

and I commend the resolution to my colleagues for their endorsement.

Whether we like it or not, this Nation and this globe are faced with water problems which could spell the end to civilization as we know it—and, if we are to solve these problems, we are going to have to explore all avenues of research, supply, re-use, and conservation. It is time that we begin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the name of the Senator from Utah will be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FRANK DI LUZIO TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on July 20 will conduct a hearing on the nomination of Frank Di Luzio to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

President Johnson on July 5 nominated Mr. Di Luzio to be in charge of water resources research, water pollution, and similar water programs in the Department of the Interior.

The hearing will begin at 10 o'clock a.m. in Room 3110 of the New Senate Office Building.

Mr. Di Luzio, of Kensington, Md., was staff director of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences from April 1963, until his appointment as Director of the Office of Saline Water in December 1964. In the new position, he would continue to supervise the saline water program.

REPUBLICAN CALL FOR HIGHER TAXES ECONOMICALLY WRONG AND UNSOUND

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday a group of eminent Republicans contended that if the administration or the Congress were to increase spending then Federal taxes should be increased.

Mr. President, there will be substantial opportunities for the Congress to cut spending in various construction programs, the space programs, and elsewhere without seriously impeding the national defense, or the building of a better America and a better world.

There may have been a time for a cross-the-board tax hike. In fact, a strong case can be made against the action of the last Congress in 1964 reducing taxes by some \$11 billion.

But, Mr. President, the economic case against a tax increase today is very strong indeed. Opposition to a tax increase right now is a matter of solid economic sense, not political advantage. President Johnson is right in not calling for a tax increase.

This morning's newspapers reported that unemployment continues at 4 percent, well above the February low of 3.7 percent.

To raise taxes when unemployment is not declining is not only bad economics, it is cruel.

But the advocates of a tax hike argued yesterday that without such action, the country will suffer inflation.

This morning's newspapers reported that wholesale prices were stable again last month. They remain at virtually the same level they reached in February. That is 6 months of stability. And it is clear that wholesale prices lead, and to a very considerable extent determine, retail prices.

Last month retail prices, the Consumer Price Index, rose only one-tenth of 1 percent, a figure the economists call not statistically significant.

Mr. President consider what 51 of the Nation's economists in Government, labor unions, industrial corporations, universities and research organizations, investment firms, and commercial banking said in reply to a midyear questionnaire by Financial Commentator J. A. Livingston.

Do they expect an out-of-control booming economy, runaway inflation?

First they expect a tapering off—that is right, a tapering off in the rate of growth of the economy.

The second half increase this year will be 2.8 percent, followed by an increase of 2.6 percent in the first half and 2.2 percent in the second half of 1967. This is an increase in the gross national product. This increase will be achieved, according to these economists, without major inflation. The economists are betting that the cost of living will rise only 4 percent during the 18 months. There is solid statistical support for this position.

The weekly hours of work, according to economic indicators, were: February, 41.6; March, 41.5; April, 41.5; and May, 41.4. It is clear that our work force is expanding and it is unnecessary for us to have as much overtime as in the past.

Weekly earnings were the same in May as they had been in April. There is no indication that they increased last month.

Total industrial production has been rising since March at about one-half of the rate in 1963. Installment credit increased last month by the lowest amount since 1965. The stock market is down. Sensitive commodities, according to labor statistics, indicate we are more likely to have a falloff.

All of these statistics, together with the views of the competent nonpolitical economists, indicate that this is a bad time for a tax increase, and that it would be a serious mistake for the President to recommend it, or for Congress to adopt it.

VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there has appeared recently in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch a series of five articles on Vietnam by the distinguished Washington correspondent, Mr. Richard Dudman.

Mr. Dudman has made a number of journeys to Vietnam and southeast Asia in recent years. At the end of each, he has reported his firsthand observations in articles of exceptional candor, objectivity, and balance. Subsequent developments have frequently attested to the accuracy of Mr. Dudman's reporting and to the acuteness of his perceptions.

The present series of articles helps to bring a measure of order and under-

standing to the confusing flow of events in Vietnam. The articles do not make pleasant reading but they are well worth the attention not only of the readers of the Post-Dispatch but of all thoughtful Americans and of the Senate and the officials of the Government who have responsibilities involving Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that the series of five articles previously referred to be included at this point in the RECORD.

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

"REVOLUTIONARY DEVELOPMENTS," VIETNAM PACIFICATION VENTURE, RAISES SOME SERIOUS DOUBTS—MILD BUREAUCRATIC SCRAMBLE GOING ON AMONG U.S. OFFICIALS TO TAKE PART IN NEWEST EFFORT OF "OTHER WAR"

(By Richard Dudman)

(NOTE.—Richard Dudman has just returned from a two-month assignment in Viet Nam covering the political crisis and military developments. It was his third assignment there since 1962. This is the third in a series of articles on the situation and prospects.)

WASHINGTON, July 6.—"Revolutionary development," the latest pacification program in Viet Nam, has received heavy promotion and has stirred great expectations but its test of performance still lies ahead. The prospects appear only marginal.

This "other war" was given a strong send-off by President Lyndon B. Johnson when he told the South Viet Nameese leaders at Honolulu that he was "determined not only to achieve victory over aggression, but to win victory over hunger, disease and despair."

So far, the chief result of the Honolulu meeting has been a political crisis that paralyzed much of the pacification and military effort for three months.

But so much money and importance have been given to the program that there has been something of a bureaucratic scramble among officials of the Embassy, the Agency for International Development, the Information Service and the Central Intelligence Agency, each trying to get a big piece of it. In a place where careers can easily be destroyed, there is a feeling that reputations can be made in the Revolutionary Development business.

On paper, the new program shows great promise and is a big improvement over the old "strategic hamlets" and the various other plans for organizing the population and ferreting out the Viet Cong.

The new plan calls for a combination of self-defense, good government, economic aid, welfare assistance and population and commodity control to cut off support to the insurgency.

The first 90-day class of 4800 cadres finished training a month ago at a special school run by Viet Nameese officers assisted by the CIA at Vung Tao. Plans call for training 20,000 this year and eventually 150,000 of these pacification agents.

They learn techniques of paramilitary defense and rural organization as well as such political tricks as how to spread rumors, how to set up demonstrations, and how to counter antigovernment or anti-American demonstration when, say, a friendly village has been bombed by mistake.

Perhaps the most important part of the course is an effort to implant patriotism in a hurry. This political motivation training includes drills in Viet Nameese slogans, songs and in the history of the nation's heroes. Discussion groups cover French colonialism, the history of the Diem regime, past government mistakes, third-country assistance, and the reason for United States intervention.

(Group leaders describe the United States and South Viet Nam as two houses in the

July 12, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

14529

the government of such Member State has agreed to take appropriate steps, within a reasonable time, for the restoration of constitutional government, the holding of free elections, and the application of human and civil rights and liberties within such Member State."

WATER FOR PEACE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, since the beginning of time, the people who have inhabited the western portion of this continent have been faced with one central, controlling fact of existence: Without water there can be no progress, no peace, and, indeed, no life itself. The pueblo ruins preserved in Mesa Verde National Park bear silent witness that, even during the days when Mongol hordes were invading Europe, water was the life blood in what is now the western part of the United States—and drought meant death, destruction, and decay.

We of the American West have learned this grim lesson, and we have learned the lessons of water conservation. We have been frugal and thoughtful in making do with that which we had.

Just a few short years ago it was the common belief that only the western half of America had any water problems. There was plenty of water east of the Mississippi River—all you had to do was turn on the tap.

Yet, today, the northeastern part of this Nation—where one-third of our population live and work—is entering the fifth year of the most severe drought in the history of the region. Our Great Lakes are dying of pollution, and every major river system, east and west, suffers under growing loads of pollutants.

We are gearing to clean up the mess we have made of our water resources. Hopefully, there is still time.

In 1963, Congress enacted the Land and Water Conservation Act—basically a recreation measure with water conservation benefits. In 1964, we approved the Water Resources Research Act. In 1965, we passed the Water Resources Planning Act, and the Water Pollution Control Act, and we accelerated the program to desalt ocean and brackish waters. The Clean Rivers Act of 1966 has received committee approval, and will be before this body later on this week.

Meanwhile, the old, established water programs continue. The 60-year-old reclamation program moves on to develop the water resources of the west, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers presses ahead with its active program of civil workers throughout the Nation.

The water picture throughout the world is as equally distressing as the one at home. Some 90 percent of the people in the less developed nations lack adequate water service or are being supplied with unsafe water. In 79 of the major nations of the world, only 11 percent of the people have water supply systems rated good or fair. The remaining 89 percent have unsatisfactory or grossly unsatisfactory water supplies. In some parts of the world, people exist on 3 gallons of water per day.

Unsafe water causes the death of 5 million children per year and incapacitates another 500 million people. The problems of famine are increasing, and increased water supplies are needed merely to maintain current starvation levels in many lands—much less improve the quality of life.

The impact of population growth alone on water resources is frightening. From the beginning of time to the birth of Christ, the total world population was one-quarter of a billion people. Eighteen hundred and thirty years later, the world's population stood at 1 billion. A century later, this figure doubled—and, in the past 36 years, another billion people have been added. By 1980, it is estimated that 4 billion people will live on this planet, and that by the beginning of the 21st century there will be 6 billion.

Yet, there is no more water on this planet than there was when the pharaohs built the pyramids, when Hannibal crossed the Alps, or when Christ was crucified.

Obviously, something must be done. While there are billions more people than at the dawn of creation, there is not a single additional drop of water. The stake that this world has in water cannot be understated. For centuries, man has been trying to find ways to supply himself with water and to use it properly. Where he has failed, the consequences have been tragic because a thirsty man is also a hostile man. If history teaches any lesson, it has taught us that no civilization has climbed on a falling water table, on polluted streams, or on arid acres.

Mr. President, last October, President Johnson called for a water for peace program. In addressing the first international symposium, the President said:

Since the beginning of time, fresh water has been one of humanity's precious needs. For it, wars have been fought. Without it, whole civilizations have vanished from the earth. . . . Our generation can end all that. We have the power—the power of science. But if we are to use that power effectively, we must work together. The earth's water belongs to all mankind. Together, we must find ways to make certain that every nation has its share, and that there is enough for all.

Today, I want to announce the beginning of a "Water for Peace Program." Under this new program, we will join in a massive, co-operative, international effort to find solutions for man's water problems. The United States is prepared to contribute its share of the resources needed for an international crash program to deal with world water resources. We ask other nations to join with us now in pursuit of a common objective—water for all humanity. Let future generations remember us as those who freed man forever from his most ancient and dreaded enemies, drought and famine.

Responding to the President's initiative, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall and Secretary of State Dean Rusk joined together to begin this assault on humanity's water problems. Task forces representing the finest water resources talent in the Federal Establishment have been working since then to develop a co-operative, international program to achieve the objectives of the Johnson administration. This program, when it is

finally formulated, will be presented to Congress for its consideration. It is, I am told, based on the premise that the interests of the United States in a peaceful world are paramount, that water is a global problem, and that all nations should contribute their fair share to improve the lot of all nations.

In addition to a substantive, long-term program to achieve the goal of water for mankind, President Johnson has planned an International Conference on Water for Peace—a conference which could easily be the most important of this generation. This meeting, however, will be more than the usual international meeting for the exchange of technical and scientific information. Delegates at a ministerial level will attend the conference so that specific problems can be identified and specific action programs and policies can be discussed. In a certain sense, the International Conference on Water for Peace will be the prolog to a vast, cooperative effort to develop the water resources of this planet.

This international conference, which also could be the largest international meeting held in the Nation's Capital, is the most effective means of bringing together representatives of governments to focus attention of the massive water problems which we all share in common. The subject matter to be covered at this meeting will be extensive:

Municipal and industrial water requirements; urban and rural supply problems and solutions, including health; water pollution; water for agriculture and fisheries; development and management of international river basins for flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, water supply, fish and wildlife, and outdoor recreation; water desalination, including atomic dual-purpose plants; collection and dissemination of scientific data; water re-use; weather modification; water economics; and international water law.

There will be many things that we will teach—and, equally, there will be many things we can learn from other nations in this endeavor.

There are many reasons why I support the President's water-for-peace program, and why today I urge my colleagues to support the International Conference on Water for Peace. I will cite only one:

Despite aggressive efforts, famine stalks this planet. A 35-percent increase in world food production is required merely to keep up with population growth. Two-thirds of the people of the world live on an inadequate diet. This is not a world which we want to bequeath to the next generation. It is not a world of which we can be proud. It is not a world on which we have intelligently expended our talents and our time. It is, rather, a world which bespeaks of our neglect, our indifference, and our ignorance.

The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee introduced, on June 15, Senate Joint Resolution 167 that would authorize President Johnson's International Conference on Water for Peace. I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor,

July 12, 1966

same village. The South Viet Nameuse house has caught fire. If the fire spreads, the American house could burn, too. So the United States is helping put out the fire now.)

These first cadres, organized into 59-man teams, now have moved into hamlets in relatively secure areas. Their task is to help the residents take over their own defense, root out any Viet Cong agents, govern themselves effectively and support the Saigon government. After three to five months, when this job is supposed to be completed in the first group of hamlets, each team will move on to another hamlet and begin again there.

Subteams are assigned to organize community defense, handle political indoctrination and help the people get available public services from the government.

The key to success is a six-man census-grievance subteam, which studies and reports on the economic level, political beliefs, religious affiliation, aspirations and complaints of every family in the hamlet. Information is gathered through a confidential interview every 10 days with every person in the hamlet over 10 years old.

A tacti quid pro quo is the real significance of the census-grievance group. It serves as an intelligence unit. In return for protection, help, sympathy and advice, the hamlet residents are expected to tell which of their neighbors are or might be working for the Viet Cong.

Subsequent investigations are intended to prevent mistakes, as when someone tagged as a Viet Cong agent actually is an undercover government agent or has been accused falsely because of personal or factional malice.

Despite official enthusiasm for this new pacification effort, serious doubts and reservations are expressed privately even by some of the men most dedicated to trying to make it succeed.

The very ballyhoo that has surrounded the program is cause for some misgiving. Some of these officials urge that it be considered a 10-year effort, not a quick formula for victory.

"Don't ask us to show any results at all in the first two years," said one. "The time to begin to judge success or failure will be about four years from now."

"We'll have all kinds of problems at first. Some of the cadres will be terrible. Some of them will rape, loot, steal, extort and try to live like kings. Some will turn out to be Viet Cong agents, infiltrated into the program as provocateurs."

The wholesale nature of the program arouses some doubts also. An official asks, "Where are we going to find 150,000 cadres when we are already short of administrators to run the government and even recruits for the army?"

There is a question also, whether this instant patriotism can be achieved among a mixture that includes former strategic hamlet cadres under the Diem regime and members of political and religious factions that often fear and distrust one another more than the Communists.

Political action teams in some of the northernmost provinces have been drawn largely from the Viet Nam Quoc Daa Dang, a political party that bitterly opposes the majority Buddhist movement there.

About all, there is a question of conflict between the pacification program and the changing nature of the military effort.

The announced strategy line calls for military action to extend the area of government control gradually. Behind this widening security screen, the revolutionary development program is intended to proceed with pacification.

