.

In 1960 he was nominated and elected without opposition to complete the unexpired term and in 1962 he was nominated and elected for a full eight-year term.

He occasionally hears from some defendant he has sentenced. "Every now and then I receive letters from prisoners who say: 'I've learned my lesson so can you cut my time in half?'"

Whether the men go straight after release depends on the environment, Judge Mintz says. "If they were guilty of felonious assault or a crime of passion the person usually goes straight afterwards; however, the person committing a premeditated act bears close scrutiny after release."

He notices that a basic and outstanding aspect of crime in general is the widespread disrespect toward law and order across the Nation.

Judge Mintz feels that he has many things now which have completed his life's dream. He has seen his children build their own niches successfully in life.

Mary Mintz is living in France with her surgeon husband, Dr. Stephen David Bourgeois of the United States Air Force.

Jean is a head nurse on the surgical floor of the Medical College in Richmond, Va.

Rudolph Jr. is a junior in the medical school of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

The judge's philosophy has always worked for him and he uses it everyday. "I have always had the desire to work; the harder you work, the better luck you have."

[From the Wilmington (N.C.) Morning Star, June 5, 1966]

HONORED BY STATE

Judge Rudolph I. Mintz of Wilmington received an honorary degree of Doctor of Laws from North Carolina State University at Raleigh a week ago.

The Commencement program statement follows:

"Son of North Carolina and of North Carolina State University. Rudolph Ivey Mintz exemplifies those qualities of service and leadership upon which the well-being of the commonwealth depends.

"Leaving his alma mater as an engineer, he quickly turned his interest to politics and the law, in which, although without formal training, he achieved a preeminence acknowledged by his appointment to the Superior Bench.

"For many, this would have sufficed. But to these accomplishments we must add a distinguished military career, service in the General Assembly, and above all continued devotion to the sound health and development of the University.

"Now rounding out his 20th year as a Trustee, in addition to his service on the executive committee, he helped to draft the University's administrative code and participated in the selection both of the President of the University and of the Chancellor of this institution. To one so disposed, activity in alumni and civic affairs comes as a matter of course.

"A University's good name depends mainly upon the service of her alumni. For sons such as Judge Mintz we are grateful and proudly acknowledge our gratitude by conferring upon him the degree of Doctor of Laws Honoris Causa."

STRAIGHT TALK ON LATIN AMERICA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the Washington Post editorial section today includes some very cogent commentary on our foreign-aid posture with regard to Latin America. It seems that even among the Committee on Foreign Relations there remain some old myths, as the Post editorial so accurately points out. Because I have studied our Latin American policies for some years, I believe the Washington Post editorialist has correctly separated fact from fantasy, and I commend to my colleagues the editorial which appeared today.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "The Arms Reflex," which was published in the Washington Post of June 27, 1966, be printed at this point in the RECORD:

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

THE ARMS REFLEX

In slashing the authorization for arms assistance to Latin-American countries, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee seemingly has been influenced by a series of out-model clichés about military dictatorships. For some years the United States has been furnishing some \$55 million a year in grants of military hardware to Latin America. Sales,

mostly light and medium arms and replacements of outmoded equipment, have run to about \$25 million more. Now, under an amendment sponsored by Senator FULBRIGHT, the \$55 million would become a ceiling that would have to cover all arms sales and military technical assistance as well as grants. The result would be to cut the existing program by more than half.

It is easy to assume that this is a way to discourage military regimes. But the facts indicate otherwise. The major aims of the military assistance program have been, first, to help governments establish internal security and carry out counter-insurgency training (some of the aid for these purposes is in communications equipment); and, second, to provide civic action programs—road building, community development and the like. In some Latin-American countries the military is presently the most effective agency for these civic purposes.

Three democratic governments in Latin America—Colombia, Peru and Venezuela—are coping with active insurgent movements. Another country where a new Social Democratic President is about to be inaugurated, Guatemala, faces a similar threat. In Chile the democratic government of President Eduardo Frei is under opposition fire for failure to provide adequate internal security. Drastically reducing military assistance is hardly the way to assist such countries to maintain order and progress.

American military assistance of one kind or another goes to all the Latin countries except Haiti, although Venezuela and Mexico receive no grant aid. Few heavy arms have been supplied, and the effect of the military assistance has not been to promote an arms race. In the net the aid averages only about 4 per cent of total Latin defense budgets. Latin-American military spending is relatively low in relation to gross national product; and U.S. military aid is only 7 or 8 per cent of the total assistance from this country.

In point of fact the happily brief trend toward military dictatorship in Latin America has been significantly reversed. Haiti, which receives no aid, has the only really ferocious dictatorship, although the durable regime of General Stroessner in Paraguay has dictatorial facets. Bolivia, where a popular military junta has been in control, will have what promises to be a reasonably free election next month. In Ecuador a military junta has yielded to a de facto civilian government. Brazil will have an indirect presidential election this fall that may not be as representative as some would wish, but the worst excesses of military rule so far have been avoided. In Central America there is a heartening trend away from caudillo-type regimes.

In short, the familiar clichés about military governments scarcely pertain to reality in Latin America. There is of course a risk that military aid could be used to prop up a rotten government that deserved to be ousted. There have been instances in which military regimes have upset elected governments and become oppressors. But there also have been instances in which regimes that have come to power by military means have been more progressive and representative than the fictionally "democratic" governments they replaced. It is doubtful in most of these situations that American military aid has been a significant factor in the military overthrow of a government. But military assistance can be a significant factor in enabling elected democratic governments—which now constitute a majority—to protect their countries against external subversion and preserve the internal order that is a necessary prerequisite for public confidence and social and economic development.

June 27, 1966

be pumped from the Dong Nai River through the new treatment plant which provides the city of Saigon with its first supply of pure, treated water in its history.

This event marks the culmination of many years of planning and construction effort. In 1958 our International Cooperation Agency reviewed a survey and feasibility report covering the need for improvement and expansion of the inadequate and contaminated water supply system of the metropolitan area of the city of Saigon. As a result, on November 2, 1960, the development loan fund loan agreement No. 62 was executed between the Republic of South Vietnam and our International Cooperation Administration, now a part of AID, for the Saigon metropolitan water project. The loan was for \$17,500,000 to be furnished by the United States with an additional \$10 million to be put up by the Government of South Vietnam.

On April 25, 1963, bids were received for the construction of the intake and treatment complex which was the initial phase of the project in the amount of \$11 million, and on September 23, 1963, the contract was awarded to a joint venture known as Hawaiian Dredging-Saigon with headquarters in Honolulu, Hawaii. However, because of a crisis involving a radical change of government prevailing at that time in South Vietnam, AID approval for proceeding with the contract was withheld until late December 1964.

Hawaiian Dredging-Saigon, the joint venture contractor for the project, started work on January 9, 1964. In the intervening 30 months construction period from January 9, 1964, until its completion on June 17, 1966, the work force consisted of 25 American supervisors, 25 nonresident specialists, and 1,100 South Vietnamese workmen of various classifications.

To give you some idea as to the magnitude and significance of the project in terms of benefits to be derived by the residents of Saigon, I will briefly outline a few pertinent statistics. The treatment plant is located 10 miles outside of the city of Saigon adjacent to the main highway running between Saigon and Bien Hoa, which is on the Dong Nai River 17 miles northeast of Saigon. During the period of construction, I might add, this location was not by any means secure from possible infiltration and exposure to Vietcong attack. The intake point at which the water is drawn from the Dong Nai River is approximately 7 miles from the treatment plant, opposite Bien Hoa and adjacent to one of the most impenetrable Vietcong strongholds. The water is pumped from the intake site through a 72-inch diameter pipe to the treatment plant where it is chemically treated, settled, filtered, stored and ultimately pumped 10 miles to Saigon through a 78-inch pipeline by 5 pumps with over 6,000 combined horsepower.

The treatment plant is capable of producing 125 million gallons of pure, treated water per day meeting U.S. standards in all respects, and in an amount sufficient to supply the over 2 million

inhabitants living in Metropolitan Saigon—a population equal to about one-third that of Greater Los Angeles.

The difficulties encountered by the contractor were staggering and difficult to imagine viewed from almost any point in the United States. Not only did the joint venture have to contend with long interrupted lines of supply, unskilled labor, intense heat, and monsoons, but in addition, there was political unrest, inflation, escalation of the war effort, and the ever-present threat of Vietcong attack. Notwithstanding these difficulties, the project was successfully completed on June 18, 1966, and safe drinking water is now available to the inhabitants of Saigon.

The completion of this phase of the Saigon metropolitan water project, it seems to me, stands for much more than just the completion of another facility regardless of its importance. It is more than a significant technical achievement bringing the most modern water treatment plant to the Far East. It is not just a monument to U.S. architectural design and building standards, which adds a dramatic touch to the landscape along a major South Vietnam highway. In my opinion this project stands as a symbol of hope amid chaos and an illustration of what could be provided on a far broader scale if the area could only be returned to peaceful pursuits.

It stands as a reminder of the part the United States is capable and willing to play in helping free men everywhere—not just as a part of the U.S. mutual security project. It is an eloquent example of what President Johnson has generally proposed for all southeast Asia in return for a peaceful and just settlement in the area.

I think I may be forgiven for expressing pride in this accomplishment. It is a tribute to America's generosity and constructive helpfulness to a developing new nation as well as to American construction skill and knowledge. The fact that our Government and an American contractor have combined money, men, and equipment in the face of hardship, delay, inflation, and personal danger in order to provide delivery of pure water on schedule to a people long deprived of such a facility, should not go unrecognized.

May this example of what can be done inspire us all to continue our dedicated efforts in the uplifting of mankind everywhere, and may God guide us and bless us in this endeavor.

COMMENCEMENT SPEECH AT THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY BY HENRY H. FOWLER, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on June 12, 1966, the Honorable Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury, addressed the graduating class of the College of William and Mary at Williamsburg, Va.