But the military effort is increasingly aimed at breaking the back of North Viet Nameuse and main force Viet Cong armies. Methods being used are increasingly "search and de-

stroy" and "search and clear." The old concept of "clear and hold" is being postponed.

"The oil slick strategy is pretty well down the drain," a briefing officer tells newly arrived correspondents. "It was all right when all we had was a few guerrillas. Now, with all these northern troops coming in, the oil slick system isn't worth a damn."

American combat commanders take pride in their growing offensive capability against enemy units, whenever they can be found. But they concede generally that territory cannot be held until the South Viet Nameuse forces are prepared to follow up with occupation of the ground. This has happened only rarely so far.

Apparent progress in the heavily populated Mekong delta, where ground fighting still is a South Viet Nameuse monopoly is largely the result of local accommodations between Viet Cong and government commanders. Neither pushes the other too hard.

As a result, when a political action team distributes blankets, rubber sandals and bulgur (parched, cracked) wheat in a hamlet, it sometimes is taken for granted that Viet Cong agents will come in the night and demand half of the new supplies.

As the war intensifies, United States forces rely increasingly on bombs and artillery. Commanders concede that targets sometimes are selected on inaccurate or outdated intelligence, so that whatever Viet Cong were present have fled. Much of the artillery fire is "harassing and interdiction" fire aimed merely at likely places of enemy travel and concentration with the results unobserved. Much of the bombing and shelling is simply at the request of Viet Nameuse commanders, with no independent American check on the validity of the targets.

A pattern is emerging in which bombs and shells pound the countryside, civilians are encouraged and helped to move to the cities as refugees, and anybody left in an area is assumed to be hostile. When all resistance has been smashed, the idea is that the people will be transplanted back and helped, through revolutionary development, along the road to pacification.

The immediate military objective has come to be to kill the Viet Cong—or, as a Viet Nameuse general kept shouting at a recent cocktail party, "zap the V.C. I zap the V.C.!"

Some of the men most deeply involved in making Revolutionary Development work consider that the military and pacification efforts are working at cross purposes. They believe that mounting civilian casualties and the destruction of the social fabric of the countryside help the Viet Cong more than they help build an effective non-Communist society.

One of the officials most widely respected as a pacification expert would like to see a prohibition on all artillery fire on unobserved targets and all bombing and shelling based merely on intelligence reports.

"Killing the Viet Cong is not the answer," he says. "The answer is to give Viet Nam a government and an economy that will compete with the Viet Cong."

DISAGREEMENT BY U.S. OFFICIALS OVER THE OUSTER OF GENERAL THI AND SUPPRESSION OF BUDDHISTS—SOME CONSIDER OFFICER'S DISMISSAL AS BAD BLUNDER THAT LED TO POLITICAL DIFFICULTIES IN VIET NAM

(By Richard Dudman)

WASHINGTON.—The day after Maj. Gen. Nguyen Chanh Thi was dismissed as commander of South Viet Nam's First Corps, Gen. William C. Westmoreland invited him to go to the United States for a medical checkup and treatment.

"If this offer appeals to you, I wish you would let me know and I will immediately make all the necessary arrangements," Westmoreland wrote.

But Gen. Thi wanted no medical treatment. In dismissing him, Premier Nguyen Cao Ky had said that Thi suffered from a nose ailment, apparently referring to Thi's chronic sinus trouble. Thi later made a joke of the matter and said that his only nose trouble was that the political maneuvering smelled bad.

To plot-minded Viet Nameuse, Gen. Westmoreland's letter looked like part of a scheme to break the political power of the Buddhists in the country's northernmost provinces. They already had assumed that President Lyndon B. Johnson's meeting with Ky at Honolulu had included a secret understanding that the United States would keep Ky in power indefinitely. Indeed, Ky began acting as if he had such a guarantee.

Actually, Westmoreland's invitation was doubtless merely a generous gesture to a fellow officer. And President Johnson certainly made no under-the-table deal with Ky at Honolulu.

But the events of the three-month political crisis that was touched off by Thi's dismissal suggest that the United States since then advised and assisted Ky in subduing the Buddhist political movement.

American planes moved three Viet Nameuse battalions to Da Nang for the first nearly disastrous confrontation with dissident troops. American advisers accompanied the loyal battalions when they returned in May to besiege the pagodas and smash the rebellion.

Later in Hue, American officers took part in marathon meetings that eventually led to the use of combat police and Viet Nameuse marines and airborne troops to move Buddhist altars out of the streets, arrest the ring-leaders and suppress the anti-government movement. American planes carried the troops.

There have been deep disagreements among American officials in Viet Nam over what could and should be done about the Buddhist dissidents.

Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge was said to have given some sort of cautious approval to the dismissal of Thi, whom the embassy in Saigon regarded as an ambitious troublemaker who was soft on the Buddhists. But Americans who worked with Thi in Hue and Da Nang considered him one of the country's most effective military leaders and one of the few persons who could deal effectively with the Buddhists there.

"Getting rid of him was the worst blunder of the war," a high United States Marine officer said. "I don't know if this country has any patriots, but Thi is the nearest thing to one I've seen."

Aids of Lt. Gen. Lewis W. Walt, commander of Marine forces in Viet Nam, with headquarters in Da Nang, said he felt that he had been stabbed in the back.

The Embassy was shocked at the uproar over Thi's dismissal. There was a scramble as officials tried to escape any responsibility for the move. They all but washed their hands of Ky, giving him less than a 50-50 chance. One said, "We're ready to take him by the hand and go to the cliff's edge, but we're not going over the precipice with him." They advised Ky strongly to give in to Buddhist demands for early national elections. Then, as Ky toughened his stand and showed signs of surviving, the dominant view at the embassy came to be that the young air force commander offered the best chance of stability. With American encouragement, he made it clear that he would remain in power at least a year longer and that the elections set for Sept. 11 would merely choose delegates to draft a constitution.

Two broad assumptions underlay the embassy decision.

First, the dominant view of the Viet Cong is that it lacks the essentials of the powerful nationalistic movements like the National

Liberation Front in Algeria. Instead, the Viet Cong is seen as relying solely on coercion and terror and not at all on persuasion.

The second assumption is that the militant leaders of the Buddhist political movement are acting in the interests of the Viet Cong, if they are not actually the agents of the Communist-led conspiracy.

Thus the Viet Cong are considered to pose no political threat. Even if they did, the Buddhist movement is seen as no proper force to oppose it.

One high official speculated that the September elections would show a 10 to 12 per cent Viet Cong vote and a 35 to 40 per cent Buddhist vote. "If you take them together, that's a dangerous combination," he said.

Independent inquiry suggests that these assumptions are nonsense. A dissenting view expressed privately by some American officials in Viet Nam seems to fit the facts of the situation better.

In this view, the Viet Cong movement is truly a political force, the most powerful in the country. Although it does increasingly use terror and coercion, it continues to attract considerable willing support and manpower by posing as the defender of the people against government corruption and colonialist intervention.

The Buddhist movement, say these dissenters, is the second most powerful political force in a country that is about 80 per cent nominally Buddhist. It overthrew the Diem regime and several subsequent governments and came close to toppling Ky.

Contrary to some reports, only a small minority of the Buddhist leaders sympathize with the Viet Cong or even would consider negotiating with the guerrilla movement. Most Buddhists among many who have been questioned on the point are vehemently anti-Communist. Their belief seems to be not that they could make peace with the enemy, but that a government in which they were well represented could be more effective in fighting the enemy.

Even Thich Tri Quang, the most militant of the Buddhist stateists, until recently described his anti-Americanism as nothing more than a tactical device and spoke strongly against the Communists.

More recently, embittered over the shooting of monks and nuns in Da Nang, he said he had come to hate America and might reach the point of warning his followers that unless the U.S. troops departed every Viet Namee woman would become a prostitute.

Allowing for a politician's exaggeration, it must be conceded that prostitution in Viet Nam is increasing rapidly. Other grievances include mounting inflation, overcrowded cities, uncollected garbage on the main streets of Saigon, and massive traffic jams as military vehicles, motorbikes, pedicabs and big American automobiles of newly rich Viet Namee try to bluff their way through the shoddy, bursting capital.

More moderate Buddhist leaders differ as to tactics but agree as to objectives. They want representative government, an end to favoritism and corruption, and, as soon as possible, an end to the war.

They want to drive out the Communists, but they object to having their country used as a practice field for counterinsurgency operations. They object also to what they see as outside control of the issue of war and peace.

If these goals and objections seem contradictory and fuzzy minded, that does not mean that the Buddhists are dominated by the Viet Cong. Even the student mob that sacked and burned the American library and the consulate in Hue was essentially an extremist nationalist group, infiltrated by the Viet Cong no more than militant civil rights groups in the United States are infiltrated by the Communists.

The failure of the Buddhists to overthrow the Ky government probably is partly a result of Ky's forceful use of police and troops and also of a deep belief by many Buddhists including most of their leaders in the importance of patience and nonviolence.

The outlook for the elections is that Ky will make wide use of his promise to exclude pro-Communists and "neutralists" and contrive to maintain his military clique in power.

As for the Buddhist movement the price of temporary stability may well be that the best potential anti-Communist political force is being either destroyed or driven into die-hard anti-Americanism.

WASHINGTON AGAIN IS MUCH MORE OPTIMISTIC THAN SAIGON OVER PROSPECT OF ENDING WAR SOON—DIFFERENCE PARTLY THE RESULT OF FALSE STATISTICS

(By Richard Dudman)

WASHINGTON, July 7.—Once again, Washington is being far more optimistic than is Saigon about the war in Viet Nam.

The current hopeful mood here, encouraged by the White House, the Department of State and the Pentagon—with assurances that this time they really mean it—scarcely matches the general view in Saigon that a long war lies ahead.

Part of the explanation for this discrepancy lies in a falsity in the statistics used to paint a rosy picture of progress.

Another part is a pair of serious omissions in the flood of figures that makes this the most high quantified war in history.

Still another part of the explanation is a number of influences and pressures that cause many of those along the chain of information reporting to accentuate the positive and eliminate the negative.

The statistics in question are the enemy "body count" and the "kill ratio," two important yardsticks by which progress is measured in the military effort to destroy the Viet Cong guerrilla organization and its reinforcements from North Viet Nam.

As every military operation progresses, Americans on the scene give their headquarters in Saigon a daily report of how many enemy soldiers have been killed. Most commands also keep tally of the "K.B.A." (killed by air) estimate, generally a higher figure, for their own records. They also estimate how many enemy bodies may have been dragged away. But the kill totals reported to Saigon are supposed to be not an estimate but a true figure based on actual count of bodies.

Any overstatement of the number of enemy troops killed improves the kill ratio, which is a weekly figure obtained by comparing Allied killed in action with enemy killed in action.

Although some commands are conscientious in making the count and some battles are more conducive than others to this score keeping, many of the men doing the fighting acknowledge freely that the "body count" is partly fiction.

One clear indication that this is the case is the fact that reports of enemy prisoners of war often break them down into Viet Cong and "Viet Cong suspects," whereas there is no such breakdown for bodies.

"We kill no suspects," said a high-ranking American information officer in Saigon. "When they're dead, they're VC."

Some officers and enlisted men insist that their body counts are scrupulously accurate. Others tell of instances where men, women and children have been included in the totals. In some cases, they point out, bodies are almost indistinguishable after a bombing, artillery or napalm attack.

Other instances are cited by men who participate in these counts, in which a quota is set in advance, obtained by multiplying

"friendly" deaths by five or 10. Afterwards, the men making the actual count just go through the motions to reach the predetermined total.

An American lieutenant colonel with long experience as an adviser to Viet Namee forces says that their totals for enemy soldiers killed are frequently inflated.

"It's a case of accurate reporting of false information," he says. "American officers get the figures from Viet Namee officers, who get them third of fourth hand from Viet Namee sources. At each level, there is a tendency to minimize the bad news and exaggerate the good news."

A high official of the Agency for International Development gives reason to doubt the rising totals for the "open arms" program for enemy defectors. He says that a sizable number of them disappear after being fed and clothed for a few weeks in the relatively comfortable amnesty camps.

"We believe that the Viet Cong is using the open arms program for their own R and R," he says.

("R and R" is American military slang for the rest and recreation program under which each U.S. military man gets a week's leave in Hong Kong or Bangkok or some other place to break his year's tour of duty.)

Official insistence on the absolute accuracy of such figures makes it difficult to learn the extent of these exaggerations in official statistics.

One of the omissions in the statistical picture is caused by a flat prohibition on reporting of allied casualties in any individual engagement. As a result, a dispatch must say, for example that 381 Viet Cong were killed, and American and Viet Namee casualties were "light," "moderate," or "heavy."

Figures on the American and Viet Namee casualties are given out only in weekly totals. A correspondent in the field often can learn the exact number of allied casualties. But reporting them in a dispatch is grounds for suspension of this accreditation.

The men on the ground sometimes complain that when a platoon or company is virtually wiped out the casualties are called "moderate" by diluting them in total losses for the entire company or battalion.

It is clear that the system tends to lessen the public impact of American and Viet Namee government, defeats. The reason given for imposing it last year was that precise figures on Allied casualties would help the enemy.

The other place where statistics are lacking is in civilian casualties resulting from bombing and artillery attacks by American and Viet Namee government forces.

"We don't keep them. Maybe the other side does," said a briefing officer when questioned about civilian casualties in an intensive American bombing and shelling attack in a heavily populated area in Quang Ngai province. The officer had just given precise figures on enemy troops whose bodies had been counted in a subsequent ground sweep.

Comparable figures on civilian casualties, if kept, would provide a guide to the effectiveness of a directive issued several months ago by Gen. William C. Westmoreland, Commander of U.S. forces in Viet Nam.

Westmoreland warned that "the use of unnecessary force leading to noncombatant casualties in areas temporarily controlled by the Viet Cong will embitter the population, drive them into the arms of the Viet Cong, and make the long-range goal of pacification more difficult."

The directive also said: "With due regard to security and success of the mission, whenever possible the people will be warned of impending air-strikes or operations by leaflets and broadcasts."

But an Army information officer in Saigon says that warnings allowed the Viet Cong to escape and are now given only infrequently.

12, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

14533

"We require a report from some Viet Name official in the area—a province chief or a district chief—that the people in the target zone are all unfriendly," he said. "We give a warning only when we're after something other than personnel, like an enemy ammunition factory, when we don't care whether the people get out or not."

Maj. Gen. James Humphreys, assistant director for health at the American aid mission in Viet Nam, says there are times when there are a great many more civilian casualties than military casualties in this war. He says, however, that sometimes the civilian casualties are less.

Among the less tangible influences on information about the war is the one-year tour of duty for military men. Whatever its merits for service morale, it has the disadvantage of giving an individual little perspective for judging progress in carrying on the war. He sometimes believes he is liberating a hamlet or clearing a road that has been in Viet Cong hands for 20 years, whereas the same hamlet or road was classed as secure as recently as three years ago.

As a result, says a lieutenant colonel who has been in Viet Nam for many years, there is a tendency to look on the bright side and send up the "positive" reports that are generally more pleasing to superiors.