Secretary Fowler said:

It is no longer possible for any of us to follow Voltaire's advice and, fenced off from the rest of the world, to cultivate our private gardens—to engage in our private pursuits and leave public problems to those who

occupy public positions. A bomb that explodes in Watts or Saigon shatters windows in Washington and Williamsburg as well.

No longer can we close ourselves up in our personal ambitions and concerns, our personal interests and endeavors, for at every step of the way we will encounter larger interests and wider concerns to challenge our conscience and to engage our efforts and our energies. In today's world, we are all—in varying degrees—public servants.

I ask unanimous consent for the insertion of Secretary Fowler's speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE HENRY H. FOWLER, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AT COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, WILLIAM AND MARY COLLEGE, WILLIAMSBURG, VA., SUNDAY, JUNE 12, 1966

There are in this country few places whose roots reach farther and deeper back into this nation's beginnings, into the origins of all that as a people we are and try to be, than this city of Williamsburg and this college of William and Mary.

Here, more than two centuries ago, came the young Thomas Jefferson, eager to explore all man had done and dreamed so that he could better understand all that man was and could be.

And today, two centuries later, it is through his voice still, and the vision that he held forth, that we understand most deeply all that America is and can be—a land where every man can find not only infinite promise but abundant opportunity for a full and free life.

And today, two centuries later, it is Jefferson's vision of all America is and can be that still summons forth our best efforts and energies—the vision set forth so eloquently for our time in President Johnson's call to the building of a Great Society in whose abundant life every man could share to the fullest measure of his ability and his desire.

But if the vision is the same—if the dream and the ideals remain unchanged—the world in which we seek to realize them bears little resemblance to the world of Jefferson's day.

We can no longer seek—as a nation or as individuals—to pursue our dreams alone and apart from the world around us. As a nation and as individuals, we are all inescapably caught up in events and changes whose pace and scale seem—in contrast to earlier eras—so much larger than life. No sooner do we begin to become accustomed to one environment, to one situation, to one set of circumstances, than we discover that another has taken its place. The late Professor Norbert Wiener observed of "modern technique" that "every apparatus, every method is obsolete by the time it is used. Techniques are developing so rapidly that we cannot, unless we are going to have a large period of chaos, allow our thinking to lag behind the techniques and the possible modes of development." And what is true of technological events is equally true of human affairs.

It is no longer possible for any of us to follow Voltaire's advice and, fenced off from the rest of the world, to cultivate our private gardens—to engage in our private pursuits and leave public problems to those who occupy public positions. A bomb that explodes in Watts or Saigon shatters windows in Washington and Williamsburg as well. No longer can we close ourselves up in our personal ambitions and concerns, our personal interests and endeavors, for at every step of the way we will encounter larger interests and wider concerns to challenge our conscience and to engage our efforts and our energies. In today's world, we are all—in varying degrees—public servants.

What, then, is the job before us—at home and abroad?

At home, we face first of all the job of sustaining our unprecedented economic prosperity, for it is this prosperity that must underlie our efforts to achieve all our other goals at home and abroad. To sustain that prosperity will require that we continue to follow a policy mix that is inclusive rather than exclusive, that seeks not one economic goal at the expense of all others, but all of our major economic goals at one and the same time—our paramount goals of strong and steady economic growth, of full employment, of reasonable price stability, and of relative equilibrium in our international balance of payments. To sustain that prosperity will require that all segments of our economy—government and business and labor—continue to work together in a growing partnership for prosperity.

But prosperity is not nearly enough. The time has long passed—if, indeed, there ever was a time—when the task of sustaining a high level of economic advance seemed challenge enough to occupy the bulk of our effort and attention. The time has long since passed—if, indeed, there ever was a time—when we could justify a prosperity that meant only more for those who already had enough, that meant only a growing gap between those who share and those who failed to share in its fruits—if it meant continued neglect of needs too long left unmet and of problems whose solution has been too long postponed.

We seek prosperity—we strive to sustain it—because it alone will enable us to better achieve our goals as individuals and as a nation. We seek it because through it alone can we develop a society that deserves to be called great.

That is the task to which President Johnson has awakened us anew—the task to which he has already aroused and engaged so much of our efforts and energies—the task in which already he has led us to such bold beginnings.

We have begun to make real inroads upon the acute social ills too long obscured or ignored in the life of our land—the ills of poverty and prejudice and ignorance. We have begun to make real advances toward the day when ability to learn rather than ability to pay will be the sole standard of educational opportunity in America—toward the day when no American need fear the economic consequences of unemployment, of old age or of ill health—toward the day, in short, when every American can enjoy the opportunity of a full and free life.

I do not suggest that the millennium is at hand. The tasks ahead are staggering. And today, as in times past, the distance between deed and ideal is long and difficult. But while I would not underestimate the difficulties ahead, neither would I underestimate our capacities to overcome them.

Not the least of those difficulties is the fact that we must pursue our goals at home in full awareness and full acceptance of our responsibilities for leadership in a deeply interdependent world.

No longer can it be said of us—as Lloyd George said of us when we rejected our world responsibilities in the aftermath of World War I: “The Americans appeared to assume responsibility for the sole guardianship of the Ten Commandments and for the Sermon on the Mount; yet when it came to a practical question of assistance and responsibility, they absolutely refused to accept it.”

For we understand—and our deeds have demonstrated our understanding—that they way in which the United States exercises its international leadership will do such to determine the future for the world and for succeeding generations of Americans.

The challenges before us are many, but surely these are three of the most basic:

First, the challenge posed by the Communist commitment to world conquest—and in particular by the Communists' effort to impose their will and extend their influence by outright aggression and by subversion backed by the threat of aggression.

Second, the challenge posed by the collapse of colonialism and the emergence of new nations—thus far more than fifty in number—coupled with the growing demands of underprivileged peoples everywhere for full and immediate deliverance from the hunger and the disease and the illiteracy and the grinding poverty that had ruled their lives for centuries.

Third, the challenge posed by the spreading outbreak of excessive nationalism—most noticeable and understandable in some of the less developed countries, but highly visible as well in some of the world's more developed nations—that considerably complicates the efforts of nations to work together on a multilateral basis to attack common problems and to achieve common objectives.

These are the overriding challenges that will continue to require our fullest energies and efforts for long, hard years to come. For surely there is not one of us who has not long ago shed—if, indeed, we ever entertained—the illusion that these challenges will surrender to sudden or simple solutions.

And surely we realize as well that our responsibilities in the world are not ours alone either to determine or to bear. For our responsibilities are determined by the realities and events of the world in which we live, realities and events which are often open to our influence but beyond our control. And they are shared by all the other nations of the Free World—by all nations who cherish their freedom and independence as we do and who equally labor to further the cause of peace and justice and freedom and well-being throughout the world.

To meet the great and common challenges before us—the opportunities as well as the dangers—will continue to require of us and our allies the highest qualities of leadership on two major fronts:

First, leadership in standing firm and united against Communist aggression and subversion with sufficient force and power to deter such efforts and to demonstrate beyond any doubt that they are too unrewarding and dangerous to be worth the risk.

Second, leadership in assisting on a multilateral basis the new nations in their struggle to achieve both essential stability and sufficient progress toward meeting the rising needs and demands of their people.

On both of these fronts—over a period of two decades and under the leadership of four Presidents—ours is a record of the most unrelenting effort and the most enduring accomplishment toward the preservation of peace, the protection of freedom and the promotion of human rights and human welfare.

We have helped counter aggression in all its guises—whether open or concealed—on nearly every continent on the globe, in countries great and small—in Greece, on Turkey and in Berlin; in Lebanon, in Iran and in India; in Taiwan, in the Congo, in Laos and now in Vietnam.

We have sought, not to act alone and apart, but to join with other nations in forging effective alliances against aggression—aggression in the Atlantic Community through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, aggression in Southeast Asia and the Pacific through the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, aggression in Latin America through the Organization of American States, and aggression anywhere in the world through the United Nations.

We have made the required sacrifices, and we have borne the required costs.

Nor have we been found wanting on the second front—where also we have led the

way toward helping assure throughout the Free World the economic development and the social progress that alone will enable men to better their lives. There has been in the decades since World War II no great multilateral organization or effort for peace and for the works of peace whose advent and whose accomplishments do not reflect, in large measure, our leadership and our support—the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Marshall Plan, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Alliance for Progress and most recently the Asian Development Bank—a venture in which we have joined with 31 other nations, including 12 nations outside Asia, and which seeks to open up for the peoples of Asia far fuller opportunities for sharing in the economic abundance and social progress that so much of the rest of the world can take for granted.

Through these multilateral efforts, through bilateral government aid, and through numerous private channels, we have devoted a vast share of our wealth and our resources to the task of helping others increase their share of the world's abundance. In the postwar decades we have contributed a net total of some \$100 billion of our national wealth to helping better the lives of others through our major government foreign assistance programs.

Indeed, in meeting the great challenges of our times, we have not been found wanting. Never in the memory of man has any nation done so much and at such great cost, not to gain dominion over the lives or the resources or the territory of others, but to help others gain full and free dominion over their own destinies.

We do not say we have always been right. We do not say we have always been successful.

But no man and no nation can justly deny what history makes manifest: in the hour of need, we have not been found wanting.

And we will not be found wanting now.

We must continue to yield to no nation the patient pursuit of peace and the works of peace—and continue to demonstrate, as we do in Vietnam, that we have the will and the weapons to resist aggression.

We must be willing to bear the burdens and accept the uncertainties and the unpleasantness and the imperfections that come with such a war as Vietnam. For Vietnam is a war of wills as well as a war of weapons. It is a test of our willingness to survive—to surmount—the strain of constant, continual conflict whose end is never clearly in sight.

At the same time we must continue—together with other developed nations of the Free World—to carry our share of the burden of leadership in the common task of helping the developing nations of the world to realize their destiny and enrich the lives of their people in dignity and freedom. And we are taking the initiative in these endeavors—seeking assiduously in both quiet and public diplomacy to enlist the cooperation of our allies in bold new efforts to promote free trade, to strengthen the international monetary system, and to make available to needy peoples everywhere the opportunity and the means and the incentives for conquering hunger and disease, and for living under the liberating light of education and knowledge.