"We live in what sociologists call a success-oriented society," says this officer. "Optimism and positive reporting may work well in running a corporation, but out here they just bring delusion and perpetuation of errors."

Civilian administrators who do not share the official optimism tend to keep their thoughts to themselves. Some of these say privately that it would not be good for their careers to let their doubts and reservations show up in their reports.

The comment is sometimes heard that it would be unwise to resign or ask for transfer because that would mark a man as a dissenter, and dissent in Viet Nam is akin to disloyalty. The way to keep a career intact is to look on the bright side.

NEW QUESTIONS AFTER ESCALATION OF WAR— THUS FAR UNITED STATES HAS WON ONLY A STALEMATE

(By Richard Dudman)

WASHINGTON, July 2.—The best that can be said for the massive American military buildup in South Viet Nam over the last year is that it has achieved a military stalemate.

The new escalation—bombing the oil installations at Hanoi and Haiphong—thus must be counted as another effort to use American armed might to break this stalemate.

Earlier such efforts have failed to break the stalemate. They included the use of American troops for general offensive combat, intensified bombing in North and South Viet Nam, and the landing of additional American forces as fast as possible short of mobilization of the reserves.

What the American escalation achieved as early as last fall was to avert imminent military defeat. United States officials who denied early last year that the Viet Cong guerrillas were winning now say that American combat forces entered the war barely in time to prevent the utter collapse of the South Viet Name army.

What the escalation has failed to do is to show any solid tread toward victory.

A reporter returning to Viet Nam after a year's absence notices two things above all.

First, overwhelming American military strength has removed any question of military defeat. Whenever enemy troops mass for an attack, their defeat is virtually automatic. American artillery, bombs and troops are brought to bear so quickly that the Communist forces must resort to hit-and-run tactics. To stand and fight means annihilation.

Additional armed power, as yet unused, is on hand to back up possible future decisions. American aircraft carriers on station off the Viet Name coast carry a wide range of nuclear weapons. Marines clear the hangar decks of all unauthorized persons during regular loading drills using nuclear bombs.

The second major point is that, despite constant pounding by the tremendous American military machine, the Communist forces are at least holding their own or perhaps doing a little better than that.

Roughly 10 per cent of the land area of South Viet Nam, about the same as a year ago, is rated under secure government control. Even the "secure" areas are subject to mortar attack, terrorist bombings and forays by bands of guerrillas.

Nearly half the population lives in these so-called secure areas, mainly Saigon and other coastal cities. The rest lives either under outright Viet Cong domination or in areas where the guerrillas move with relative freedom at night.

These population figures, like the area figures, have changed little in the last year.

Despite figures showing an enemy "kill" running from 3000 to 6000 a month, American estimates of enemy strength continue to increase. The Pentagon's current estimate is 255,000 to 270,000, compared with 230,000 at the first of this year and 106,000 at the beginning of 1965.

Infiltration from North Viet Nam obviously accounts for part of the steady net increase in enemy strength. But there is much doubt and disagreement over how the stream of men and supplies enters South Viet Nam.

The fact that the men and material keep coming despite heavy bombing of the so-called Ho Chi Minh trail leads some military men to suspect that the importance of the trail is overrated or that other routes may be more important.

Some officers believe that the hard-surface road visible from the air amounts to a stage set—a route built for bombing while the bulk of the traffic moves along parallel paths obscured by the jungle canopy. The Communist Chinese used that trick in supplying Viet Name besieging Dien Bien Phu in 1954.

Others are convinced that much of the infiltration is by sea, either by landings on the long, rugged coastline or travel up the Mekong river, with transfers to sampans sailed into Viet Nam from Cambodia through the network of canals and streams that run through the huge delta.

Navy officers admit the impossibility of registering the many junks that sail in coastwise trade or performing more than a spot check on their cargoes. Ocean-going ships steam up the Mekong without any effective check on their cargoes.

A high Navy officer says: "I wish we could devise a practical way of controlling infiltration through the canals. We know there is relatively free movement between Cambodia and South Viet Nam. But it would be suicide to operate small naval vessels in those canals, since the whole area is under Viet Cong control."

Another American official suspects that most of the infiltration is through Cambodia. He supposes that no one wants to acknowledge the fact because it would remove the justification for bombing the routes in Laos and North Viet Nam.

If the views of the responsible civilian and military leaders directing the operation in Viet Nam can be summed up in a few words, most of them believe that they see slow progress, that the right formula is being devised, and that, given persistence in the field and patience at home, the country can eventually be pacified. Estimates range from several years to as long as 10 years or more.

A sizable minority, including some highly placed officials, remains deeply skeptical of the value of bombs, artillery and napalm in suppressing what is seen as essentially a po-

litical insurgent movement. This group doubts that the present formula ever will succeed.

Few share the optimistic estimate being circulated by Administration officials in Washington that the major fighting will be over by the end of 1967.

Another minority, including some top military leaders, had been restless at restraints on bombing targets in the Hanoi-Haiphong area and welcomed the decision to bomb the oil and gasoline tank farms.

Such slim hopes as there are for an early end of the conflict rest on the supposition that more troops and more bombing must eventually break the will of Hanoi to continue the fight.

Some observers are impressed by reports of prisoner interrogation indicating that captured North Viet Name now believe that their side faces defeat. Others concede that enemy morale may be sagging, but await what they consider a clearer indication, in the form of mass defection of Communist forces in squad or platoon strength.

American planes are delivering explosives at twice the rate of the peak month of the Korean war. Roughly, 10 tons of explosives are being fired for every enemy soldier counted as killed.

American planes make about 100,000 flights a month, including helicopter and reconnaissance missions. That means between 10 and 30 flights for every enemy counted as killed, when combat strikes alone are considered the ratio is two to three sorties for each enemy killed.

Officials cite as another indication of faltering enemy morale the fact that the Communists have been avoiding large-scale confrontations with American forces. But this trend cuts two ways. American commanders continually hope for set-piece battles where they can fix an enemy battalion or regiment as the best chance of smashing the elusive foe.

As these set-piece battles disappear, ambush and terrorism are on the increase. A Marine regiment commander says that fully half his casualties are from mines, booby traps, snipers or poisoned bamboo "pungee sticks" hidden in grass or shallow water.

The dominant view among responsible Americans in Viet Nam, even among those who support the bombing of North Viet Nam, is that those raids are really a side issue. They believe that the outcome will be determined in South Viet Nam.

Heavy emphasis in Washington on Hanoi as the source of aggression tends to obscure the fact that the Viet Cong are fighting what continues to be an important degree a civil war in South Viet Nam. And through its political arm, the National Liberation Front, the Viet Cong continue to operate an effective shadow government that rules much of the country.

Viet Name political leaders in the populous Mekong delta say that the enemy continues to collect taxes in rural areas and even in provincial capitals. They say also that the Viet Cong continue to recruit troops in the delta.

As the intensity of the war has increased, the Viet Cong have resorted increasingly to coercion in taxing and recruiting troops. But, particularly in the delta, the guerrilla force still relies largely on persuasion.

Rice merchants in the big cities have a grudging respect for the Viet Cong tax collectors. Some of these merchants prefer to ship rice through solid Viet Cong territory because the first Communist checkpoint will give a receipt that will be honored all the way. The merchants complain that a shipment moving by government controlled route must pay legal and illegal taxes to government collectors over and over again along the whole route. They find it cheaper to pay the Viet Cong.

July 12,

As the years pass and the war continues to escalate, Viet Nam is said to demonstrate ever more clearly the limitations of overwhelming military power in dealing with a political insurgency.

YEARS-LONG U.S. BUILD-UP FORECAST; ROLE OF VIET NAM TROOPS DIMINISHING—600,000 AMERICANS MAY BE IN WAR LATE NEXT YEAR

(By Richard Dudman)

WASHINGTON, July 8.—A G.I. folksinger was entertaining American officers at An Khe with a ballad for a popular battalion commander being rotated home at the end of his year in Viet Nam. This was the refrain:

"So in Viet Nam we will stay,
Forever if need be.
To guard the hopes of freedom
Is our destiny."

The singer's "forever" was artistic exaggeration, of course, but most indications suggest that the American military effort in Viet Nam will require many more American troops, many more billions of American dollars, and time reckoned not in months but in years.

Barring collapse of the enemy's will to fight—an eventuality that still is more hope than expectation—the direction promises to be steadily upward in American manpower commitments, intensity of bombing in South Viet Nam, intensity of attacks on North Viet Nam and employment of American combat troops in offensives against the enemy.

American officers on the scene speak in terms of 400,000 men there by the end of this year and possibly 600,000 by the end of 1967. Some speak seriously of needing a total American buildup of 1,000,000 men.

As the American build-up progresses, South Viet Nam forces play a relatively less important role. Some of their units win American praise, and their heavy casualties prove that they still are doing a big share of the fighting. But there is continuing criticism that they lack aggressiveness and good leadership and that most of their units are infiltrated by Viet Cong agents.

Operation Georgia, launched recently south of Da Nang after supposedly secret joint planning by U.S. and Viet Namese marines, was announced in advance by radio Hanoi.

South Korean forces in Viet Nam, now numbering about 20,000 and expected to rise soon to 40,000, are considered first class troops in aggressiveness, discipline and general fighting ability.

"They go through an area and kill everything in sight," says an American officer recently.

Some American officials believe, however, that their high "kill ratio"—running up to 20 enemies killed for every Korean killed—must mean that many noncombatant men, women and children are counted among the enemy dead.

The trend is evident that the war is being taken over by the American forces and to some extent, by the South Korean forces, which are financed by the United States.

The base at An Khe, where the ballad singer sang of staying forever seems to be the wave of the future for the war in Viet Nam. It is 100 per cent American operation.

An Khe is headquarters for the American First Cavalry Division (Air Mobile), which keeps its helicopter-borne troops out on operations an average of 68 per cent of the time, hunting and trying to destroy nine enemy regiments thought to be skulking in the jungles of the central highlands.

A striking feature of the huge base, which contains the largest heliport in the world, is that no Viet Namese national is allowed inside.

At most other American bases, Viet Namese troops guard the perimeter, and there are Viet Namese laborers, truck drivers, cooks,

walters, laundrymen, maids and bartenders. At An Khe, the men of the First Cavalry do those jobs themselves except when they can go off base to the Viet Namese shack town that has mushroomed outside the gate, to get their clothes laundered or their trucks washed.

Officers attribute to this quarantine policy the fact that An Khe is one of the few bases never yet infiltrated. Mortar attacks and satchel-charge raids at other bases are traced to espionage by Viet Cong agents among the Viet Namese workers.

Even the security of Route 19, the base's road link with the coast, is put into the hands of Americans and South Koreans. They guard the bridges along the dangerous stretch of Highway, the explanation being that South Viet Namese troops can be used better elsewhere.

Military leaders speak of sending a similar division to the densely populated Mekong delta, south and west of Saigon, until now the military responsibility of Viet Namese government forces.

Although the delta has been considered well along the way to pacification, the apparent progress now is regarded by some as attributable to tacit agreements by Viet Namese and Viet Cong local commanders not to bother each other too much. Eighty per cent of the Delta's huge rice crop is taxed by the Viet Cong.

American advisers complain that the Viet Namese troops, who set up hundreds of elaborate ambushes every night, chatter and play their transistor radios so loudly that the traps rarely are sprung.

The announced strategy of having Viet Namese troops move in to hold ground gained by the Americans is more and more being put off. The main effort is to use American military force to break the back of enemy strength in the south and to persuade Hanoi that it should give up the fight.

The latest upward step, considered for many months before the President ordered it last week, is the bombing of oil storage depots near Hanoi and Haiphong.

Other steps being discussed include mining the Haiphong harbor, bombing industrial targets and taking some battleships out of mothballs and using them to bombard positions near the coast.

There is serious talk of an American ground offensive against North Viet Nam. Some high-ranking officers say this would be more likely than the often-mentioned possibility of a ground offensive from Thailand across Laos to cut the Ho Chi Minh trail.

Carried to its logical conclusion, the Americanization of the war could conceivably lead to a complete American takeover of South Viet Nam. A widely respected American commander advocates this course privately in so many words.

"We should occupy and rule this country," he says, "instead of pretending to respect the sovereignty of a government that really is only temporary and illegal and could change tomorrow."

"It would be more efficient, and probably the end result would be better, if we abandoned the idea of assistance and pacification and settled for subjugation, regarding South Viet Nam as an enemy country."

"That's what we did in Korea, Germany and Japan. Can you honestly deny that the results you see now in those countries are better than anything we have reason to expect the way things are going here in Viet Nam?"

China's entry into the war would, of course, change everything. But an Administration official told a group of Congressmen recently, "If anyone had said a year ago that we could do what we're doing now without China's coming in, I'd have said he was crazy."

Another possibility is that the toughening American military blows at last will break down the enemy's will to continue the war.

Still another is some new political crisis throwing the country into such a turmoil that the United States would withdraw.

Barring some such development, the present trend seems clear. It is toward indefinite occupation by an American force of hundreds of thousands of men.

ONE INTEREST RATE RISE BRINGS ON ANOTHER

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, sometimes when one reads about tight money or is shown an index of average charges in interest rates, it has a rather cold, abstract, and impersonal flavor. This is not so for those who are having to face their bankers and listen to the interest demands which the bankers make, not necessarily because of their cupidity but because of their inability to do otherwise because of the lack of reserves supplied by the banking system.

For some time now attempts have been made to control the expansion and growth of the economy through monetary measures, that is to say, tight money, higher interest rates, and a rationing of credit.

When the news of increasing interest rates occupies large parts of the financial journals, those people who read them tend to skip over them; and, of course, many people are not regular readers of the financial journals so that they are unaware of the day-to-day happenings.

The Wall Street Journal undertakes to keep its readers advised of significant money market changes, and from the last week of June, I have collected the following examples of monetary policy at work. Note that these include some increase in interest paid as well as interest asked since the spiral goes on and on. These items are essentially headlines, or a selection of a key sentence from a number of stories. Note, moreover, that these are not one story but literally scores of stories from which these disturbing headlines have been taken.

The point which I wish to make is that interest rate rises begun at one point tend to spread throughout the economy—that one rise here prompts another rise there—and no one can be sure where the spiraling process is going to lead us. There is no ceiling that appears to hold, unless it may be that of a "bust," which, of course, none of us would want.

These news stories about rising interest rates collected from one short period of a week are not only telling what is happening but should give concern as to whether there is any gain to be expected from competitive boosting of rates.

The sheer numbers of these separate news stories seems to me to add a new dimension to the news itself.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point excerpts from articles published in the Wall Street Journal.

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

EXCERPTS, WALL STREET JOURNAL, JUNE 27

Dime Savings Bank of Brooklyn, the nation's second largest mutual savings bank, will pay a 5% annual dividend rate—up from 4½—on regular savings in the quar-

and guidance in drafting this Resolution and for pointing out the real necessity for such action.

As is so often the case, unless someone stands up to speak in defense of an important issue, often times it continues down the same path with little or no attention. In this case Senator McGovern raised his voice, from the call of his constituents, and it will be sometime before we will fully realize all the benefits to be derived from his actions on this matter.