For we seek for others no more than we seek for ourselves—the opportunity for a full and free life. Abroad as at home, our efforts reflect our awareness that with might must come maturity, with wealth and riches must come wisdom and responsibility, and with success must come sacrifice.

This, indeed, must be our awareness—not only as a nation but as individuals—in the days ahead. For the challenges before us are too great and the world is too small for any of us to retire into an island of purely

June 27, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

13745

private concern—into what one observer has called the "cult of private sunshine and secluded complacency."

I do not share the view, held by some, that these years of academic education you are now completing have been years of isolation from the world, from life and its problems. I know, on the contrary, that they have been, in the profoundest sense, years of entrance into the world, years of real encounter with life and with its problems and its promise—years for deepening and developing in a multitude of ways that understanding that Alfred North Whitehead deemed the most essential end of education—"the understanding of an insistent present." The present, Whitehead rightly declared, "contains all there is. It is holy ground; for it is the past, and it is the future." I know that it is your experience here at William and Mary—and that of others like you at colleges and universities throughout our land—that helps us heed the warning uttered by that same thinker half a century ago: "In the conditions of modern life the rule is absolute, the race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed."

But, as I have tried to suggest in all I have said—as, indeed, all the awesome and awful events of recent decades so unanswerably argue—the "trained intelligence" alone is not nearly enough. For as individuals and as a nation, we can accomplish all we seek to accomplish, and avoid all we seek to avoid, only to the extent that we exhibit in abundance, not only the trained intelligence, but the active and engaged intelligence, the informed and awakened imagination, the aroused concern and the committed conscience.

As one who has known the privilege of spending many of his years in formal public service, I hope very deeply that some of you will seek to know that privilege. I would urge, indeed, that all of you give serious thought to the possibilities of public service, not only on the national level, but on the state and local level as well. Everywhere throughout the country our states and our cities struggle to cope with the most staggering problems, and everywhere those citizens who have most to offer are often the most reluctant to become involved in local and state affairs.

I know that only some of us can—that only some of us should—enter formal public service. But all of us can and all of us must, in the broader sense, accept the obligations and opportunities for public service that in today's world exist in such abundance.

I urge each of you, whatever your career, to interest and involve yourselves—for you have so much to give—in all those issues and affairs that so critically affect our lives but lie beyond the narrow boundaries of our own personal pursuits.

I urge you to do all you can in every way you can to bring to life in your businesses and your professions, in your towns and your communities, in your cities and your states, in your nation and your world, that vision evoked for all time by Thomas Jefferson two centuries ago—and set forth so eloquently for our own time by President Johnson—the vision of an America and a world in which men and men's hopes can not only survive, but flourish.

OUR "GO-IT-ALONE" POLICY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, while it is impossible to capture the full flavor of a political cartoon in words, I should like to note that the Washington Post yesterday reprinted a noteworthy cartoon from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. It captured and summed up very well

the fact that we are standing virtually alone in South Vietnam, that despite the claims of the State Department of support from numerous nations, we have no real support.

The cartoon shows a line of men, rifles to shoulder, stepping off in parade uniform with every boot in lockstep. Over them floats a banner labeled "Western Alliance." But in the foreground, hurrying in the opposite direction, is a familiar figure, battle-uniformed and jungle-helmeted with full equipment, including a shoulder bag labeled "U.S. Position in Vietnam." From the corner of his mouth he is grimly saying:

I don't think y'all realize it, but everybody's out of step but me!

In a speech on April 19 at Ball State University in Muncie, Ind., I commented on that situation, in which we have produced for ourselves a new isolationism by the rejection of the rest of the world of our policies in Vietnam. Here are some of the facts I noted then, which has not changed.

Our SEATO allies include Great Britain, which has furnished assistance through 11 police instructors, a professor of English, and some technical and construction equipment.

France belongs to SEATO. France has sent 600 educators, medical, and technical personnel.

Of the others among the 39 nations which the State Department says are helping in our struggle, Italy's assistance is a 9-man surgical team and science scholarships. Belgium has contributed some medicines. Pakistan has given some clothing and \$10,000 for flood relief. Thailand, like Pakistan a SEATO member, has furnished cement and some assistance of a classified nature. Iran's assistance is a 22-man medical team and 1,000 tons of petroleum. India has given only clothing for flood relief.

So it goes down the list. This is what is meant when the press speaks of "token assistance." And it is this of which Clayton Fritchey spoke recently in his Washington Star column under the caption, "Most Nations Oppose U.S. Asia Role."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Fritchey's article of June 13 may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, June 13, 1966]

MOST NATIONS OPPOSE U.S. ASIA ROLE

(By Clayton Fritchey)

Secretary of State Dean Rusk has returned from the Brussels meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization with little to show for American leadership or general support of U.S. foreign policy. It was the same story at the last two previous meetings of NATO.

Yet just before leaving for Brussels, Rusk made a major speech in which he foolishly and incautiously said, "I have found that the objectives of American foreign policy are widely understood, respected and supported." He added that "a large majority" of the nations of the free world are "sympathetic to our efforts in Southeast Asia . . ."

This statement is so palpably wide of the mark that it is embarrassing. It does disclose, however, the administration's present capacity to deceive itself.

Other nations may be wrong, or misguided, but that is another argument. Rusk's contention is not that they should back the United States, but that they do. The painfully evident fact is, they don't.

The Johnson administration likes to believe that President Charles de Gaulle's opposition is personal and spiteful, and does not reflect French public opinion. Yet the most recent French poll showed (1) strong support for De Gaulle's anti-U.S. policy, and (2) no confidence in U.S. leadership. Our other great European ally, West Germany, has just given the State Department fits by agreeing to finance a large steel plant in Communist China.

In the non-aligned world, it is the same. And Nasser denounces the United States at every opportunity. Tito accuses the United States of "jeopardizing world peace." When Dr. Nurreddin Attassi recently became the new Syrian chief of state, he promptly charged that U.S. policy in Viet Nam "springs from nothing but lust to dominate the peoples."

The African nations have demonstrated time and again in the United Nations their lack of confidence in U.S. policy, just as in the Organization of American States most of the important Latin nations have frowned on American interventionism in this hemisphere and elsewhere.

The United States has repeatedly said it is in Asia to protect Asians, but it is an eloquent fact that no large power in that area backs the policy that Rusk says is so "respected" and "supported." Despite an American combination of arm-twisting, vast foreign aid, and cajolery, India, Pakistan, Japan (and now even anti-Communist Indonesia) want no part of our Viet Nam adventure.

India's new prime minister, Indira Gandhi, publicly rebuffed Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY when he coupled a plea for support in Viet Nam with the announcement of a \$100 million dollar loan. President Ayub Khan of Pakistan says, "There is no danger to the subcontinent from China provided no uncalled for provocation is aimed against that country."

The Japanese government like the British government, feels compelled to pay lip service to U.S. policy, but no one pretends this reflects popular feeling in those countries. A poll taken by Asahi, Japan's largest newspaper, showed 75 percent of the people against the Viet Nam war.

To sum up, there are 116 nations in the United Nations but only two (plus our puppet, South Korea) are supporting us with troops in Viet Nam. New Zealand has sent 150 men, and Australia, 1,400. The United States has 300,000 in the theater.

Despite this, the President and Rusk keep telling the American people that over 40 nations are providing assistance to Viet Nam. Actually only 31 nations (mostly under U.S. pressure) have made any contributions, and even they are merely token offerings.

It may be that the United States is a deserving maid, but not even Rusk can make her look like the belle of the international ball. Under the Johnson administration, Miss U.S.A. has all too obviously become a wallflower.

ERIC SEVAREID ON VIETNAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, that noted and distinguished broadcaster, commentator, and columnist, Eric Sevareid, has just returned from a visit to southeast Asia, the theater of our undeclared war. He has reported his find-

13746

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 27, 1966

ings and feelings over the CBS television network. His reportage provides much material for study and soul searching.

Why, for instance, must the United States—in addition to its 300,000 men in uniform in Europe—have an additional 669,000 men in the Pacific with major troop installations in 10 Pacific countries and areas?

Why is it, that non-Communist countries much closer to China, such as Japan, are much more unconcerned and relaxed about the possible menace of Chinese aggression than our policymakers?

Mr. Seavared obviously is doubtful about the administration's contentions that our invasion of Vietnam is the way to stop the advance of Chinese communism. He fears that our policy will involve us in a greater war.

He is clear that it is a civil war which we got ourselves into—which the administration seeks to deny—and he finds little to sustain its justification for its policies and actions. He points out, also, how deceptive are our reports of casualties.

He points out what has been painfully evident to a few of us who have voiced our dissent from our administration's policy for over nearly two and a half years—that "there is not a single leader of countrywide prestige in South Vietnam," and that our attempts "to apply Western logic and experience to this oriental land" are futile.

Mr. Seavared's views on our military activities in southeast Asia have undergone some modification over the last 2 years. So have those of others—despite the misleading propaganda that comes from the seats of U.S. power. There is a gratifying change of public sentiment as the truth emerges, but thus far it seems not to have registered effectively with those who are responsible for sending our young men to fight and die in a cause that does not correspond to the fictions which are advanced to justify this needless slaughter.

I ask unanimous consent that the CBS news special report entitled "Vietnam: Eric Seavared's Personal Report," which was broadcast over its television network on Tuesday, June 21, 1966, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

"VIETNAM: ERIC SEVAREID'S PERSONAL REPORT," AS BROADCAST OVER THE CBS TELEVISION NETWORK, TUESDAY, JUNE 21, 1966

Good evening. I'm Eric Seavared. I propose to sit here for the next thirty minutes and talk about America in Asia, about war and about truth. This may set television back a long way. We'll find out.

I am not an authority on Asia. Asia is far too big, changing far too rapidly for many certainties.

I am not an expert on war. There is no such thing as military science. War is a rude art, in which human character, will and faith play at least as great a role as figures and logic.

About truth, I hope I know more. It is a reporter's business to tell appearance from reality, rhetoric from fact. He often fails. In this Vietnam war, he fails unusually often because he is normally a stranger to

the land, its language and its people. And because at every level—military, political, economic, psychological—the truth is fragmented in a thousand pieces. At each level it is a jigsaw puzzle that no single man is able to piece together.

We are therefore confronted with an extraordinary condition: no honest man can return a convincing answer to the great and obvious questions that all men ask:

Is our action there insurance against eventual war with China, as the Administration asserts, or is it increasing the risk of such a war? Will the Vietnamese pull themselves together politically, or fall further apart? Are we winning this war? Do we have a clear strategy for winning it? How many years and men will it take?

To each question the official rhetoric of Washington gives the optimistic response. These officials speak from faith, not fact. The total of the known facts does not deny their optimism, but it does not confirm it, either.

Through this fog of uncertainties the reporter must pick his way; he must report out of instinct, experience and impression. He can guess, estimate, and try to project what seem to him the probabilities. And his first task is to break through the crust of his own pre-conceived notions.

I think I was only dimly aware of what the American power in the Pacific world really means. As you fly the great arcs to Alaska and Japan, and down the eastern rim of Asia's land mass, you begin to understand. The vast Pacific and the skies above it belong to American power. America—its men, money and machines—is intermingled with the affairs of governments everywhere, the daily lives of hundreds of millions of people.

Consider the world of the Pacific Ocean and the southern seas in this American era: Alaska, 30,000 military men; Hawaii, 100,000 military men; Guam, 20,000; Okinawa, 25,000; Japan, 39,000; Korea, 55,000; Taiwan, 10,000; the Philippines, 25,000; Vietnam, about 285,000; Thailand, 20,000. Besides, of course, the 7th Fleet itself—60,000 to 70,000 men.

This is the legacy of the defeat of Japan in World War II; of the take-over of China by the Communists; of the collapse of European rule; of the Korean War; and now, of the fighting in Vietnam. It is also the legacy of habit, of the military man's fear of ever giving up any salient, of the idea that Communist China is bent upon military aggression, as were Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Russia.

There is a strange phenomenon that comes into play in the relationship between impressions and reality. It has to do with time and space. For distance lends not only enchantment, but apprehension. So to Americans at home, the Buddhist riots in Saigon mean that all Saigon is in turmoil. But the man sitting in a cafe a block from the riots is relaxed; he knows it is not. So to us at home, China appears a frightening monster, straining at the leash, eager to smash her neighbors.

But some of her neighbors are far more relaxed than we. This is true of the government of Japan, the most powerful non-Communist society of eastern Asia. Their view of China as an aggressive threat is closer to the view of Senator FULBRIGHT than to that of Secretary Rusk. They believe that China is already contained. She is contained by the existence of the nuclear bomb, by the simple knowledge that if she marches over the border of a friendly country that we are able to help, we shall immediately help. She is contained by this gigantic ring of steel built by the United States along her eastern and southern borders and by Russia's ring of steel along four thousand miles of her western border. If she feels encircled, no big power ever had more right to feel that way.

She fears what the United States may do more than some of her neighbors fear what she may do.

China can try the methods of subversion in Southeast Asia; she has and she does. But it is doubtful how successful she would be, even without our presence and resistance in Vietnam. Nationalism is basically stronger than any ideology. Most nations are not dominoes that fall over with a click. These nations of Southeast Asia, like Thailand or Burma, are more like sponges. Their edges can become waterlogged with Communist-trained resistance groups, but there are a thousand natural obstacles to the water seeping through the whole organism. One is the historic dislike and distrust of the Chinese throughout these regions.

A crucial question is whether our resistance in Vietnam is preventing the spread of Chinese dominance in other Asian countries through their propaganda, infiltration and subversion. The Administration points to Indonesia, where the powerful Chinese-inspired Communist apparatus was smashed not long ago. That would never have happened, they like to think, were we not there, in Vietnam.

If this is true, all of us would feel very much better about this war in Vietnam. My personal opinion is that it's not true. Indeed, it was the conclusion of Japan's ambassadors to Southeast Asian countries, in recent consultation, that Vietnam had nothing to do with those events in Indonesia; that internal, domestic pressures alone were responsible.

Korea in the north and Thailand in the south are exceptions to this line of thought. The men who rule Thailand have thrown in their lot with the United States and its argument, contrary to Burma on their west and Cambodia on their east. They do fear China and communism in general, and they have given welcome and facilities to American power.

The Thai government tries to keep as much of this secret as it can; and we helped them in this out of diplomatic considerations. But the truth is that we have upwards of 20,000 military men in Thailand, mostly on the great bomber bases from which we hit North Vietnam and the Ho Chi Minh trails. Reporters are not permitted to see these bases. Twenty thousand is more men than we had in Vietnam itself when Mr. Johnson became President.

Our military wanted, at one time, to put ground combat units into Northeast Thailand, where skirmishes go on with Chinese-trained guerrillas. Our diplomats stopped that; but we have more than a few Special Forces and advisory fighting teams in the Northeast. And there one sees how war tends to spread and of why military men must be kept in constant check by political men.

Laos, technically neutral by the Geneva Agreements, is thoroughly engulfed in the war already. The North Vietnamese run their supplies and fresh soldiers through much of Laos; and therefore we bomb it constantly. We admit to no men on the ground in Laos. My information, from people I consider reliable, is that we have several thousand soldiers inside Laos, including spotter groups and Special Forces teams. When an American is killed in or over Laos, his death is officially registered as having occurred in Vietnam.

Cambodia is becoming more and more deeply involved in the fighting. We have bombed and shelled Cambodian territory, more than once, for some time back because we have had to. I believe our front line intelligence reports and our eyewitnesses. When General Larsen, Commander of our Second Corps, whose boundaries lie along the Cambodian line, said there are heavy North Vietnamese troop concentrations inside Cambodia I am inclined to believe him rather

June 27, 1966

than the Pentagon's immediate denial of this. After all, he is on the scene.

This, then, is how war spreads—in spite of all the official proclamations that we shall not allow it to spread.

War has a logic, a momentum, imperatives of its own. And in this process, language is adulterated, reason twisted, policy follows in the wake of actions, instead of the other way around, and the inner sequence of cause and effect is lost to man's comprehension.

And so the Administration argues that unless we stop communism, or China, or both in Vietnam now, other nations will fall, as happened in Europe in the thirties, until the grand confrontation of World War III with China will be forced upon the world.

It seems to me that it is quite as logical to argue that our very presence in Vietnam, with this inevitable osmotic spread of hostilities across other borders, is just as likely to produce war with China, unless we are extremely careful and extremely lucky. And if that happens, it will be like World War I, if not World War II. Men still argue how World War I got started, as actions led to reactions and still further reactions, engulfing nation by nation. If we are sucked into collision with China in these regions, we will never be sure of the precise point in space or time when it happened. How the Vietnam war goes will be the test of all this; Vietnam is the anvil on which our future relations with vast, emerging China are being hammered out, and the sparks fly in all directions.

Until we got into it, the Vietnam war was essentially a civil war; a civil war and a social revolution and a struggle for national identity and freedom from European rule. For legal and diplomatic reasons, Washington must argue that it is not a civil war at all, but an aggression and an invasion by an external power. But when men speaking the same language, living within the same cultural context, raised in the same cities and villages fight one another by the thousands that is civil war. When men of the North (including Prime Minister Ky) are part of the government of the South, and vice versa, it is civil war. Even the Geneva Agreements called the two "zones" of the one country, not sovereign states.

North Vietnam has gone to the Chinese weapons system; their material help from China and Russia is considerable. But no Chinese officer or soldier has ever been found among the enemy's fighting cadres, to my knowledge.

It is the apparent conviction of Washington that if North Vietnam will just stop its infiltration into the South the war could be settled. Not necessarily, not unless Hanoi also ordered a cease-fire all down the line. One of our leading generals there argues strongly that the units from the North need the local guerrillas far more than the guerrillas need them. The guerrillas are home; they need ammunition but not trucks or oil or great depots of rices.

How many men are coming down from the North? Last fall, Secretary McNamara said it was 4500 a month; this April we were told in Saigon that it had gone higher and might reach 7,000. The other day the Pentagon again said 4500. These figures are educated guesses, no more.

How many in all have come down? At the Saigon headquarters you are told there are, at a generous estimate, fifty battalions of North Vietnamese now in the South. Their battalions are far smaller than ours—perhaps four or five hundred men. That means about 25,000 Northerners in their own combat units. That in turn, is only ten per cent of the estimated total of a quarter million organized and semi-organized fighting men that we and the South Vietnamese now face.

On both sides, it is a much bigger war than a year ago, when it was nearly lost and when President Johnson ordered the massive in-

fusions of American troops. Our intelligence people out there believe that the enemy is now better armed, man for man, than our South Vietnamese allies. Far worse armed, of course, than we.

Our fighting men, our weapons and devices, our tactical ingenuity—all are profoundly impressive. We could not fight this war at all were it not our side that enjoys the real "privileged sanctuaries"—the sea and the sky. Both are denied to the enemy.

If our tactics are ingenious, our grand strategy remains a mystery, at least to me. We are fighting what is essentially a war of attrition, the most disagreeable kind of war, counting progress by the number of enemy bodies. The count is accurate when our men can actually go among the bodies; when the Air Force claims so many Vietcong killed from bombing and strafing runs, those are foolish guesses. The claims of enemy killed by the South Vietnamese forces—and the figures on their own casualties—may be approximately right or wildly wrong; none of us can really check.