THE PRESIDENT'S DECISION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the July 6 issue of the Washington Post there was an article by Joseph Alsop entitled "The President's Decision," which also fits the same philosophy expressed in the editorial I placed in the RECORD, explaining the rationale behind the stepped-up bombing of North Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE PRESIDENT'S DECISION (By Joseph Alsop)

The President's decision to intensify the bombing of North Vietnam, so long anticipated, has been warmly welcomed by the country. The first public opinion tests have already been taken, and they show an overwhelming majority behind Lyndon Johnson on this occasion.

This will surprise a lot of people here in Washington, because this is the place where criticism of Presidents reaches the highest decibel level. But in reality the opposition to his Vietnamese policy is largely restricted to a sector of the intellectual community, a sector of the press, mainly on the East Coast, and a small minority in the Senate.

Being very vocal people, the critics are extremely audible; but they do not speak for the voters.

Among the voters, as many earlier public opinion tests have clearly shown, there was mounting disquiet before the recent bombing decision. But the disquiet mainly arose from the appearance of aimlessness inflicted on the President's Vietnamese policy by his repeated concession to his exceedingly vocal critics. This has now been cured, with the result above-noted.

Ironically enough, the new bombing decision might not have been taken, or might at least have been further deferred, if it had not been for the powerful contribution of the people who most loudly deplore it. In the final round of the interminable argument in the White House, a very great role was in fact played by the political intelligence concerning the North Vietnamese assessment of the war.

The message of the intelligence was both clear and well buttressed with facts. It indicated that the North Vietnamese leaders still count on winning the war in South Vietnam, not in South Vietnam, but in Washington, precisely as the Vietminh won their war against the French in Paris.

It indicated further that whenever this reliance on a failure of American willpower began to be questioned, it was invariably strengthened again by another speech by Senator WAYNE MORSE of something else of that sort.

Thus the need to show that the United States really does mean business was one of the three principal factors in the President's decision.

Another factor was, of course, purely military. Bombing the fuel stores was the obvious, indeed the only logical, response to the increasing North Vietnamese invasion of

South Vietnam, which has reached the point of a nearly complete Northern takeover of the Communist war effort in the South.

Furthermore, dispersal of the Northern fuel stores was beginning, which made the response fairly urgent.

Finally, the main obstacle to the decision was removed by the restoration of comparative political stability in South Vietnam. The bombings would have been made much earlier, perhaps, if it had not been for the political troubles in the South that began in March and continued for so many long weeks.

Given these factors, it is hard to see what the President's opponents really want him to do. Quite aside from the facts that trying to win is the usual thing to do in a war, there is no evidence at all that any of the opposition's proposed solutions have the smallest relation with a practical situation.

Negotiations have been persistently refused by Hanoi, quite largely because of the false encouragement given to Hanoi by the attacks on the President by the critical minority in the United States.

Even the dissident Buddhist, Thich Tri Quang, has publicly denounced the slightly different proposal of Senator ROBERT KENNEDY that negotiations be sought with the Vietcong and that places in the government be offered to Vietcong leaders.

No South Vietnamese of the smallest standing, however much opposed to the government of Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky, has either called for immediate negotiation with Hanoi, or has endorsed Senator KENNEDY's halfway house. Nor has any South Vietnamese of any standing, including all those who tried to overthrow the Ky government, shown the smallest inclination to join the Vietcong.

By any rational test, the position in South Vietnam ought therefore to be clear to everyone. As to the position in this country, it is only necessary to look at the most politically sensitive group in Washington—the 77 Democratic freshmen in the House of Representatives, who must seek reelection in November.

The head of the freshmen's Eighty Nine Club is from the old isolationist heartland, southern Indiana; and his district was almost continuously represented by Republicans from 1940 until 1964. Yet Representative LEE HAMILTON says, "I support the President without qualification, because I think he's right, and that is what my people want, too."

Among the more left-wing Democratic members of the Eighty Nine Club, there is a sprinkling of members like the Club's able vice chairman, Representative PARSY MINK of Hawaii, who says, "I support the President's policy, but I would like to see more done to get negotiations"—whatever that may mean.

Careful checks in fact reveal no more than two or three of these 77 Democratic freshmen who may take an overtly critical line on the stump in the autumn.

You could have no stronger confirmation of the post decision test of public opinion.

CONGRESS SHOULD APPROPRIATE \$110 MILLION FOR SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM THIS YEAR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I was deeply disappointed that the Senate Appropriations Committee saw fit to appropriate only \$105 million for the special milk program for schoolchildren for fiscal 1967. This was \$3 million less than the Senate appropriated last year. It would permit a 5-percent increase in the rate at which the Federal Government reimbursed the States for program expenses but it would not fully restore the 10-percent cutback in the reimbursement rate that was necessitated this year by the lack of sufficient funds.

Furthermore it would take no account of the increase in the school age population. If this increase accounted for a proportionate increase in school milk program participation, an additional \$2 million would be necessary to take care of additional participants. Finally the \$105 million makes no allowance for program expansion.

I am carefully exploring the advisability of asking my colleagues, 67 of whom cosponsored my bill setting a \$110 million floor under the milk program for fiscal 1967, to amend the agriculture appropriations bill on the floor of the Senate to provide \$110 million for the program. This is no reflection on the magnificent work Senator HOLLAND has done in behalf of the program, both in the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Senate Agriculture Committee. It is merely an indication of my concern lest the schoolchildren of America be shortchanged in any way.

RESOLUTION PROPOSING A U.S. FISHERY POLICY FOR THE EAST- ERN NORTH PACIFIC OCEAN

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, concern continues in the Pacific Northwest over the continued fishery offshore by a growing fleet of vessels from the Soviet Union. Many of our citizens are concerned over the security aspects of the Soviet appearance, others are aware of the dangers to the fishery stocks in the adjacent sea, some of which our fleets are not harvesting.

In Seattle, Wash., recently, four of the major fishery organization representatives made a thorough study of the problem and agreed to a "U.S. Fishery Policy for the Eastern North Pacific Ocean."

Mr. President, I commend these organizations for their interest in the problem and recommend that the policy be a matter for close study by the Members of this body.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

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

A RESOLUTION PROPOSING A U.S. FISHERY POLICY FOR THE EASTERN NORTH PACIFIC OCEAN

Whereas both inshore and high seas fishing off the West Coast of the United States holds great potential from the standpoint of economic activity for United States citizens as well as from the standpoint of providing needed food, and

Whereas this potential if it is to be fully realized requires the implementation of a sound fisheries policy by the United States so as to encourage expansion by the U.S. fishery industry into hitherto unexploited fishery stocks, to provide for an adequate conservation program for all stocks of fish so as to maintain their productivity on a permanently sustained yield basis as far as is practicable, and to assure the protection of existing fully developed fisheries so they may not be unnecessarily harmed during any expansion into new fisheries, and

Whereas this policy is most urgently needed now that large numbers of foreign fishing vessels are operating on the high seas fishing grounds off the West Coast of the United States: Be it therefore

14542

Resolved, That the undersigned organization urge the United States government to take the following action to protect all stocks of fish found off the West Coast of the United States:

1. Pass immediately pending legislation to extend U.S. jurisdiction over fisheries from the present three miles to twelve.

2. Initiate efforts as soon as possible to secure extended jurisdiction beyond twelve miles through international agreements wherever adequate protection of fisheries resources off the United States cannot be secured otherwise.

3. Continue efforts to secure international recognition of the abstention principle for the protection of fully developed and utilized fisheries such as those of salmon and halibut.

4. Press for efforts to prevent depletion of stocks of fish off our shores not covered by the abstention doctrine such as ocean perch, bottom fish other than halibut, hake, anchovies, etc. This should be based upon the terms of the 1958 Geneva Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas and should be pressed against all foreign fishing, irrespective of whether or not the countries involved in such foreign fishing are signatories to the Geneva convention.

5. Monitor the operations of all foreign fishing off our coasts to provide the basis for an immediate protest if such fishing appears to endanger the continued maximum sustained productivity of the stocks fished. The United States government under this recommendation and the precedent set by the 1958 Geneva Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas, should contact the Soviet Government and ask that government to provide scientific proof that continuation of their present fishing off our shores will not deplete the stocks of fish being taken to levels below that of maximum sustained yield.

6. Make immediate contact with the governments operating fishing vessels off our shores with the aim of minimizing or preventing international incidents involving loss of gear, vessels and lives, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be sent to all Senators and Congressmen from the Pacific Northwest States and to all appropriate government agencies.

ASSOCIATION OF PACIFIC FISHERIES.

SEATTLE, WASH.

DEEP SEA FISHERMEN'S UNION.

SEATTLE, WASH.

FISHING VESSEL OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.

SEATTLE, WASH.

NORTHWEST FISHERIES ASSOCIATION.

SEATTLE, WASH.

NEED FOR EXPANSION OF FACILITIES OF THE PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, cattle raisers in my State are concerned over the need for expansion of facilities of the Packers and Stockyards Division of the Department of Agriculture.

Just the other day I received a copy of a resolution passed by the board of directors of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association in support of an increase in funds for the Division.

The secretary and general manager of the association, Mr. Joe S. Fletcher, pointed out in a letter to me that it is imperative that the Division be a strong, efficient organization. To that end, as he points out, it is important that the funds made available to the Division

keep pace with the expanding workload which constantly faces it.

So that other Senators may give this matter their attention, I ask that the text of the resolution be entered in the RECORD, at this point.

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

RESOLUTION

(Passed by board of directors, Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association, June 18, 1966, at Wichita Falls, Tex.)

Whereas the cattle industry of the Southwest has benefited greatly from the work of the Packers and Stockyards Division of the U.S. Department of Agriculture; and

Whereas the activities regulated by this division have increased greatly without commensurate expansion in personnel and travel budgets; Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Directors of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association go on record as favoring a \$200,000 increase in division funds awaiting the action of the Congress and that appropriate officials be so advised.

PRESSURES GROW IN MONEY MARKET

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, our military commitment in Vietnam is not alone escalating these days. Interest costs throughout the land are also on a high-speed elevator upward. The skyrocketing cost of money and the unprecedentedly tight state of the Nation's money markets are part of the hidden cost which—as individual householders and as a nation—are paying for this expanding “dirty little war.” As H. Erich Heinemann reports in today's New York Times:

There is nothing in sight . . . that would promise relief from the pressure for higher interest rates. . . .

Rapidly rising interest rates have not only raised the cost of everyone's borrowing—from the Federal Government to the teenage car buyer. They have not only made the risk of a downturn in corporate investment—the engine of our prosperity—a clear and present danger. They have not only reduced the homebuilding industry, which is utterly dependent upon borrowed funds, to its most depressed state in years. They have also set off a rate war between savings institutions and a political war between the agencies responsible for the competing groups of such institutions. In his New York Times article, Mr. Heinemann reports that the Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. stated in its most recent bond letter:

These pressures [for higher rates] finally appear to have taken hold in the last few weeks and the brakes have begun to screech. The question now seems to be: “Who will be hurled through the windshield?”

Mr. President, I submit that it is the American economy, and its unmatched record of growth, stability, and prosperity, which is about to be hurled through the windshield into financial distress and economic dislocation due to the reckless and uncontrolled escalation in interest rates and monetary tightness.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in New York Times for July 12,

“Pressures Grow in Money Market,” by H. Erich Heinemann, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

PRESSURES GROW IN MONEY MARKET—BORROWING COSTS CONTINUE TO MOUNT AS INCREASE IN THE DISCOUNT RATE IS AWAITED—TREASURY BILLS AT HIGH—FEDERAL FUNDS TRADED AT RECORD LEVELS—CHARGES TO BOND DEALERS RISE.

(By H. Erich Heinemann)

The money market was on tenterhooks yesterday, waiting for the Federal Reserve to raise its 4½ per cent discount rate.

The common assumption was the short-term interest rates have soared so far above 4½ per cent that the money managers now have no choice but to bring their own lending rate in line with interest charges in the free market.

The discount rate has been at 4½ per cent since last Dec. 6.

Meanwhile, heavy upward pressure on interest rates in the following areas continued in what one banker called a “wild, swinging market.”

For the second week in a row, the yield on United States Treasury bills—“the closest thing to cash”—surged to an historic high. Three-month bills were auctioned at an average rate of 4.876 per cent, and six-month bills went at 4.999 per cent. These rates were up from 4.731 per cent and 4.915 per cent, respectively, the week before.

At least one major finance company, Walter E. Heller & Co. of Chicago, increased to 5½ per cent the rate that it pays on unsecured notes that it sells directly to investors for all maturities from 30 to 270 days. Previously, the Heller Company had been 5½ per cent across the board—a rate that it is continuing to pay on paper from five to 29 days.

For the second business day in a row, a substantial volume of Federal funds transactions—interbank loans of temporarily surplus reserve funds—took place at a record level of 5½ per cent.

NO RELIEF SIGHTED

Government bond dealers, also for the second day in a row, had to pay up to 6½ per cent in order to obtain funds from major New York City banks, and there were rumors—which were denied—that further increases were in the works in the rates that New York City banks charge on loans secured by stock market collateral—so-called brokers' loans.

A 6 per cent rate on brokers' loans has become fairly general within the last day or two.

In analyzing the situation, money-market specialists could see nothing in sight yesterday that would promise relief from the pressure for higher interest rates and correspondingly lower prices for fixed-income securities.

The Continental Illinois National Bank and Trust Company observed in its latest weekly bond letter that “the cumulative pressures of an ever-expanding economy, working against broad and spreading monetary controls designed to slow the expansion, finally have culminated in a severe money pinch.”

“These pressures,” the bank added, “finally appear to have taken hold in the last few weeks and the brakes have begun to screech. The question now seems to be—who will be hurled through the windshield?”

Argus Research Corporation, an investment advisory concern, said that “the scramble for cash in the past couple of weeks has reached a stage only very rarely experienced in this country during the 20th century.”

Assuming no sudden break in Vietnam, commented S. F. Porter in her widely read bond letter, Reporting on Governments, a

July 12, 1966

14544

ROSTOW RIDING HIGH IN ADMINISTRATION AS THE ROCK OF JOHNSON'S VIET POLICY— HELD SAME STRONG VIEWS UNDER KENNEDY (By Chalmers M. Roberts)

Before an audience of foreign journalists recently, President Johnson heaped so much praise on Walt Whitman Rostow that the Presidential aide seemed, in the words of one of the visitors, to puff up "as proud as a peacock."

Rostow has reason to be proud and he has reason to be as happy as a bureaucrat can be. His long-time tough recommendations for the Vietnam war are now Johnson policy.

As far back as June, 1961, Rostow was saying that the kind of "operation run from Hanoi against South Vietnam is as clear a form of aggression as the violation of the 38th parallel by the North Korean Army in June, 1950."

In October, 1961, after a visit to Vietnam, Rostow backed a recommendation by Gen. Maxwell Taylor that an American military task force of perhaps 10,000 men be sent for self-defense and perimeter security and, if the South Vietnamese were hard pressed, to produce an emergency reserve. That report as much as anything led President Kennedy to take the irreversible steps into the Vietnam war.