It might be better if we in the news business reported weekly progress in terms of hamlets restored or re-settled, classrooms built, village chiefs who feel it safe to go back and sleep in their own houses. That, after all, is what the war is about. And in this respect there is progress. It is something to see tough American Marines acting as dedicated social workers; it is a fact worth knowing that of the three thousand Marines who have voluntarily extended their term of duty in Vietnam, most are those men who work daily with the ordinary people. Progress, but painfully slow progress, and against it must be set the great numbers of refugees who come into our secured areas. About a million of them now. Not all of them, by any means, fleeing from Vietcong terror; many fleeing from the terror of our napalm and high explosives which have inescapably killed and maimed hundreds of innocent people.

We are not really conquering territory. Our official statement is that at the end of last year eight and a half per cent of the total land area was considered secure; at the end of February nine and a half per cent; all the rest is in enemy hands or disputed and unsafe, or empty. About eight million people, a bit over half the population, are in secure allied controlled areas.

We are using giant sledgehammers to kill hornets. The Vietcong's National Liberation Front in the South has an annual budget estimated at about ten million dollars. Our annual costs in this war run to about fifteen billion. The enemy needs an estimated eighty-seven tons of supplies each day; the American establishment alone needs about twenty thousand tons a day. In terms of last year's total expenditure for the war, each enemy soldier killed last year cost us well over a million dollars.

What of our human investment and human losses? Of the total American military in-country, say 285,000, only a distinct minority do the real fighting, on the ground and in the air. They alone are the heroes. All the rest, in the enormous support and supply echelons, in the cities and ports, in the countless offices—they may occasionally court danger, but their life is wholly different, usually comfortable, for a great many enjoyable.

We had, when I left, five combat divisions and two brigades in the field, around 85,000 men. Add to that the Special Forces teams and the combat fliers. Of these I would guess, generously, that about 60,000 can be defined as men in frequent combat. Now this is an arbitrary definition, but necessary—some definition's necessary—if we are to think at all about our human investment and losses. And thinking from this rough definition, one feels obliged to say that our casualties are high, not low. They are low

in relation to the total number in Vietnam, mostly men who never or rarely ever see the enemy, and low compared to enemy losses. But our losses in combat dead and wounded have mounted rapidly to the current rate of about 30,000 a year. One year is a man's term of service there. On the simple statistical face of it, then, the chances for the individual fighting soldier in an active combat zone avoiding death or wounds in his twelve months are not great, about fifty-fifty. What lengthens his odds is the increasing rotation of more units, not just between home and Vietnam, but between the fighting zones and the rest zones. And if enemy attacks slacken off, that, of course, will improve the odds. For every man admitted to hospital in Vietnam for combat wounds, three times as many are admitted for non-combat injuries and disease. In terms of the combat troops, one is then forced to the conclusion that we lose the equivalent of about a battalion a week; most of them, of course, to return later on. But this is a rather constant process, and the need for more men and more rotation in combat operations would seem obvious.

In this sense, our casualties are high, not low. And by the other relevant measuring rod, the lasting gain from the average combat operation—some Vietcong killed, some rice destroyed, a village cleaned out, much of which the enemy will later replace and recover—by this measure, too, the casualties must be considered high, not low.

Last summer began the big increase in the American fighting force. So this summer, tens of thousands of men will leave Vietnam, but they will be replaced, these veterans, by green troops. However good their training at home, all soldiers are green until they have gone through at least one real battle. And greenness does cost lives. One green company of my acquaintance recently lost 130 men, killed and badly wounded, out of its 170, in one engagement. In the official hand-out later, the casualties of that action were described as "moderate," presumably because other units were also involved or because the enemy lost even more. The phrase "heavy casualties" I don't think I ever saw in those handout statistics.

I do not believe we are losing this war or will lose it. I am not sure one can call it a stalemate, as some men do. The Vietcong in the South and those units from the North are getting badly hurt. That is why the Vietcong is now recruiting kids as young as thirteen from their homes in the South, taxing the people more heavily and thus losing some of their popular support. That is why some of those Northern units are not at all well-trained; that is why those who desert to the other side are nearly all the enemy fighters, not South Vietnamese or, of course, Americans.

Hanoi may have to call it off, though we see no signs yet that it will. We are not playing chess. Both sides are playing poker, doubling each lost bet. It is a test of political will.

But, like some others, when I try to envisage the process of winning, I am haunted by a spectre. The spectre of this fragmented, weary Vietnamese society.

It was our official belief and the argument of among many of the so-called Hawks, that as we stopped losing this war—which we've done—and as we started winning it, which we've not quite done—the bitterly conflicting political and social factions in South Vietnam would start to pull together, in their national interest. The trouble is that Vietnam is only a society, not a nation. There is not a single leader of countrywide prestige in South Vietnam. The people have had little experience in responding to general laws and impersonal institutions. They respond to local personalities, cliques, religious groupings, or their own private interest. The resistance and rioting of the most militant Buddhists

seems to mean that they hate the central government more than they hate the Communist enemy.

We try to apply Western logic and experience to this Oriental land. So we encourage the elections, envisage a parliament and eventual civilian rule, representing groups and regions. My own guess is that this process of democratizing would produce years of political turmoil before stability is reached. It will probably, though not certainly, open a whole new Pandora's box, all the quarrels in the country bursting into the open. Vietnam, I think myself, is not to be compared with Korea or Greece, where we were successful, in these respects; a strong national sense, strong leaders existed there.

If this proves to be the trend, as we try to democratize government in Vietnam, then the immediate consequence would be a nightmare for us, for we should then have to involve ourselves deeper and deeper into their politics, their economy and more and more of the fighting and dying would be done by Americans and less and less by the Vietnamese.

Ten days ago, Secretary McNamara asserted that Vietnamese politics would not hinder our war effort there. It is part of the duty of national leaders to speak from their faith, not from their fears. But it is part of the duty of the press to examine their faith, to raise the questions that officials never publicly raise.

The hypothetical alternatives in Vietnam remain about what they were: bomb more of North Vietnam's industry and see what happens while nervously watching nervous China; halt the bombing and pull back to our base areas and see what happens; encourage the various third nation efforts to get negotiations started; quit Vietnam entirely; keep the pressure on, as we are doing, and wait for Hanoi's will to break. As of now, the prospect is more pressure—more and heavier war; that is the meaning of the stepped-up draft, the new troop shipments, the longer lanes of cargo vessels plowing the South China Sea, the increasing roar of the airplanes settling on to those ever-increasing airfields.

I should like to mention, before I end this long and not very happy discourse, two matters: a bit cosmic perhaps, but of fundamental consequence for our future affairs.

One is the fantastic size of our military establishment and the fantastic speed by which its cost increases. This can consume our marginal substance. This is what General Eisenhower warned about in his last words as President. He said we must guard against undue power by a military industrial complex. It will take a very convincing peace and a very strong President to put our military genie back in the bottle.

The other thing is this: the deepest, strongest forces motivating the people of Asia are not those we picture as we sit here at home. From here, one has the illusion that Asia is clanking armies, colliding ideologies, aggression and fear, that Asia is politics.

But the deepest forces moving Asian peoples now are not these at all, but the forces of the modern scientific-industrial revolution. Asians have discovered the great secret, so long hidden from their hope: that man is not born to a short life of pain and work and poverty. They see the marvelous evidence, nearly everywhere they look: Japan, a booming economic colossus whose production may soon pass Great Britain's. Korea, prosperous enough to do without direct American aid. Taiwan, where food production has doubled in 15 years and where new hotels, highways, factories open every month. Thailand, whose cities boom and grow. Indonesia, which has stopped its ridiculous war with Malaysia and now wants to join the real procession. Even Communist China, where basic comfort now seems assured for most, and where a new gen-

eration of economists, engineers, builders is slowly but surely coming to replace the old men of politics and war as they were replaced in Russia when Stalin died.

In Taiwan I had a Chinese driver, name of Jimmy. A mainlanders who had to flee the Chinese Communists and has no love for them at all. But he said to me, "If only American and China can learn to get along—what a wonderful thing for us all."

Jimmy perceives what Asia and life can be. Our government perceives it, as attested by the Johnson plans for Southeast Asia's economic development.

But if this war in Vietnam goes wrong and the great collision does come, all this will be lost, and that would break history's heart.

This reporter, like most, even among those who fear and doubt, still believes that God and the stars will again indulge their notorious weakness for Americans and bring us through this unhappy Vietnamese transaction in safety and peace. There, like the government officials, I speak from faith, not from the facts; knowing, as they know, that faith—even blind faith—can sometimes change the facts.

FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR ADULT EDUCATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that in its deliberations today and tomorrow, the Education Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee is considering the inclusion of an amendment to the elementary and secondary education bill dealing with adult education. I sincerely hope they will report favorably, and that the Senate will pass such a measure.

Specifically, the proposals under consideration are those contained in my bill S. 3012, on which testimony was received last month and which bears the endorsement of 17 other Senators as cosponsors.

I believe it is high time that we moved forward into the area which is now the neediest in the education field, that of adult education. My bill, which I hope will become a title of the elementary and secondary education proposals, calls for primary use of the public schools as the great existing resource for the upgrading of educational opportunity for adults.

Adult education is considered in these proposals under the two heads of adult basic education and of adult supplemental education. The concept of adult basic education as contemplated at present under the Economic Opportunity Act is enlarged to include instruction and services for adults who do not have a secondary education or its equivalent—in other words, all who have not finished high school. Supplemental adult education is the area which includes, in the language of the bill, such items as citizenship training, parent education, and consumer education.

I have previously, both in the Senate and before the committee, spoken of the advantages of giving support to the expansion of such programs through the public schools. There are other avenues of adult education through which persons may forward their knowledge and understanding in an organized way. While the schools were providing, according to a survey some 5 years ago, adult education for nearly 2 million people, adult education activities of

churches and synagogues reached nearly 3½ million and colleges and universities 3,440,000.

The problems of the college and university in dealing with adult education through extension courses are discussed in a recent Christian Science Monitor article by Wesley Max, writing from Los Angeles. He points to the "economic squeeze" faced by extension courses as State support, pressed hard by the needs for the regular university curriculum, has dwindled. In California, the State budget has declined from 20 to 7 percent of the cost of the courses, and those who often need such study the most are being hard pressed by the need to pay fees averaging \$45 per course.

This article, at this time when adult education is under consideration in the committee, is worthy of attention. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

AN ECONOMIC SQUEEZE: THE STRANGE WAYS OF ADULT EDUCATION

LOS ANGELES.—Any university that would consider curtailing education in liberal arts and social sciences while retaining courses in Wine I, Chinese Cooking, and Skills in Social Dance—Advanced would generally be considered an educational degenerate. Yet the highly regarded University of California Extension (or adult-education division) finds it faces just such an embarrassing predicament.

This predicament arises from a maxim that has plagued the remarkable growth of adult education at the university level over the nation: Courses must make money in order to make the curriculum. This cost consciousness often also means that the people who need the courses most are least able to pay for them.

At California, Wines I, Chinese Cooking, and Social Dance—Advanced make money; some liberal-arts and social-sciences courses do not. At the same time state support of the extension's budget, now \$15,000,000, has dwindled from 20 to 7 per cent in the past several years. One recent legislative report recommends that extension services, normally supported largely by student fees, be supported entirely by them, a proposal that extension officials decry.

It is this economic squeeze that prompted Extension Dean Paul Sheats to warn recently that decreasing state support would "force us increasingly into an elitist type of program." Courses that fail to attract a sufficient and affluent clientele will be dropped. An affluent clientele is necessary because student fees now average \$45 per course for the 133,000 students who are enrolled at 175 state-wide extension branches.

KEEPING UP TO SNUFF

Says Dean Sheats: "In general we don't have problems in engineering, science, business, and law because many firms reimburse employes for extension work. They realize it is necessary to keep their people up to snuff." Although they are not reimbursed, teachers, too, are willing to pay the increased fees because they need the courses in order to be promoted. But lower-income groups like social workers, labor personnel, some night students, and municipal employes are often thwarted by the higher fees.

The pressures of the enrollment economy as it is often called among extension officials are being felt in other university-extension systems. Many systems enjoy a higher level of state support than the California Extension systems. Many systems enjoy a higher level of state support than the California Extension systems.

June 27, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

13763

now from a crazy quilt, unsettling high interest rate pattern.

On the other hand, candor demands one note that the protax increase group misjudged the actual strength of the economy this year.

VIETNAM THE KEY

A tax increase might have put a real crimp in the economy. Recession? I doubt it, but that "lull" might have been more painful.

To be sure, there has instead been an inflation of prices, damaging, but not crippling. This has been the "trade off" for keeping unemployment low.

But what of the future? The only thing that is certain is that Vietnam is the key. If Tobin's hunch is right, then 1967 could see a cost push inflation (wages and prices out of hand) supplementing today's demand pull inflation (too many dollars chasing too few goods).

Then the debate will start all over again, and economic logic, "new" or "old," will again demand a tax boost.

PENTAGON EXPERT STUDIES HOW TO STEM VIETNAM INFLATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. One of the ablest young men with whom I have worked closely in recent years is Leslie Aspin. He comes from Wisconsin and is a graduate of Yale summa cum laude, 1960. He then studied at Oxford and received his master's degree in 1962 in economics. He completed his doctorate study at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. For some months he has served in the Pentagon as an outstanding economist.

A few days ago, he was sent to Saigon by Secretary McNamara to make a study and report on inflation in Vietnam.

The Aspin report on Vietnam could be extremely significant. We all know how vital it is to win political stability in South Vietnam if we are to have a chance to negotiate peace and self determination. It is vital that we succeed in stemming Vietnam's rampant inflation, if we are to develop the basis for political stability.

The Aspin study will contribute to that vital objective.

I ask unanimous consent to have an article published in the Milwaukee Sentinel, entitled "Shorewood Economist Aids Saigon Fight on Inflation," written by James G. Wieghart, printed in the RECORD.

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

SHOREWOOD ECONOMIST AIDS SAIGON FIGHT ON INFLATION

(By James G. Wieghart)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A Shorewood economist left for Saigon Thursday to help fight inflation—which next to the Vietcong poses the most serious threat to the South Vietnamese government.

He is Leslie Aspin, 27, of 3935 N. Ridgely circle, an economic advisor to Defense Secretary McNamara.

Aspin will spend two to three weeks touring South Vietnam to determine if the recent anti-inflationary steps taken by the United States government will be sufficient to save that country's economy.

The South Vietnamese government last Saturday announced a massive devaluation of its piaster currency, which had been depreciating alarmingly under the onslaught of inflation.

As a result of the devaluation, the commercial exchange rate of the piaster to the

dollar was raised from 60 to 1 to 118 to 1. The new rates consist of an 80 to 1 exchange plus a 38 piaster tax, for a total of 118 piasters per \$1.

Aspin conceded that the American government views the Vietnamese economic crisis just as seriously as it does the political crisis brought on by Buddhist dissidents who have sought to unseat the Saigon government.

He said that the country is undergoing an almost classical wartime inflation brought on by a decline and dislocation in agricultural and industrial production due to the war.

This is aggravated by mounting government defense expenditures and falling revenue caused by decreasing tax collections. On top of all this is the tremendous economic pressure generated by the presence of 260,000 American troops plus the tremendous United States spending for port and other facilities.

Just how serious inflation has become in Vietnam is evidenced by the increase in the money supply from 25 billion piasters in April, 1964, to more than 57 billion now, Aspin said. He said the cost of living has risen 130% since January, 1962.

He pointed out that food prices alone have jumped 84% since the eve of the American buildup in January, 1965, and have risen 15% in the last six weeks.

A recent report from Vietnam lists the price for the most common brand of rice eaten in Saigon at 1,120 piasters for about 200 pounds. In January, the cost of the same quantity was estimated at about 800 piasters. The report said the average Vietnamese family spends about 13% of its budget for rice.

Aspin said that efforts to bring the South Vietnamese economy in line is a joint one between the South Vietnamese government, the international monetary fund and the American government, particularly the defense and state departments.

He said he will check on methods for distributing the defense department's massive spending to avoid disrupting the economy. One way to do this, he said, is for the defense department to buy as much of its supplies as possible from sources outside of South Vietnam.

The American government also is helping to increase the supply of goods by releasing 160 million dollars to the South Vietnamese treasury for imports between now and September.

Aspin has been an economic adviser to McNamara since he received his Ph.D. from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology last February.

He was graduated from Shorewood high school in 1956, and received his bachelor's degree in history from Yale university where he was graduated summa cum laude in 1960.

He received his master's degree in economics, politics and philosophy at Oxford (England) university in 1962.

Aspin also has been active behind the scenes in Wisconsin politics. In the summer of 1960 he worked in the office of Sen. PROXMIRE (D-Wis.). From February to November, 1964, he was campaign director for PROXMIRE.

In July, 1965, he directed a fund raising dinner for PROXMIRE and in August 1965, he was director of a fund raising dinner for Lt. Gov. Patrick J. Lucey.

Aspin also has had experience as an economic consultant. In the summer of 1961, he was economic adviser to the United Africa Co., Freetown, Sierra Leone in western Africa.

In the summer of 1963 he was assistant to Walter Heller, another former Shorewood man who was then chairman of the council of economic advisers in the Kennedy administration.

His mother, Mrs. Leslie Aspin, lives at the Shorewood address.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM SHOULD NOT BE MERGED WITH LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, when Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman testified before the Senate Agriculture Committee on June 21, he endorsed a permanent special milk program for schoolchildren with no authorization ceiling. Of course, this greatly pleased those of us who have been fighting for a continuation of the program in its present form.

However, it was a matter of some concern to me that in his statement Secretary Freeman alluded to the milk program only once—in a single paragraph. This concerns me, because it indicates that the milk program might be swallowed up in the school lunch program if it is included as a part of that program.

For example, the lunch program requires one-half pint of milk to be served with a school lunch if the Federal Government is to contribute to the cost of that lunch. However, the Federal contribution does not go toward the cost of the milk. On the other hand, the school milk program provides for Federal reimbursement for half-pints of milk consumed at midmorning and midafternoon milk breaks.

It is quite possible that, if these two programs were merged, the school milk program might in the years ahead be used to pay for that half-pint of milk at lunch without a corresponding increase in the funds available. This, of course, would require a cutback in the amount of milk provided in midmorning and midafternoon.

This is just one of the problems that could arise if the programs are merged. It is enough to indicate, however, the dangerous precedent we would be setting. Consequently, I sincerely hope that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will take action to insure the integrity of the school milk program at this vital juncture in its history.

FISH PROTEIN CONCENTRATE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2720) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop, through the use of experiment and demonstration plants, practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments en bloc.

The committee amendments were agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the amendments, as follows:

On page 2, lines 13 and 14, strike out the words "not to exceed five experimental and demonstration plants" and insert "one experimental and demonstration plant"; and

13764

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 27, 1966

on page 4, line 5, strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000,000".

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these amendments be considered en bloc.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendments.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield on a procedural question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from California.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, as I suggested informally to my colleagues on the majority side, members of the minority leadership are necessarily absent at an important luncheon downtown. If, however, we were able to agree on a time certain for the yeas-and-nays vote which has just been ordered, it would accommodate them. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the yeas-and-nays vote take place at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this is a bill which, of course, is very important to us in the fishery States but it is a bill that I believe is not of great interest to some Senators. We told the Senate on Friday that the bill would be brought up today and that it would be the only business for today. The Senator from Alaska and I would not mind putting this over until tomorrow, but we found that on tomorrow the calendar of the Senate will be wholly preoccupied with another important, major bill and we probably would not get the opportunity to get our bill through. I do not know whether there is anything else before the Senate between now and 2:30 o'clock. I did not know so many Senators were interested in having a yeas-and-nays vote on the amendments of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

There is one other point I would like to make. That is many of us have been very patient with the Food and Drug Administration while they have been considering the proposal from the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. I hope these apparent recent delays will not become serious and disturb this fine understanding and relationship.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have no objection to—

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, putting the question, has my unanimous-consent request been acted upon?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am not going to object, but I hope that we can dispose of this matter and get on our way with other important legislation. There is not much more to debate between now and 2:30 o'clock on the Senator's amendments, unless he has something more to say.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would the able Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] indicate on what basis he concludes that this luncheon downtown is important?