In addition, as Arthur Schlesinger Jr. has since recounted, "Rostow argued so forcefully for a contingency plan of retaliation against the North, graduated to match the intensity of Hanoi's support of the Vietcong, that 'Rostow Plan 6' became jocularly established in the contingency planning somewhere after SEATO Plan 5."

It was not, however, until February, 1965, that a new President, Lyndon Johnson, adopted that proposal. And not until last month did the President agree with the Rostow thesis that the North's oil supplies should be attacked.

In short, Rostow is now in his element. He is without doubt one of the key men in Government today, physically occupying the White House basement office long used by McGeorge Bundy before he went off to head the Ford Foundation.

Rostow as yet has neither the broad Presidential charter that Bundy had nor the power within the bureaucracy that Bundy exercised. But, if the Johnsonian compliments mean anything, he certainly is moving in that direction.

In fact, it is a case of a return to the beginning for Rostow. It began at the start of the Kennedy administration as Bundy's top assistant.

In those days Rostow was the long-range thinker for the New Frontier (some, in fact, credit him with first suggesting that sobriquet to JFK when he was a campaign speech writer in 1960).

But when President Kennedy dumped Chester Bowles as Under Secretary of State in mid-1961, Rostow was shipped over to the State Department to be Counselor, and chairman of the Policy Planning Staff.

TOO MUCH OF A HAWK?

There he produced all sorts of long-range papers, but many in the Foreign Service considered him either something of a dreamer or too much of a hawk on Vietnam. The word got around that he wasn't to be taken too seriously and he seemed largely out of touch with the day-to-day crises that dominate the department.

Rostow found an outlet for his massive energies in Latin American affairs. In 1964 he became the American representative on CIAP, the Spanish initials for the Inter-American Committee for Alliance for Progress. His enthusiasm and optimism bubbled over to the point where—again—many felt he was unrealistic.

To understand Rostow, then and now, one has to know a bit about the man and his background. Now 49, he has an A.B. and

Ph. D. from Yale. A Rhodes Scholar at Oxford and a wartime major in the OSS, he was a professor of economic history at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology from 1950 until he came to the White House.

Schlesinger has aptly called him an "economic historian turned social philosopher." In 1959 Rostow wrote what the London Economist called "the non-Communist manifesto," a series of lectures which became a book on "The Stages of Economic Growth."

Some critics said his manifesto was as rigid as that of Marx (whom he once dubbed "a city boy") to explain Communist agricultural failures) because Rostow divided all the world's nations neatly into five stages of development.

LIKES TO PHILOSOPHIZE

Nothing delights the chunky Rostow, eyes beaming intensely through metal rimmed glasses, sleeves rolled up and hands clasped behind his head, then to lean back in his chair and philosophize. A lot of this sort of private talk later turns up on the lecture platform or between hard covers.

The relative performance of India and China "may very well determine the outcome of the ideological struggle for Asia." (1955)

"Communism is a technique for seizing and holding power in sick societies." (1957)

"Doctrinally, Marxism is increasingly viewed by the young as a voice from the past, not as a guide to the present and the future; and Communism, as a technique for organizing either an advanced or an underdeveloped society, is increasingly perceived as inefficient and reactionary, as well as profoundly inhumane." (1962)

"This debate within the (Atlantic) Alliance is perhaps the greatest Constitutional question that this country has been involved in since we set ourselves up in the 1780," (1963)

"We are evidently at the beginning of the third major effort since 1945 to establish whether or not it is possible for the Soviet Union and the West to live together on this planet under conditions of tolerable stability and low tensions." (1963)

That word "tolerable" incidentally, is a Rostow favorite. It is the kind of a word that got him into an ironic fuss early in the Kennedy years with Sen. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, the GOP leader. Some right-wing Republicans had jumped on reports about a secret Rostow long-term policy paper and DIRKSEN attacked him for "fuzzy thinking" because Rostow was said to believe that the Communists were "mellowing."

A HORSE LAUGH

This brought a horse laugh from everybody who knew Rostow, since his passion for both economic growth and anti-Communist guerrilla warfare has brought him the title of "Chester Bowles with machine guns." Rostow went up to the Capitol and convinced DIRKSEN et al that he was as tough as they about the Communists.

Indeed he is, though with a higher degree of sophistication. It was Rostow and Jerome T. Wiesner, later to be the Presidential science adviser, who told the Russians in Moscow seven weeks before the Kennedy inauguration that if they wanted better relations with the United States they had better release two American fliers without being asked and without attempting to bargain. Nikita Khrushchev did just that.

Rostow has been in the public prints mostly for his quotable prose. Once, however, he pulled a blooper with international repercussions. In Ottawa with President Kennedy in 1961, he carelessly left behind a secret memo on which the President had made some scribbled comments.

Prime Minister Diefenbaker angrily claimed the President had written "SOB" beside a reference to him. The incident put a strain on Canadian-American relations, especially since Diefenbaker was correct.

But Rostow survived that blooper as he has survived the Siberia of State's Policy Planning Staff, the criticism of his economic theory, the scoffing at his ebullient prose, his hawk-like proposals and all the rest.

Last week Rostow was one of three officials dispatched by President Johnson to Los Angeles to sell the Administration's story on Vietnam. And characteristically, it was Rostow who did most of the talking to the sometimes skeptical governors and apparently to good effect.

For such reasons there is not much time anymore for tennis or swimming for Walt Whitman Rostow, a fellow who has come a long way from Oxford and MIT.

BOMBING OF MILITARY TARGETS NEAR HANOI AND HAIPHONG

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the lead editorial in the Air Force Times of July 13 clearly focuses attention on what was involved in the recent order to bomb military targets near the Hanoi and Haiphong areas.

I think it speaks for itself.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "The Bombings," be placed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Air Force Times, July 13, 1966]

THE BOMBINGS

The loud protests against American bombing of military targets near Hanoi and Haiphong reveal more about the protesters than they do about the U.S. attacks.

The same voices continue to remain silent although the Viet Cong has murdered and kidnapped more than 24,000 South Vietnamese civilians since 1964. They were silent when the VC bombed the U.S. embassy and killed and wounded civilians. The numerous bombings of restaurants in Saigon have claimed more civilian than military lives.

The U.S. attacks on the oil storage tanks, clearly military targets, were carefully designed to limit civilian casualties. In the U.S. case the object of the attacks were military supplies. The Communist side's principal targets were civilians. The protesters are in a peculiar moral position.

Particularly galling are the squawks from the British government about the U.S. bombing. Britain disassociated itself with the action, its Prime Minister declared. It seems to us that Britain long ago disassociated itself with all U.S. involvement in Vietnam; it has sent no troops to back us up, and British-owned ships have continued to carry supplies to the enemy.

The U.S. decision to go after the military targets on the fringes of Hanoi and Haiphong was long overdue.

While we are on the subject of the bombing raids over these flak-heavy targets, we are reminded that there is a significant inequity which needs correction in the matter of combat pay and income tax exclusion.

Some of the attacks on the North were made by Navy carrier-based planes of the Seventh Fleet. The support people—mechanics, deck crews, stewards, etc.—get both combat pay and income tax exclusion because their vessels are declared to be in combat zones.

The men supporting the AF part of the raid do not get the same benefits unless they are stationed in Vietnam.

The Communists claim that the AF flights originated in Thailand. The U.S. and Thailand have not admitted this for various reasons—but there are 20,000 U.S. servicemen in Thailand.

There is little doubt that the mission did originate from some area outside the combat

July 12, 1966

severe squeeze in bank credit—quite probably the tightest in modern history—should become painfully apparent as the fall upturn in loan demand gets under way.

For the money market, the problem posed by the upward pressure on interest rates has a number of complex facets.

An increase in the discount rate, some market observers believe for example, would not be an event of major importance in the money market.

The discount rate, they argue, has lost much of its former importance as the interest rate from which all other rates are scaled. But even these skeptics concede that the discount rate does have great psychological importance. And they freely admit that the current surge in interest rates and generally price weakness in practically all fixed-income obligations stems from market anticipation that the discount rate will be increased.

MISS VELMA LINFORD, DISTINGUISHED WYOMING EDUCATOR

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] had intended to make an insertion in the RECORD today, but was called away from Washington because of the death of his father.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement be prepared and the newspaper article he wished to bring to the attention of the Senate be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCGEE

My State of Wyoming holds the proud distinction of being the first State in the Union to take the lead in insuring equal rights for women by passage of the first legislation giving women the right to vote.

Wyoming is proud of her record and she is proud of her women. Throughout our history the women of our great State have made distinguished contributions that have not been confined to our borders but to the benefit of the entire country.

One such outstanding Wyoming woman is Miss Velma Linford. Beginning her Wyoming career as a school teacher in northwest Wyoming, Velma was elected to serve for eight years as our State superintendent of education where she made significant contributions to both the quantity and quality of education.

Today, Miss Linford continues to maintain a career of public service and dedication helping people all across the United States as a special assistant for Project Development at VISTA.

Miss Linford was the subject of a July 10, 1966, feature story in the Washington Post.

[From the Washington Post, July 10, 1966]

ARCTIC VILLAGERS ALL KNOW VISTA'S VELMA

(By Elizabeth Shelton)

When Western historian Velma Linford wrote her thesis for her master's degree she set out to prove that the beautiful adventures in Rocky Mountain literature had real-life prototypes.

She failed.

The heroines in the Western novels were invariably fair of face and form, as well as tough and daring.

The women in real life were adventurous and tough, but they were seldom beautiful. They won the West by hard work, and most of them were mothers and homebodies.

"I was quite perturbed," Miss Linford confessed. "The real women just didn't fall into a type."

That was one of few failures in the life of the Wyoming-born redhead who is Vista's expert on rural poverty.

Her formal title is Special Assistant to the Associate Director for Project Development.

But Miss Linford, a no-nonsense type Westerner who can pluck a discomfiting stay from her waistline region and toss it into the nearby wastebasket without interrupting the trend of conversation, likes to think of herself as a generalist, rather than a specialist.

Her work is establishing Vista projects in places where the poor have a need for services and welcome a person-to-person relationship with a fellow American willing to serve in the midst of poverty.

This farflung operation Miss Linford has carried on with such peripatetic vigor that the residents of 300 isolated villages in Alaska, some a hundred or more miles within the Arctic Circle "all know Velma," according to a staff colleague.

Reaching these outposts to inspect projects being carried out by 61 Vista volunteers is a rugged exercise in circling the tundra or coastline while the bush pilot hunts a landing spot and incidentally remarks the whereabouts of a walrus he will tell the villager's hunters about as soon as he puts the rickety little plane down.

Developing the Alaskan projects has been one of the most satisfying parts of Miss Linford's job. Poverty there is the most abject in the United States, she observes, and because of the unusual opportunity to participate in an emerging culture the volunteers attracted there have a special enthusiasm which she shares.

She tells with delight of the good works of young Americans, some hardly out of their teens in the remote, isolated locales.

One 20-year-old boy in a village of 122 Eskimos felled trees to build an electrification plant through Community Action Program funds, bringing light to help children study during the long Arctic winters.

Another improved a village economy by bringing in a generator to operate freezers. The fishermen were able to ply their trade only one month of the year and were sacrificing profits for quick sales until the Vista volunteer found a way to extend their marketing year-round.

An archeology student taught the village elders to read and write so they could draw up council resolutions.

The same volunteer taught the Eskimos to read their own language as well as English and further enriched their culture by Christmas carols—in Yiddish.

Other Vista projects are occupying the attentions of some 2,000 18-to-80-year-olds in all parts of the continental United States and the Virgin Islands.

A training program for some of the new volunteers is now being conducted on a Navajo reservation and 25 others are in process elsewhere, some in heavily populous cities where, according to Miss Linford, poverty breeds a loneliness even more acute than in the isolated rural settings.

One project is in America's oldest city. This is Akima, N.M., where the Pueblo Indians built their "Sky City" from desert adobe before white civilization came to the continent.

Miss Linford thinks of Vista as "a new outreach" to the hard-to-reach.

"Vista," she says, "is the expression of a need for Americans to actually contribute their talents and energies toward changing things they think should be changed. This is a new outreach that is becoming more understood. I think it will have a powerful effect on hard-to-reach individuals."

She adds that many school dropouts could be kept in the educational system if it were possible to reach their parents in time.

"Sixty-eight per cent of the parents were dropouts," she explains her reasoning. "The children drop out because their parents did not see school as offering something their children could profit by."

In some of the rural areas and on Indian reservations, parents are loath to educate their children because experience has shown them that educated children seldom return willingly to take up primitive existence with their uneducated parents.

Besides helping the boxed-in poor people who need educational, health, welfare and other services, during an extreme manpower shortage in all these fields, Vista is helping the restless and boxed-in young people of the middle class to find focus for their lives.

About one-third of them volunteer to stay in a second year after completing a year's duty and about one half of all Vista volunteers are willing to go wherever sent. Others have a particular place of service in mind, such as Appalachia, or prefer to work in their own hometowns.

Miss Linford served eight years as Wyoming's elected state superintendent of education before coming to Washington. Descended from Mormon homesteaders who went West with Brigham Young, she began her public career as a grade school teacher in Star Valley.

During a 20-year fight to win retirement and other benefits for school teachers, it came to her that things are more successfully accomplished on a state rather than local level.

Proud feathers in her cap were the establishment of special funds for the educable retarded in every school; programs for the non-educable retarded in every community, braille books and tape recorders for the blind in graded classes, and a state-operated oral school for the deaf.

"We brought our children home," she said with a slight tremor in her voice. Previously the state had boarded out its problem children, the deaf, the blind and the mentally retarded.

Miss Linford thinks of her careers as an exercise in opening doors, of which her Wyoming experiences were one; her Vista experiences another.

"You asked me whether I missed Wyoming," the author of the textbook, "Wyoming, Frontier State," concluded the interview.

"I am just overcome with nostalgia every time I return. But once I am back again, I am involved in a program that is important to Wyoming and is important to the entire Nation."

WALT ROSTOW, KEY ADVISER TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, also on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement prepared by him relative to an article about Mr. Walt Rostow, published in the Washington Post of July 10, 1966, and the article itself.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCGEE

The July 10, 1966, edition of the Washington Post carried an excellent article by Chalmers Roberts on Mr. Walt Rostow, a key adviser to President Johnson and one of the most articulate proponents of administration policy in southeast Asia.

The article gives an excellent insight into both the man and the policy he espouses so intelligently.

July 12, 1966

pay and tax break zones. We believe the rules should be changed so AF men supporting the combat operations in the same way the carrier-based men do should get the same financial breaks.

BIG BROTHER

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, it seems that everybody is against wiretapping, bugging, and other forms of invasions of privacy—subject to certain exceptions. The Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure is attempting to determine what, if any, exceptions should eventually be written into law. Art Buchwald, writing in the June 19, 1966, issue of the Washington Post, has, in a humorous vein, pointed out some of our problems.

I ask unanimous consent to insert, at this point in the RECORD, this article entitled "Still a Few Bugs."

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 19, 1966]

STILL A FEW BUGS—A PRIVATE EYE IS ALL FOR AMERICAN PRIVACY—WITH A FEW EXCEPTIONS

(By Art Buchwald)

Anyone who has been keeping up with Senator Edward Long's invasion-of-privacy hearings is outraged to discover how much bugging and wiretapping has been going on in the United States. It appears that nobody is safe any more from the "big ear" and it is hoped that some legislation will be passed soon to protect the rights of the American citizen.