Mr. KUCHEL. On the basis that it concerns the revitalization of my political party.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection on that ground. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and the yeas-and-nays vote will therefore be at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Chair.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I am not going to delay the bill, but I should like to restate the question.

The purpose of the amendments is merely to bring to bill in line with the recommendations of the administration and every agency affected. I see no reason why the bill should provide for five experimental pilot plants when the agency says they cannot efficiently use but one at this time.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record excerpts from the letter of Director Donald F. Horning, from the Office of Science and Technology in the Executive Office of the President, which endorses the legislation in principle, but specifically recommends that one pilot plant be constructed.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

I am fully in support of the objectives of S. 2720 and agree with its approach. On the basis of the experience gained by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries in developing a promising laboratory process, I believe that there is need for the construction of a single experimental and demonstration pilot plant which would pave the way for the subsequent construction of semicommercial and full-scale production plants.

We now have a fragmented, hand-operated laboratory process. A necessary next step is to construct a relatively small experimental continuous process plant with maximum flexibility for the conduct of engineering research studies under a wide range of conditions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record excerpts from the letter of the Department of the Interior, and an excerpt from the letter of the Comptroller General.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

INTERIOR COMMENTS

We recommend the enactment of the bill with the amendments suggested herein.

S. 2720 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to increase his present fish protein concentrate research and experimentation program and to build five experiment and demonstration plants to produce this concentrate. The bill authorizes a maximum appropriation of \$5 million to construct these plants and additional sums for operation and maintenance and the program itself.

Our amendments and comments thereon are as follows:

1. On page 2, lines 4 and 5, delete the words "not to exceed five experiment and demonstration plants" and insert "one experiment and demonstration plant."

2. Delete the last sentence in subsection 2(a) of the bill.

3. On page 2, lines 6, 15, 18, and on page 3, lines 1, 21, and 24 delete "plants" and insert "plant".

4. On page 2, line 23, delete "or plants".

5. On page 3, line 4, delete "Each constructed" and substitute "The".

These changes reduce the number of authorized plants from five to one. This plant would be an expanded version of the existing model-scale solvent system developed by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries of this Department. Studies utilizing the currently available model unit have indicated that a highly nutritious fish protein concentrate (FPC) can be produced using solvent extraction procedures.

It is now necessary to determine whether a similar product can be manufactured on a commercial scale within the economic limits required. It is also necessary to produce larger quantities of FPC for testing purposes—to determine and demonstrate where and to what extent it can be used as a supplement with other food stuffs.

These needs justify the construction and operation of one experiment and demonstration plant by the Federal Government at this time.

It is possible, however, that when the studies on other families of fishes are completed, additional plants may be needed. At that time, the operation of the single plant proposed herein will permit us to design more efficient solvent-extraction plants, tailored to the specific characteristics of these other families of fishes. In addition, work is underway on two other basic processes for the production of FPC—namely, an enzymatic digestion process and a physical cell disruption process.

It should be emphasized that we do not now have a marketable product. Nor do we know whether it can be manufactured on a commercial scale within reasonable economic limits.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL COMMENTS

It is our understanding that as of October 31, 1965, the Food and Drug Administration has not approved whole fish protein concentrate for human consumption. Accordingly, you may wish to consider amending this section of the bill to provide for deferment of plant construction until such time as the Secretary of the Interior shall ascertain that the Food and Drug Administration will approve a whole fish protein concentrate for human consumption.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, each of these agencies heartily endorses the principle that we need but one pilot plant at this particular time. They agree that it would be a waste of money to build five pilot plants at this time. I think it would be the height of folly for the Senate to pass this bill authorizing the expenditure of five times as much as the agencies themselves say they need or think they can spend efficiently, particularly at a time when we are already operating on a deficit of several million dollars per day.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am sure that most Members of this body are familiar with fish protein concentrate and the efforts which a number of us have made to have it included in our food-for-peace program when it has

June 27, 1966

they had been led, bound and barefoot, at the end of ropes.

MARCH

On June 14 they were marched to another prison camp and Sgt. Dodson told Cpl. Eckes they were heading north, toward Da Nang.

On the evening of June 16, Sgt. Dodson said, he and Cpl. Eckes were sitting in a circle with three Viet Cong guards eating rice.

"I kept looking over there toward the carbines, trying to figure the distance, how quick I could jump over there," Sgt. Dodson said. "For a while I almost backed out of it."

But Sgt. Dodson said he jumped up, ran toward the tree, grabbed a carbine, cocked it and whirled about.

"When I turned they were on their feet, but they still had their rice dishes in their hands," he said. "I was scared, kind of shaking."

"They looked at me," he said. "I looked at them. Then they ran."

Sgt. Dodson said he then grabbed another carbine and threw it to Cpl. Eckes.

"We just kept a canteen we had taken from one of the VC packs and a little bag of hard candy," Sgt. Dodson said. "We had three pieces of candy each day."

On the second night they were almost recaptured.

DANGER

"The Viet Cong must have had a search party out," Sgt. Dodson said. "We could hear them all around. We stayed as quiet as we could. We'd decided earlier, tho, we'd fight it out with them before they could capture us again. But I was so scared I thought they'd hear my heart beating. They went right by us."

Cpl. Eckes said that at least three Viet Cong walked within two or three feet of where he and Sgt. Dodson were lying. They passed two villages, one where the villagers took after them with shovels and the other where they were fed rice.

On the fourth night they saw "a light going round and round way off in the distance." "We both figured it must be a light from the Da Nang air base," Sgt. Dodson said.

They walked up a mountain to get a better look.

"When we got up there we could see the lights of Da Nang," Sgt. Dodson said. "Man, did that feel good."

ORDEAL OF TWO MARINES: IN PRISON

(By Jim G. Lucas)

DA NANG, June 27.—The Viet Cong segregated a Negro U.S. Marine from a white Marine in a mountain prison camp to preach to the Negro about the evils of segregation.

"You're a black American," they told Sgt. James S. Dodson, 23, of York, Pa. "Why should you fight the white man's battles for him?"

"Your own people at home are fighting for the same things we are."

When Sgt. Dodson remained silent, they asked:

"Do you like the way your people are being treated at home?"

"I approve to a certain extent," the Marine said he answered. "Some things aren't right, but many things are."

Sgt. Dodson and Cpl. Walter W. Eckes Jr., 23, of New York are now back inside our lines. They escaped June 20 after disarming their Red guards in the mountains.

Sgt. Dodson's interrogators bore down heavily on alleged American injustices to Negroes.

IMPERIALISTS

Cpl. Eckes said "every other word was about (President) Johnson or (Defense Secretary) McNamara" in the questioning of him.

"They told me Johnson and McNamara were imperialists and kept repeating that over and over. They said the President and McNamara weren't concerned with the little

people fighting their war, but only in making money."

Later the two Marines were interrogated jointly and denounced as "imperialist Yankee dogs."

"It seemed like the guy was angry when he said it, but then he grinned," Sgt. Dodson recalled.

Sgt. Dodson said morale among the Viet Cong seemed high. They saw no signs of defeatism or discouragement.

"They believe they're winning this war," Sgt. Dodson said, "and why shouldn't they? They made us listen to Radio Hanoi every day. They hear the same thing. If they're shooting down 200 Yankee planes a day—and Radio Hanoi tells them they are—they're not going to think anything else but in terms of winning."

How does a man feel when he realizes he's a prisoner?

"It's a hollow, sunk feeling," Cpl. Eckes said. "You're lost. You don't think you have any chance to escape. You think about all those years ahead."

"You think about being sent to some kind of concentration camp," said Sgt. Dodson. "That's the hard part."

NO SIGNATURES

Both men said they were urged to sign papers, but refused. Their captors did not press them. Each prisoner gave only his name, rank and serial number.

Neither man was forced to work or abused. They spent their time playing cards and reading. Sgt. Dodson taught Eckes Whist. Their guards taught them a French game called Lecarte.

South Vietnam Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. DUNCAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post published in its editions of June 20, 1966, a lead editorial that summed up in clear fashion the objectives of the administration in respect to Vietnam. It also properly touched on the many ambiguities, distress, and the distaste that we must acknowledge as we pursue and support our legitimate objectives in that unhappy land. I ask that the editorial be published in the Appendix of the Record.

SOUTH VIETNAM POLICY

President Johnson's press conference statements on American policy in South Vietnam put firmly on the record the intention of the Government to persist in its present policy until it achieves the objective of a peace under which the independence of South Vietnam is assured.

The President's assertion that "we must continue to raise the cost of aggression at its source" by further attacks on military targets in North Vietnam will give disquiet to many who would like to limit or diminish the air attack. It well may foretell a long-deferred assault upon petroleum storage facilities that ground and air military experts long have desired. The air war seems bound to escalate to include every military target in the country eventually; but there is no indication of an assault beyond military targets. At the same time, any air effort against the great fuel dumps at Haiphong and elsewhere no doubt will involve some civilian casualties.

The casualties reported by the President reflect the rising intensity of the conflict. Dismay at the loss of 2200 Americans will not be diminished by the knowledge that the enemy has lost 22,500. The people of this country will grieve over the calamity that war visits upon both friend and foe; no one will exult over the death of the unfortunate Vietnamese who have been harnessed to an aggressive military machine by Communist power.

The President's plea for peace and an end to the war will find an echo in every American heart; and most Americans will support him as well in his determination to carry on until an honorable peace is obtained.

It is, as the President says, a "bitter and an ugly war." It also is a war the end of which cannot now be foreseen. It seems likely to go on for a long time. And it is also likely that if the war in South Vietnam ends, there will be aggression elsewhere. There may be aggression at other points in the area even while the war in South Vietnam continues.

The President spoke again of this Nation's "responsibility and its commitment to help Vietnam turn back aggression from the North." There can be disagreement and difference over the legal basis for that responsibility and commitment. But beyond the legal niceties and diplomatic detail there lies a responsibility and a commitment from which we cannot escape, no matter how hard we may struggle or how much we repine. We must be reconciled to the "price of greatness" to which Winston Churchill referred in his Harvard speech in 1943: "One cannot rise to be in many ways the leading community in the civilized world without being involved in its problems, without being convulsed by its agonies and inspired by its causes."

The late E. W. Scripps predicted in 1915: "Within two or three, or four decades, of necessity, the American people will be intervening in all international and world affairs, settling disputes between nations and suppressing such international conflicts as may, by disturbing the world's peace, disturb the serenity of the American people."

The destiny that Churchill foretold in 1943 and that Scripps envisioned in 1915 has come upon us. It is a destiny that few Americans view with relish and one from which many recoil with revulsion and dismay; but we cannot retreat into the womb of history and the prenatal comforts of gestating political might. We find ourselves in a world where great and powerful nations are using force and the threat of force against small countries. In such a world, the decision to use or the decision not to use our power, must determine the fate of many nations. As anguishing as the price of war in South Vietnam may be, in the lives of Americans and in the lives of the soldiers of the countries allied with us, it is difficult to see any alternative that would not exchange present for future danger, inspire new aggression elsewhere and confirm in all aggressors renewed faith in force as an instrument of policy.

Pathetic Gesture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1966

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared an editorial entitled "Pathetic Gesture" in the Wednesday morning, June 1, Commercial Appeal, an outstand-

where in the nearby mountains. About 12 South Vietnamese army prisoners also were there.

After several weeks of confinement in a small enemy prison camp somewhere southwest of Danang, Dodson and Eckes were taken by three guards on a march toward a different prison camp.

They estimated the date at June 14 when the trip began.

As the march progressed the marines noted that their captors were careless with their American-made captured carbines.

"They weren't carrying them in a position where they could fire them immediately," Dodson said, "So we started planning how we could get away from them."

On the evening of June 16 the two marines were seated in a circle with their three captors eating rice. The guerrillas had left their .30-caliber carbines leaning against a tree about 10 feet away.

"I kept looking over there toward the carbines, trying to figure the distance—how quick I could jump over there," Dodson said.

'ALMOST BACKED OUT'

"For a while I almost backed out of it," he added.

Finally, however, Dodson jumped up and raced to the tree, grasping a carbine, cocking it and whirling around.

"When I turned they were on their feet, but they still had their rice dishes in their hands," he said. "I was scared, kind of shaking."

"They looked at me. I looked at them. And then they ran."

Eckes took another carbine and Dodson carried the third as they made ready to flee. Eckes had boots but Dodson had only a pair of sandals. Both men were dressed in Vietnamese peasant black pajamas but still had their Marine fatigue uniforms in their packs.

"We went down the side of a mountain," said Dodson, "we kept going all night. We wanted to get as far away as we could."

To lighten their burdens they threw away their rice and subsisted for the next four days on three pieces of hard candy a day for each man.

On the second night of their escape they were almost recaptured when, on a mountain top, they heard voices and noise. The two marines took cover in deep "elephant grass."

During the next two days they were almost run over by the stampeding water buffaloes and wandered until they reached a point where they saw the lights of Danang.

"Man did that feel good," said Dodson.

Dodson's weight dropped from 195 to less than 165 pounds and Eckes from 135 to 105 pounds. Both men were treated for exhaustion, lacerations from thorns and brush and sore feet.

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot,
June 27, 1966]

GRABS CONG RIFLE, ESCAPES WITH BUDDY:
YORK GI OUTWITS RED CAPTORS

DA NANG, SOUTH VIETNAM.—The U.S. Marine prisoner made a desperate leap, grabbed the carbine of one of his captors, cocked it, and looked straight down the barrel at the three surprised Viet Cong.

And then it was a whole new ball game.

This was part of a harrowing tale revealed yesterday—the story of how two Leather-necks, captured in separate incidents in early May, escaped from their captors and walked for four days before finally reaching friendly lines.

The Marines are Sgt. James S. Dodson, 23, of York, Pa., and Lance Cpl. Walter W. Eckes, 20, of New York City.

The two met for the first time on May 12 in a Communist detention camp where they had been led—bound and barefoot—at the end of ropes.

They were suffering from hunger, minor lacerations, infections and near exhaustion

when they made contact with a Marine unit last Monday at An Hoa, 20 miles southwest of Da Nang.

They had survived the last four days of their ordeal on water from streams and rice paddies and a few pieces of candy a day. Their overall condition was described as good.

On one occasion they came within a few feet of being recaptured.

Dodson, who arrived in Viet Nam in July, 1965, is a member of the 3rd Engineer Battalion, 3rd Marine Division. He holds the purple heart for a leg wound sustained last December. He has a 10-month-old son he has never seen.

He was working on a roadbuilding project seven miles southeast of Da Nang when he was captured.

He had walked forward to check the area where the road was to extend. There was a cluster of huts and he was walking around one when "something hit me on the side of the head. It stunned me and I fell."

He said there were six Viet Cong and they subdued him and bound his hands with rope, then removed his boots.

They started dragging him by a 10-foot rope but Dodson said he managed to get to his feet. His captors then started running, pulling him behind them.

"We got to a river, crossed it in a boat, then started running some more," Dodson said. "Then we stopped and were met by a whole group of VC, maybe 30 or 40, all armed."

After a while, he said, four of them led him off in a southwesterly direction. They walked for three days and nights until they arrived at the detention camp.

During the journey, the sergeant said, he and his captors passed through several villages and bypassed others. He said the people in the villages they went through "seemed to be friendly," and some of the people gave him bananas and cookies.

Dodson said his captors did not treat him roughly during the trip and that they gave him rice and water. He said they arrived at the camp in the mountains on May 9.

Eckes, a radio operator with an artillery forward observer team attached to "Charlie" Company, 9th Marine Regiment, was hitchhiking back to his company from regimental headquarters at the time of his capture on May 10.

He said three armed Vietnamese, whom he thought were South Vietnamese soldiers, leveled rifles at him.

"I was stunned and it was too late to do anything," said Eckes.

The Viet Cong took his .45-cal. automatic, bound him and took him to a nearby village.

He later was led toward the south. Two days later he reached the camp where Dodson was held.

Both men reported that when they arrived at the camp their feet were blistered, cut and swollen. They said a Vietnamese doctor treated them. They were also taken to a stream to wash and given more rice.

Each evening, the Marines said, the Viet Cong leader of the camp came to the hut where they were held. They were taken from the hut and forced to listen for a half hour to an English-language newscast from Radio Hanoi. They also were given Communist newspapers and pamphlets to read.

The Marines said that on occasions they were questioned about military matters but refused to answer. They said there were no attempts to force information from them.

Dodson and Eckes said they often discussed the possibility of escaping.

On June 14 they were being taken to another camp.

"They said they were going to take us there to school us about the National Liberation Front and other things," Dodson said.

"I told Eckes we were heading north, toward De Nang," Dodson said. "Then after

some time we could even hear the artillery firing and I knew we were heading toward De Nang."

Dodson said that on the evening of June 16 he and Eckes were seated in a circle with three Viet Cong guards eating rice. He said their captors had left their carbines against a tree about 10 feet away.

"I kept looking over there toward the carbines, trying to figure the distance, how quick I could jump over there," Dodson said. "For a while I almost backed out of it."

But Dodson said he jumped up, ran toward the tree, grabbed a carbine, cocked it and whirled about.

"When I turned they were on their feet, but they still had their rice dishes in their hands," Dodson said. "I was scared, kind of shaking."

"They looked at me," the sergeant said. "I looked at them. And then they ran."

Dodson said that when the three Viet Cong guards ran he grabbed another carbine and threw it to Eckes.

Dodson said he picked up the third carbine and a pack he had been carrying.

Dodson said the next morning they threw away the extra carbine because it was too much to carry.

"We just kept a canteen we had taken from one of the VC packs and a little bag of hard candy," he said. "There was a lot of rice but we did not want to carry it along. Besides, we couldn't take a chance on cooking it."

The Marines said they limited themselves to three pieces of candy each day of their four-day trek.

On the second night they were almost recaptured.

"They must have had a search party out," Dodson said. "We could hear them all around. We stayed quiet as we could. We'd decided earlier, though, we'd fight it out with them before they could capture us again. But I was so scared I thought they'd hear my heart beating. They went right by us."

Eckes said that at least three Viet Cong walked within two or three feet of where he and Dodson were lying.

"We just stayed in the same spot the rest of the night," he said.

On the fourth night they saw "a light going round and round way off in the distance," Dodson said. "We both figured it must be a light from the Da Nang air base."

They walked up a mountain to get a better look.

"When we got up there we could see the lights of Da Nang," Dodson said. "Man did that feel good."

The two Marines spent the night on the mountaintop.

Dodson said they had hoped to signal a plane with a mirror Eckes had stolen from the shaving kit of one of his captors. But they were unsuccessful in signaling a plane.

They started moving again. Finally they came to a South Vietnamese military outpost.

Dodson, who ordinarily weighs 195 pounds, had lost over 30 pounds. Eckes was down to 105 pounds from his usual 135.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News,
June 27, 1966]

ORDEAL OF TWO MARINES: ESCAPE

DA NANG, S. VIET NAM, June 27.—Sgt. James S. Dodson, of York, Pa., held a rice bowl in his shaky hand. His eyes were glued to three carbines his Viet Cong captors stacked against a tree.

In one desperate leap, Sgt. Dodson seized one of the carbines, and aimed it at the three Viet Cong. The Viet Cong fled and so did Sgt. Dodson, 23, and a fellow Marine corporal, Walter W. Eckes, 20, of New York City.

The two Marines met for the first time May 12 in a communist prison camp where