I discussed this subject with Sampson Klutznick, a private detective who assured me that most private detectives were as much against bugging as their victims. He said, "They should pass strong laws making it a crime to bug or wiretap any American citizen."

"That's for sure," I said.

"Of course, we'll have to exempt the FBI, because they must tap wires and bug people to find out who the criminals and Communists are in the United States."

"Yeah, I guess so."

"And we should let the Internal Revenue Service continue bugging Americans so we know who aren't paying their taxes."

"Naturally," I said.

"And then we can't forbid the Post Office from listening in to find out what people are writing dirty books."

"That's for sure," I agreed.

"And the CIA can't be included in the law because there has to be counterspying. And the local police must be permitted to bug college campuses to find out what the students are up to."

"I would hate for local police not to," I said.

"Then it's also very important that big companies be allowed to bug other big companies."

"What for?"

"To find out if they're being bugged."

"I hadn't thought of that."

"And," he said "I don't think the law should apply to private detectives looking for evidence in divorce cases."

"You don't?"

"Of course not. It's very important that a divorced person have a solid case against the guilty party, and how could we get it if we didn't use all the latest scientific devices?"

"But you would only bug the guilty party?"

"That's correct. An innocent person would have nothing to fear."

"What other exceptions would you make in passing a strong anti-wiretap law?"

"Politicians should be allowed to bug one another during a political campaign, and unions should be allowed to bug management, and management should be allowed to bug the unions, and salesmen could still bug customers, and members of the board of education should be allowed to bug teachers."

"Shouldn't anybody be permitted to listen in on clergymen?"

"Only if the clergymen are involved in civil rights or anti-Vietnam war demonstrations."

"If those are the only exceptions," I said, "I think we could live with the law."

"The law should have teeth in it," Klutznick said, "or pretty soon the American people will have no privacy at all. Don't you agree?"

"One hundred per cent," I said. "Hey, is that a microphone in your martini?"

"Yes it is," he replied. "My job is to bug anybody who voices any opinion on bugging."

"But that's a violation of my constitutional rights."

"Maybe so, but how else are we going to know who is for the law and who is against it?"

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE WEST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is indeed gratifying and encouraging to note that a number of my distinguished colleagues in the House have approved in principle my bill providing for the appointment of a registered professional architect to supervise all future Capitol construction and renovation. Such proposals will effectively prevent the further desecration of our noble Federal structures at the abusive hands of Mr. J. George Stewart.

The measures introduced by the able Congressmen, Mr. President, are not unlike those which I myself sponsored in the first session of this Congress, and I am, of course, in wholehearted agreement with the goals which they were designed to achieve. The sizable expenditures which we annually appropriate for Capitol construction and renovation as well as a recognition of the prominent place which these structures occupy as elements of our national heritage makes the acquisition of a skilled, knowledgeable, and technically competent architect an indispensable necessity. Furthermore the elimination of unnecessary extravagance and the protection of the esthetic purity resulting from such professional supervision are most necessary.

Vigilance and discretion demand that we assign such projects to none save the most expert and masterful of the architectural profession.

Men who would lay their unhallowed hands on these sacred structures—

A recent editorial observed—

are indifferent to the glorious episodes of our past, ignorant of the architectural merit of some of the greatest buildings of the world and indifferent to every consideration of national pride and honor.

Surely no expert knowledge should be compromised in the historic undertakings.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Morris Ketchum, Jr., president of the American Institute of Architects; a transcript of a radio broadcast by Ed-

ward P. Morgan, and certain newspaper articles and editorials relating to the proposed extension be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS,
Washington, D.C., June 27, 1966.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: The American Institute of Architects is deeply concerned that proposals for the extension of the West Front have been approved by the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol.

We are inalterably opposed to this extension. We are cognizant that the facilities of Congress must grow with the Nation and the increased demands upon the Congress. However, it is patently obvious that this one building cannot be continually extended and expanded until it is shapeless and functionally impractical. At some time this construction must stop. We urge that it be now, while the quality and uniqueness of the creativity of Thornton, Bulfinch, and Olmsted still remain as examples of our national heritage.

The AIA recognizes the state of disrepair and structural weakness that exists and that the West Front must be strengthened. This can be done and the West Front can either be restored or rebuilt without destroying the beauty of proportion and detail that comprise the Capitol's present aesthetic appearance.

We ask that you oppose this extension, and urge your support of comprehensive planning for the future needs of Capitol Hill so that these needs can be planned and provided with the advice of an impartial, professional group constituted to render such service to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

MORRIS KETCHUM, JR.,
President.

EDWARD P. MORGAN AND THE NEWS

JUNE 24, 1966.—After the British Redcoats burned the U.S. Capitol in 1814 in the War of 1812, Congress had to move to a tavern called Blodgett's Hotel. Presumably this could have served the legislators as a permanent meeting place since, as legend has it, politicians most comfortably gather in smoke-filled hotel rooms. Blodgett's had a cloakroom too. Lobbyists traditionally contact lawmakers in cloakrooms. So everything was fine and dandy. But then some busybody insisted on restoring the Capitol building and there has been nothing but trouble ever since. Additions here, alterations there; all very unsettling. So I, for one, simply cannot see what the fuss is all about when an ex-Congressman from Delaware named J. George Stewart steps courageously forward and starts to bury all this history under a facade of freshly-cut marble.

Nobody, of course, is more eminently qualified for this delicate but heroic task than Stewart. He is not now and never has been a card-carrying architect and, as far as I know, never intends to be one. He does operate with the title of architect of the Capitol and it was under that cover that he executed—one might even say, murdered—his most famous work, the Rayburn Building, named in travestied memory of the late Speaker of the House. Into this crypto-fascist-style mausoleum, jestingly referred to as a Congressional office building, Stewart poured all of his supervisory talents and by some reports, considerably more than one hundred million dollars of the taxpayers' money. The result, naturally, was a happy combination of superlatives—the ugliest and most expensive edifice of its kind ever erected on the face of the earth. Perhaps the hap-

July 12, 1966

piest note of all was the fact that it cost only approximately twice as much as Stewart originally said it would. With such a monument around, the Great Society doesn't need urban renewal, it needs a camouflage corps.

But now, oh let joy be unconfined, we are about to be treated to another sterling Stewart contribution to the beautification of Washington. At a starting price of just \$34,000,000—a steal, really—he is going to stick the west front of the capitol out a maximum of 88 feet so it can house more offices, two big auditoriums, two cafeterias, four dining rooms seating more than a thousand people and an information lobby to take care of the tourist explosion. The sheer beauty of the Stewart plan is that in one fell swoop, or in what may come to be known as one swell foop, it will destroy the capitol's historic vestiges—the last traces of the original work of Thornton, the West Indian doctor who won the \$500 first prize for the building's first design; the embellishments of Latrobe, the contributions of Bulfinch, the famous Boston architect, and the terrace with its majestic flights of steps designed by Frederick Law Olmstead. You don't hardly get a demolition job like that anymore.

Indeed, while he's at it, Stewart might well consider razing the whole structure, including his other handiwork, the east front, which cost \$22,000,000, the customary double of his beginning estimate. Then the space could be used for a parking lot, which Washington needs anyway and the Congress could move down the street to Union Station and thus save that little-used landmark from destruction.

An alternative plan, which I like better, would be to let Stewart run rampant on a field of bad taste across the entire face of L'Enfant's famous city. Thus with his ravenous appetite for eating places, we could hope to see a Stewart restaurant revolving around the tip of the Washington Monument to rival the space needle in Seattle. The lethal hydroplane races could be shifted from Hains Point to the reflection pool, the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials could be converted into public restrooms and shoe shine parlors. The cherry trees around the tidal basin would of course be cut down because they obstruct the view that billboards would supplant. And it might be a good idea to install a couple of gas pumps on the Pennsylvania Avenue side of the White House. Their revenue could help finance the Stewart master plan.

Don't be so timid as to think all this is impossible. The Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol, including those well-known aesthetes and city planners, Vice President HUMPHREY, Speaker MCCORMACK and Minority Leaders FORD and DIRKSEN, has already blithely gone along with Stewart's west front job. All he needs now is money. He figures he can easily wheedle that out of the Congress with the argument that the front's ancient sandstone blocks are crumbling and a jet's sonar boom may bring the whole building down, dome and all. After careful study, the Fine Arts Commission reports the capitol can be repaired, restored and its priceless architectural history preserved, all at a trifle of the cost of Stewart's folly. That would be the sensible way to do things. But thank Heaven that's not the way things are done in this crazy, wonderful town. Ask George Stewart.

This is Edward P. Morgan saying good night from Washington.

[From the Washington Daily News, June 24, 1966]

THE CAPITOL

Today's guest editorial is really two editorials on the same subject, namely, the proposal by the Architect of the Capitol to alter the building's West Front. The first involves a letter from William Walton, chair-

man of the Commission of Fine Arts, to Vice President HUMPHREY and Speaker MCCORMACK. It goes like this:

"The Commission of Fine Arts has asked me to express its grave concern over proposals to alter the West Front of the Capitol. The Commission, established by Congress in 1910 to advise the President and the Congress on matters of art, feels that this is the single most important architectural proposal of the 20th Century. We have therefore studied the matter deeply and come to the conclusion that to erase this great historic facade would be a national tragedy.

"The Capitol as a whole is one of the great buildings of the world, comparable in size and shape to St. Peter's in Rome and St. Paul's in London. While it finally cannot rank with either of them in architectural purity, it has a style and a quality that is unique.

"It has been developed piece by piece as this Republic grew from a small nation to become the greatest world power. And that history is reflected in the architecture of the West Facade. In the process of growth the Capitol has taken on a patriotic symbolism that scarcely needs to be pointed out. Unquestionably it is the single most important building in our great Republic, expressive of our noble ideals and great achievements. To preserve it, other lesser needs such as those for additional office space, restaurant facilities, and tourist accommodations must be set aside for a larger goal.

"The Commission has made a very careful study of the Congressional proposal with special attention to the engineering report by the Thompson and Lichtner Co. On our own we have sought the advice of an independent structural expert with considerable experience in analyzing old buildings. Our report indicates that it is feasible even though difficult, to restore the original walls or partially rebuild them in their present location. We strongly support this view . . .

"In the meantime the Commission believes that it is of the greatest importance that no steps be taken which might make inevitable the vandalism of the Capitol's historic and beautiful West Facade."

The second statement is from Senator JOSEPH CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, who said:

"I desire to solicit the interest of Senators in a bill which I am thinking about introducing to designate the U.S. Capitol building as a National Historical Landmark. As I understand it, this would have the effect of making it a Federal offense for anyone to deface, mutilate or in any other way desecrate it. It would apply to all persons, including architects, nonarchitects, and nominal architects.

"I come from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania where we have many national landmarks. We do not like to see our landmarks 'improved'—we are quite happy with them the way they are. If someone proposed to 'beautify' Independence Hall in Philadelphia with the addition of a modernistic hot-dog stand—or even a colonial reproduction of a hot-dog stand—we would strenuously object.

"I do not believe we should do less for the U.S. Capitol building. It, too, is a national shrine. It is as much entitled to protection against vandalism—whether from high places or low—as Independence Hall or Old Swedes' Church.

"It is true that we do not have our own Architect at Old Swedes' Church. This is an advantage. Not only does this save us a great deal of money—it has also tended to have a beneficial effect on the state of preservation of this fine old building. This is all the more reason why the U.S. Capitol, which does not have this advantage, should begin the protection which the bill which I am contemplating introducing in the Senate would afford."

To all of which we add a fervent "Amen!"

[From the Washington Post]

MATTER OF FACT: OUR FOREFATHERS' GLORY

(By Joseph Alsop)

The first point to note about the official Architect of the Capitol is that he never has been, is not now, and never will be an architect.

J. George Stewart is an amiable, aging Republican congressional lame duck from Delaware, who was named architect of the Capitol by President Eisenhower. This was an appointment almost as whimsical as the Emperor Caligula's famous nomination of his favorite horse to the Roman consulship; and it has produced far more practical results, all of them perfectly godawful.

The worst of the damage might have been prevented by the normal operation of the laws of pork and patronage, if the Architect of the Capitol did not have such a remarkable gift for attaching himself to speakers of the House of Representatives. Unfortunately, however, at the very first leaders' meeting held by President Kennedy, Sam Rayburn's opening remark was:

"Now Mr. President, I want you to keep on George Stewart. He's a good man, and I want him to stay on the job."

Stewart was kept on, and therefore the great speaker and doughty old patriot is now cruelly commemorated by the Rayburn Building. It cost the taxpayers close on \$130 million and is certainly the most monstrously ugly, ludicrously wasteful and vulgarly pretentious structure erected anywhere in the Western world since Joseph Stalin ruthlessly inflicted his Palace of Culture on the defenseless city of Warsaw.

After Speaker Rayburn died, one of President Kennedy's cherished projects was the replacement of the Architect of the Capitol with an honest-to-God architect. But the President was killed before the deed was done. And in very short order thereafter, non-architect Stewart apparently managed to attach himself to Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK.

So J. George Stewart's fell career continues. In fact, it is grimly appropriate to remember him at this holiday time dedicated to the founding of this republic. For the great non-architect is now planning the destruction of one of the last architectural mementoes of the Founding Fathers, the superb Bulfinch-Latrobe West Front of the Capitol itself.

It is an extraordinary record. It began with the new Senate Office Building, which seemed impossible to surpass in extravagance, impracticality and tastelessness until the Rayburn Building was constructed. Then followed the extension of the Capitol's East Front, with the machine-made marble exterior and the new interiors that appear to have been imitated from the costly men's rooms in the Moscow subway. The Rayburn Building followed. And now the West Front is to be extended, and this time, instead of an exact though machine-made copy as on the East Front, we are to have improvements on Latrobe and Bulfinch by non-architect Stewart.

If you seek the answer to this mystery of mounting horror in Stewart's lair in the Capitol basement, you find a kindly though occasionally testy old gentleman, with an antique congressional air about him. If you ask him if there is any committee of design to pass on his projects, he answers cheerfully that "it's usually confined to the leadership."

There is more to it than that, of course. Just how the pork and patronage work in this case is not immediately apparent. But there is an enormous amount of both, as the price tag on the Rayburn Building indicates; and it can hardly be accidental that the same architects' names seem to appear again and again as Stewart's "associates."

One imagines them all together, cheerfully opening their meeting with the famous

July 12, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

14683

Klores yesterday confirmed this, saying he felt a new organization would be "more representative" than a private foundation controlled by people who donated private funds.

He said Shriver had no policy against family foundations but said: "Private foundations are filled with all sorts of problems."

Klores also said he thought at least one member of the board was a migrant worker. The name he mentioned, Mrs. Myrtle Mae Walker, was not listed by Hardeman as a director last week and does not show up on the secretary of state's records of original directors.

Hardeman said he is busy expanding membership of the CAF board, and said three new members have been added within the past month. He listed these as Ray Houston, executive director of the Community Welfare Council; Jack Ross, assistant professor of sociology at the University of South Florida; and Ben Fraticelli, executive director of the Florida Christian Migrant Ministry.

But for nearly a year CAF was run entirely by Hardeman, Mansfield and Garrett.

Last month a new group, Migrant Legal Services, was formed to handle a \$806,000 U.S. grant to provide legal help to migrants. Original officers were Garrett, president; Hardeman, vice president; and Mansfield, secretary-treasurer.

Since then the board has been expanded, with Garrett moving up to chairman of the board, Mansfield to president, and Hardeman becoming a regular board member.

Tabulation of grants, contracts to date in CAF-CFS operation

	1965-66	1966-67
Community action fund migrant program	\$626,410.00	\$610,708
Community action fund migrant legal services		806,099
Community action fund migrant VISTA conference	4,900.38	
Community service foundation VISTA training	1316,635.50	(?)
Costs incurred in VISTA training through:		
July 27, 1965	\$27,336.23	
July 28 to Aug. 24	15,919.55	
Aug. 25 to Sept. 30	36,320.31	
Oct. 1 to 24	17,069.41	
Total	96,635.50	947,945.88
Grand total		1,416,807 2,364,752.88

¹ Estimated total, since records beyond Oct. 24, 1965 not open to inspection. Estimate made on basis of statements by Director Thomas P. Hardeman that some \$220,000 beyond the \$96,635.50 has been paid under the present fixed-fee contract of \$1,000 per trainee. Training cycle for each volunteer is 6 weeks.

² Contracts not yet negotiated for this period.

REPORT ON TRIP TO SOUTHEAST ASIA BY SOME MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous orders of the House, the gentleman from New York, [Mr. MURPHY], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, with the approval of President Johnson and with your approval, the following Members of Congress journeyed to the Southeast Asia area to investigate the U.S. military, economic, and political commitments:

Representative JOHN M. MURPHY, Democrat, of New York.

Representative JOHN J. GILLIGAN, Democrat, of Ohio.

Representative TENO RONCALIO, Democrat, of Wyoming.

Representative THOMAS C. McGRATH, Democrat, of New Jersey.

Representative JAMES C. CORMAN, Democrat, of California.

Representative WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Democrat, of Maine.

Representative EDWARD J. GURNEY, Republican, of Florida.

Representative TIM L. CARTER, Republican, of Kentucky.

Representative ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Democrat, of Illinois.

Representative BASIL L. WHITENER, Democrat, of North Carolina.

Representative GALE SCHISLER, Democrat, of Illinois.

Representative ROBERT B. DUNCAN, Democrat, of Oregon.

Representative HASTINGS KEITH, Republican, of Massachusetts.

Representative JOHN B. ANDERSON, Republican, of Illinois.

The Members represented virtually every section of our country, both political parties and are decorated combat veterans of World War II and the Korean war. We departed Washington, D.C., on Saturday, July 2, and returned late last night, Monday, July 11; upon our return we went directly to the White House and reported to the President and to the Speaker of the House in the Cabinet Room. The U.S. Air Force provided our transportation and coordinated our itineraries at the different countries we visited. At this time I would like to express our appreciation for the very efficient and professional assistance rendered by Maj. Gen. Lawrence S. Lightner, U.S. Air Force, and Col. John M. Chapman, U.S. Air Force, throughout the entire tour.

Prior to our departure during the week June 27-July 2 we were briefed at separate times by the Defense Department, the State Department, and by our AID officials in Washington. We departed Andrews Air Force Base at 6 p.m. on Saturday, July 2, and arrived at Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, shortly after midnight. We met with the acting commander in chief of our Pacific Forces, Lt. Gen. Paul S. Emrick, U.S. Air Force—Admiral Sharp was in the Eastern Pacific at the time—Gen. John K. Waters, commander in chief, U.S. Army, Pacific; Gen. Hunter Harris, Jr., commander in chief, U.S. Air Force, Pacific; and Adm. Roy L. Johnson, commander in chief, U.S. Navy, Pacific, and their respective staffs. These senior U.S. commanders conferred with us for about 4 hours describing in detail the constitution, disposition, mission, and operations of the U.S. Forces in the Pacific.

The emphasis was placed on southeast Asia and concentrated on the activities in South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand. The interrelationship of all of these countries was stressed politically as they related to terrain, culture, and the political and economic factors. It was clearly pointed out at this conference that the control and direction of subversive forces acting not only in South Vietnam but in Laos and Thailand as well were centered in Hanoi.

There were no illusions that the South Vietnamese or the Laotians or their guerrilla activities were independent na-

tionalist movements. It is clear that the subversion of this entire area is the working of the Communist-controlled government at Hanoi. After these briefings we toured the Pearl Harbor naval and port complex, and departed early on July 4 for Clark Air Force Base in the Philippine Islands.

At Clark we were met by Lt. Gen. James W. Wilson, commander of the 13th Air Force. After a tour of our supply and logistical areas, as well as the Air Force Material and Tactical Aircraft we went to the Clark Air Force Base Hospital, which is the air evacuation hospital for all of our Asian forces.

This hospital is one of the most complete medical complexes I have ever inspected. Col. William Hernquist, a most qualified surgeon and administrator, personally conducted us through the operating and recovery areas and described in detail the operations of his air evacuation and treatment facilities. The ability to move a wounded soldier from the battlefield to this hospital in 5 hours was clearly an indicator of the top efficiency of our battlefield and medical concepts of today. In effect, instead of trying to bring the hospital to the front lines, we bring the frontline wounded to the hospital in a matter of hours. Never in our history have we provided such complete medical care and treatment to our soldiers. The attitude and morale of the men at Clark made me proud of our American fighting men.

Without exception, the men I spoke with were fully confident of our inevitable victory in Vietnam and more important, they were fully aware of the reason for fighting in this faraway country.

We departed Clark at about 6 p.m. and headed for San Son Nhut Airbase in Saigon and arrived on Tuesday evening, July 5. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge met us at the airport and welcomed us to South Vietnam. We had a very short Fourth of July having crossed the international date line shortly after we departed Hawaii.

Early Wednesday morning we met with Ambassador Lodge at the American Embassy and received a comprehensive detailed analysis of the situation from the Ambassador. He pointed out that we were beginning to achieve a military victory but that in this era of "modern" war, a total victory would have to be accompanied by an economic and political victory as well. The Ambassador stressed that the Ky regime had been the longest continuous government in the country since the Diem era. Ky was now in his second year as Premier and had stabilized the Vietnam Government.

The Vietnam Government with the advice and the assistance of the allied forces had instituted social, economic, political, and administrative reforms throughout the entire country.

Under the revolutionary development program, it was evident that the people were making impressive strides toward complete stability. Facts related by the Ambassador left no doubt as to the Hanoi direction and conduct of the main force Vietcong units and North Vietnamese units in the country. The South

Vietnamese never were the least bit attracted to communism and have been resisting this aggression for 20 years.

According to the Ambassador's estimates the Vietcong have about 24 percent of the population under their domination while the RVN government has secured about 54 percent of the population. Living in a sort of twilight zone are 22 percent of the South Vietnamese people. A cursory examination of Vietcong tactics reveals that more than 10,000 Vietnam civilians have been killed by the Vietcong in their wholesale terrorist tactics to intimidate the country into submission.

In May of 1966, the lives of 115 officials were added to this list, many of them schoolteachers and hamlet leaders who were valiantly trying to educate and lead their people in a democratic life. The fourth dimension of this war was clearly portrayed by the Ambassador when he remarked that we are not only fighting a war, but we are trying to build a peoples' confidence in themselves and to win an economic struggle as well.

Our Army can catch the whales—

He said—

but the terror fish requires a finer mesh to our net of tactics.

Proceeding to the political situation, the Ambassador stated, and later in the day Premier Ky confirmed, the intention of the Vietnam Government to have the September 11 elections to the constitutional convention. This election will be the second in Vietnam history and once the convention draws its constitution, the people will then have the opportunity of participating in the democratic way of life. It must be stated, however, that the Army in South Vietnam has been the nationbuilder in a land which was dedicated to people in a small family concept instead of a nation as we know it. The Buddhist Institute headed by Thich Tom Chow has agreed that this is a good election law and this action confirms the fact that the much publicized Buddhist uprising and demonstration represented only a small minority of Buddhist thought. Although there have been demonstrations against the government by different factions, at no time has any of these factions evidenced a pro-Communist line of philosophy. Further at no time has any minor or significant political figure or leader in South Vietnam defected to the Communist side.

Ambassador Porter charged with the economic development of Vietnam described his efforts in working with the Government of South Vietnam.

At all times the junta shows cohesion and willingness to take advice from the U.S. to work in three areas simultaneously, namely to run the war against the Vietcong, to restructure the country, and to institute an electoral system.

He stated that more and more people are feeling that their Government is worthwhile and not just a tax collector. The pacification program which is now operating in areas already swept by the Army consists of political action teams which go into the hamlets and villages to create peoples action elements to struc-

ture and stabilize the local governments. This ambitious program envisions 25,000 men per year in 59-man teams per hamlet going to 40,000 men per year in 1967 with the express mission of restoring economic and political life to areas formerly terrorized by the Vietcong.

Charles Mann the U.S. AID Director described in detail the assistance rendered to the South Vietnam Government. This program is the most complex ever undertaken by the United States. This year alone, this amounts to \$650 million—part of a total of \$2½ billion since 1955. The 842 Americans in this AID program are dedicated to working with the Royal Vietnam Government on activities to support and strengthen their Government and to reestablish the fiber and fabric of government.

These activities are in the fields of police, public works, with the emphasis on port development, road construction, rural electrification, city powerplants, and provincial electrification. In field operations over 2,800 projects have been undertaken on the local level. In the field of public health the total of 1,000 indigenous medical doctors which must serve a population of 16 million people are augmented by 33 medical health teams in the country at present with 20 of these teams being U.S. military personnel. The Republic of China Government has sent medical teams to help. This area of public health needs greater emphasis.

Preventive health with a program to conquer malaria and other diseases as well as the communicable disease problem are also being attacked by medical teams. This is part of a worldwide medical assistance program titled "Project Vietnam."

Refugee coordination is most vital to insure proper disposition of 1 million refugees in the last year alone. One-half million are still in temporary shelters. Fifteen international voluntary agencies are helping this refugee program. The International Red Cross as well as West Germany and New Zealand are participating in this program to aid the 40,000 to 50,000 new refugees per month.

The agriculture program is aided by a 200-man American staff. Key problems they are solving are the land reform programs to insure land tenure contracts, proper land and crop pricing, and farmer services to foster cooperative developments and farm credits.

The police program has 5,000 men currently in training. The very simple operation of maintaining checkpoints to apprehend smugglers, Vietcong infiltration, and other subversives will be expanded.

Education is of course basic to the development of this country as pointed out earlier, teachers are a target of the Vietcong terrorist activities but nonetheless the hamlet school program has seen 6,000 classrooms completed with 2,000 having been constructed through a self-help program. Seven million textbooks have been printed and 14 million are programmed by 1968. These texts were written by Vietnamese teachers. Secondary school education is being emphasized and teacher training is a nec-

essary part of their program. Over 5,000 have been trained to participate. In the vocational education field, 20 rural trade schools have been programmed with 7 already completed. Five technical institutions to teach 1,000 students are completed.

On Wednesday afternoon, Gen. William C. Westmoreland conducted a detailed briefing on the mission and operation of MACV—Military Assistance Command Vietnam. Our participating allies under his command are the Republic of Korea, Australia, New Zealand, Republic of China, Republic of the Philippines, and Thailand.

General Westmoreland traced the escalation of the war by the North Vietnamese. In 1961 they used battalion strength organizations. By 1963, six regiments of Vietcong were identified in the field. By 1965, 14 Vietcong regiments and 9 North Vietnam Army regiments were identified. Today 13 Vietcong and 14 North Vietnam Army regiments, coordinated by 5 division headquarters are operating against the South Vietnam Government and Allied forces.

The effects of allied military operations against the Vietcong and North Vietnam Armies was a source of pride to everyone. The cumulative effects of U.S. Air Force, naval carrier-based aircraft, B-52 bomber units, naval gunfire, and the U.S. combined Army operation in the field, completely reversed the course of the war.

The problem of winning the peace must, however, be carried on simultaneously. The Vietcong terrorists are operating in the 43 Provinces, 235 districts, 2,558 villages, and 13,211 hamlets of this country. To drive this subversive terrorist organization out of this grassroot area is going to take a long time and very strong effective action by the RVN Government. The answer is the revolutionary development program which I referred to earlier.

On Wednesday departed Tan Son Nhut Airfield—the main airport at Saigon—which is busier than Washington National and Kennedy Airports combined, and flew to Cam Ranh Bay about 250 miles north of Saigon where the second largest port is located. We have enlarged the unloading capacity here from about 1,000 short tons daily to 8,000 short tons daily. We have also established a bulk oil terminal. The logistical problems appear to be solved although there is a wait for some dry cargo ships in unloading. Much lighterage is used for discharging ocean vessels, unloading in some cases is done on a selective basis. This port will be a \$300 million facility when completed and will be a big asset to the economy of the country when the war is over.

In the bay were two power ships for electricity, an ammo storage ship, aircraft ordnance maintenance ship. Four dry cargo ships were being unloaded and four were waiting for berths. All in all this is a very huge but efficient port operation. The Cam Ranh Bay Airfield is an example of an "instant airfield"; 90 F-4 fighters and 90 large cargo transporters move in and out daily.

July 12, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

14685

The runway is aluminum and they have the usual aviation facilities. Combat sorties were taking off and landing every few minutes. Pilots fly about 200 missions during their 11-month tour. They usually operate in the same area and consequently are experts on the terrain.

We flew to Que Nhon in an Army Caribou aircraft, a two-engine small cargo type, and visited the ROK Capital Division. We received an honor guard which was the best I have ever seen. The South Koreans are really a model unit. They have adapted to the country completely and have formed a personal bond with the South Vietnamese. They have been most effective in combat operations.

Twenty-four thousand troops are in Vietnam now and by November 1 they will add another division which will bring their force to 48,000-plus. They have been very effective in civil action programs. Many of their soldiers are farm boys and have greatly assisted the Vietnamese in improving productivity.

We flew to An Khe in the interior to the 1st Cavalry Division. This is our air mobile assault division. We observed several air strikes which were in process along our route of travel. This division actually has units in combat over a 300-mile area and can still support itself because of its great mobility. The "Air Cav" were experiencing difficulty in trying to make contact with the Vietcong. The Vietcong seemed reluctant to close with U.S. units and more interested in attacking Royal Vietnamese Army units.

From here we flew to the 1st Brigade of the 101st Airborne Division at Dakto, about 18 miles from the Cambodian border. This was the unit which was involved in the heavy action during which Capt. William Carpenter had called the air strikes in on top of his unit. Carpenter described this action as necessary because the Vietcong were 15 yards from his men hidden in the bamboo undergrowth. The 101st are astride a main infiltration route and consequently in action all the time. The area is inhabited by the Montonyard—mountain people. Very primitive, the men were in loin cloths and the women are bare breasted. Obviously, the coastal areas are rich and the target of the Communist action. We returned to Saigon via the Pluku Airfield, about a 400-mile trip. The strongest impression of the day was our base development and use of air and mobility of our units. These three dimensions of the war are going well. The fourth we are obviously going to have to concentrate on, and that is to restore confidence in the minds of the Vietnamese people—confidence in themselves and their Government.

Every day this is proceeding effectively and it is endorsed by more schools under construction, more commerce on the roads, and more importantly by defectors from the other side.

On Thursday we departed Tan Son Nhut Airbase. We boarded a Navy two-engine eight-seat plane, the C-1A "Trader" and headed for the U.S. Aircraft carrier *Intrepid* which is on duty in the South China Sea. The landing was a real thrill. We came in with the

carrier doing about 30 knots, the tail hook caught the first arresting cable and we were stopped in about 100 feet. Capt. Vince Macri, the captain, briefed us as to his mission and then we proceeded to inspect this 23-year-old veteran of World War II, Pacific action. This carrier incidentally was the last one to be refitted at the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

The *Intrepid* has 32, A-4 jet fighter aircraft and 24 A-1 propeller fighter, dive-bomber-type aircraft. She launches and receives back 10 planes every hour. The launch is by steam catapult and one plane goes off every 30 seconds. I spoke with the returning pilots in the readyroom and they told me that their armament of rockets, machine guns, Napalm, and 500 to 2,000 pound bombs are very effective against the Vietcong units. Pilots know the terrain intimately and they felt they were effectively supporting the ground combat elements.

The *Intrepid* launches 90 strikes per day, about the same as the 12th Fighter Wing at Cam Rahn Bay airfield that I described earlier. The carrier is in every respect a floating, mobile, airbase. We flew from the *Intrepid* to our II F FORCEV Headquarters at Long Binh and were briefed by Maj. Gen. Jonathan O. Seaman, the commander. He commands the Southern U.S. Forces which includes the Saigon area and runs to the Cambodian border.

He has Vietnamese as well as United States, Australian, and New Zealand forces under his command. He is very confident of our efforts and showed graphically on his situation maps the definite turn to our side that the war has taken. We traveled to the III Corps Headquarters of the Royal Vietnamese Army and were briefed by the deputy commander, General Tinch, and then visited the 25th Royal Vietnamese Division. The Viet soldier impressed me with his toughness and firm purpose.

They have been fighting for 20 years and want to end this war as quickly as possible. They showed some very revealing tonnages of rice and other supplies captured from the Vietcong. They now control the rice-producing areas and it is obvious that the Vietcong are hard pressed in the productive areas of the country.

Traveling by helicopter now, we went to Cu Chi, headquarters of the U.S. 25th Infantry Division—a real operation, Maj. Gen. Fred Weyand, commander. His base camp is right on top of the town that was the main Vietcong headquarters. It took a tough fight to drive the Vietcong away, but he now controls and secures the entire north flank of the Saigon corridor.

Using B-52 strikes, armored artillery, and our vastly superior firepower, the Vietcong is forced to break contact when they engage U.S. forces. The problem, as usual in this area, is to restore confidence to the local village and hamlet people. Confidence in United States and the Royal Vietnamese Armies to report the Vietcong terrorists in the villages so that action can be brought to bear against the terrorist. This is being done on an increasing basis.

On Saturday we traveled by Army Caribou aircraft to the 5th Special Forces Group Detachment at Phuoc Long Province. A very fertile valley due to the Song Be River which flows through the Province. The special forces work closely with the provincial police and the revolutionary force units to pacify the area of 68,000 population.

About one-half are under control of the Vietcong and no production has been forthcoming from a large rubber plantation in the Province. The provincial chief hopes to resume production in the near future. That afternoon we went to the 1st Logistical Command installation in Saigon and toured the port, pier, warehouse, and distribution facilities with Maj. Gen. Charles W. Eifer.

The port congestion of Saigon has been relieved both here and at Can Ronh Bay. A port authority under the contract of the Vietnamese Army will coordinate all logistical movements both civilian and military in the near future. It was evident that our logistical base has been carefully and soundly completed and is efficiently supplying the needs of our military and economic operation. For example, of 97,296 items on requisition for 7 days, 83,539 had been filled; 95 percent of aircraft requisitions were filled.

We departed Vietnam and arrived in Dong Muang Airbase, Bangkok at 6 p.m. on Saturday night and were met by Maj. Gen. Richard G. Stilwell, commander, of the U.S. Military Assistance Command, Thailand. We proceeded to the U.S. Embassy and were briefed by the Chargé d'Affaires and General Stilwell. The U.S. concern for the development of Thailand can be readily understood by analyzing the past development at Sat-tahip which in effect is the creation of a new port city to meet the increased economic development of this entire country of 31 million people. New highways, railroads, pipelines, and airfields are proceeding with increased American emphasis. There is a real threat in the northeastern areas of this country along the Laotian and Cambodian frontiers. Hanoi-trained terrorists are employing the same terror tactics of ruthless murder and intimidation of town people as in Vietnam. The Thai Government is meeting this threat with American assistance and advice.

We departed Bangkok Sunday afternoon for Taipei on Taiwan arriving at 7 p.m. We met with Ambassador Walter P. McGonnaby and Vice Adm. William E. Gentner, on Monday morning and were briefed on the military, economic, and political situations. Our AID program has been such a success here that we are phasing out our program and the Formosans will be completely on their own. The threat of Red China is always present. Numerous clashes at sea and in the air occur in the straits between the mainland and Formosa. At 10 a.m. we met with the Vice President, C. K. Yen and then had an hour conference with President Chiang Kai-shek.

Chiang Kai-shek expressed his admiration for the U.S. role in southeast Asia, stating we were there in the nick of time. He felt that a negotiation would have to

14686

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 12, 1966

take place in Vietnam before any powers would withdraw their armies. He further stated that the problems on the mainland would prevent any Chinese involvement at this time. His country is a model for the full enterprise system in Asia. Booming industry, agriculture, and educational systems were evident from the people on the streets.

Mr. Speaker, I support President Johnson's policy in Vietnam and commend him for his continuance of the policy supported and enunciated by our last five Presidents. That we as a nation will honor our international agreements and that we will fight if necessary to prevent the totalitarian aggressors from overcoming our allies. The President has committed and I support his commitment of American troops in Vietnam on the frontier of freedom.

The American people should fully understand that we here in the citadel of freedom are secure only as long as the frontier of freedom is protected. Every patriotic American has an obligation to support our commitment and the voices of doom should be hushed lest they give aid and comfort to an enemy that may misgauge our national purpose.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I would like to compliment the gentleman from New York on his splendid report on Vietnam. I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to him and the other Members who just returned from Vietnam on their factfinding tour.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY], was one of the most outstanding soldiers ever to serve his country. He won a distinguished service cross in Korea among other decorations. He is now demonstrating as a Member of Congress a capacity to prove equally valuable to his country as a statesman. It is a rare combination for a man to be both an outstanding soldier and an outstanding statesman but these qualities JOHN MURPHY possesses.

I would like to compliment too my colleague from New Jersey, Congressman McGRATH, who went to Vietnam, for his excellent service to our country. A graduate of Annapolis fully trained on the ways of war but who has dedicated himself to the search for peace and the security of our country.

To all the Members of this Vietnam study mission, Mr. Speaker, please allow me to extend my admiration and gratitude for a job well down.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY] in this report on our visit to Vietnam and to the Far East.

I have not had an opportunity to prepare a detailed and formal report, but will do so within the next few days and I hope to bring to the attention of the Members of the House some of my views.

Mr. Speaker, were we gratified that we were given an opportunity by the President and the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives to make this important mission, which we feel has great significance for the Congress as well as for the people of the country.

As the gentleman from New York has said, while we must be cautious in our optimism, we have every reason to be proud of the efforts that are being made in Vietnam. We have many indicia of the progress that has been made as we look about that country. One of the indicia is the information which was given to us with reference to the defections under the Chu Hoy or open arms program that is now in effect in Vietnam.

In the entire year of 1965, we were told that there were only 11,124 Vietcong defectors whereas through June of this year 9,200 such defectors have shown up on our side.

May I say also, as the gentleman has said, every American should be proud of the young men we have sent to Vietnam for the courageous and patriotic attitude that they have.

Those of us who visited with the marines in the northern part of Vietnam and we were told when we visited with General Westmoreland in Saigon and with Ambassador Lodge and when we visited the II Corps area and visited with General Larsen—wherever we went, whether we talked to Marine, Navy, or Army commanders, we were told that never in their experience, either World War II or in the Korean war, had they seen America's young men perform with such zeal and devotion to duty as they had experienced in this military conflict.

I would like to quote briefly several statements that were made to us by General Larsen who has command of the U.S. forces in the II Corps area of Vietnam.

One of the things he said was this:

Every month things look a little bit better.

Then with reference to the criticism that some have made with reference to the alleged shortage of ammunition, General Larsen had this to say and I quote:

We have never been short of any type of ammunition at any time we needed it.

Then, in discussing the situation of our acquisition of intelligence data, General Larsen said:

Vietnamese civilians are now making much valuable information available to our side.

This, as the gentleman from New York knows, is another indicia of the effectiveness of our effort.

Then I thought it was significant that General Larsen had this to say:

I think President Johnson has fought the smartest war, psychologically and militarily, of any war that we have engaged in during my lifetime.

So when we hear this criticism from the beatniks and the peaceniks and, if you please, the so-called doves, I think

that it is unfortunate that they cannot have the experience which the gentleman from New York and the other 12 who joined us on this mission have had in seeing firsthand what is happening. As I have thought about the matter from a firsthand look, I think we do have a very serious problem. Assuming that we could accomplish a total military victory today, I am afraid that we would not have gained much unless we had time to proceed with the civil action program which will mean so much in the preservation of this country, its freedom and its independence in the future, with the orientation of the Vietnamese mind toward the village and the province, and not toward the nation, which is a serious problem. I would urge the U.S. Information Agency and other bodies to give attention to some unsophisticated approaches to those problems.

I think, too, that we cannot delude the people of our own country by thinking that this is purely a military action. The people of that area have, I believe, a great potential if we cooperate with them in technological and particularly agricultural training programs.

So, while I do not want to transgress upon the gentleman's time unduly, I do think that this mission of which we were a part, having had the opportunity not only to talk to people, but to see our troops in combat, and actually almost to be a part of it, gave us a picture which we would hope in some way we could convey to more of our people, because America is not willing to turn down any people who are craving for freedom. I know that if the people had the facts, they would feel as the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from Wyoming, the gentleman from Ohio, the gentleman from New Jersey, the gentleman from Illinois, and the others of us felt—that we have an opportunity in Vietnam, not only to restore freedom to that country, but also to preserve freedom in all of southeast Asia and, in doing so, to strengthen freedom here at home.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I look forward to having an opportunity to develop some of my thoughts more fully after a few days.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

I would like to point out at this time that in 1941, when the gentleman was a member of the House of Representatives of the State of North Carolina, he resigned his seat so that he could enter the service of our country. During that critical period in World War II he became a gunnery officer, and finished the war as a lieutenant in the Navy. Having served overseas in the defense of our country, he is the voice of experience when he speaks about our armed services.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman in the well and the gentleman from North Carolina in thanking the

July 12, 1966

President and the Speaker of this House for making it possible for 14 of us to make this trip to Vietnam and to see firsthand the situation there.

I congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY] who served as the chairman of this House task force. He certainly handled himself very well throughout the trip. It was a great pleasure to travel with him. He conveyed the wishes of this House to our troops and to the various leaders in a manner that would make every Member of this House proud that he is a Member of this House.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a very helpful, instructive, and informative trip. The Members of the House had the opportunity to see firsthand the deployment of U.S. troops and of South Vietnam troops, the deployment of the Australian troops and the New Zealand troops, totaling 1 million men.

It is quite obvious the question is no longer whether we are going to win the war; the question rather is, How soon can we win the war?

The gentleman in the well has quite properly stated that we view the progress with caution but with optimism. My own judgment, in watching the deployment of these troops, is that the enemy has been so thoroughly pinned down by our own troops and our allies that we have reason to believe the Communists are indeed ripe for a massive knockout blow.

I believe history will show that President Johnson's decision last year to slug it out with the Communists in Vietnam, rather than to abandon this very rich and important territory to the Communists, will constitute the turning point in our 20-year struggle with the Red menace. President Johnson's decision to bomb the oil depots in Hanoi and Halphong last week was acclaimed very loudly by our troops as certainly a sign that we are moving in the direction of total victory in Vietnam.

It is my hope that these bombings are going to continue. It is my hope that there will be other targets of a military nature that will be bombed. It is my hope that Hanoi is going to realize the folly of continuing this war in Vietnam. It is my further hope that we are going to hit the powerplants in the area of Hanoi, to totally immobilize Hanoi as the great supply depot for the troops that are waging warfare against our own men and our allies in Vietnam.

It is quite obvious that the deployment that has been accomplished by our forces in the relatively short time is nothing short of spectacular. Our forces have denied the Communists all initiative in Vietnam. They have denied them mobility. It is indeed a source of great pride to all of us who were there to see the high degree of proficiency and efficiency with which our troops are engaging in their mission.

I am quite positive that if every American could have the opportunity we have had in viewing our troops in Vietnam, their hearts would swell with pride, as ours did, in watching our men meet the great challenge.

There is no question that the helicopter has seriously challenged the old axiom that one must never get one's self involved in a land war in Asia. This may have been true many years ago. Thank God, our Defense Department and our industries have developed the great team that has been able to meet the challenge in Asia. Otherwise this great territory would have fallen to the Communists. With the aid of the helicopters, we are making every part of Vietnam inaccessible to the enemy.

It is my judgment, from speaking to the PW's and those who have questioned the prisoners of war, that the prisoners of war are reporting their morale has never been lower. The supply of food is short. The supply of medicine is literally nonexistent. The problems of ammunition are certainly slowing down their activities.

I think the other war is equally important. I was very happy to hear the gentleman from New York mention the peace program there. Too often the daily headlines we see in the press tell us only about the military aspect of the great challenge that we have accepted in Vietnam.

In fact, a great portion of our forces is being deployed in the pacification program, to secure the hundreds of villages from the Vietcong terrorism and subversion. Through this pacification program, developed by our Armed Forces, we are able to restore local governments and to make it possible for Vietnam to be ready for self-government. In my judgment, this pacification program holds the key to our long-range success in Vietnam.

I should like also to take this opportunity to congratulate and commend our medical forces in Vietnam. It is a source of great hope, of great courage, and of great consolation to all of us to know that such teamwork has been developed among the Navy, the Army, the Air Force, the Marines, and the Coast Guard that we are able today to move a wounded soldier from the field of battle to a major hospital installation where he can get major medical attention in less time than it took during World War II to move a soldier from the place where he was wounded to a field hospital, for limited care, in an ambulance. Our casualty rate has been kept down because the medics have been doing a truly outstanding job of giving excellent and quick help to our soldiers.

Also, we ought to commend those gallant civilians who work in the Agency for International Development. They are as much soldiers as the boys who are carrying guns. These men in Vietnam are bringing new dimensions of hope to the people of Vietnam and giving new meaning to America's presence there.

We were very much impressed by our interview with General Ky, who assured us that the elections are coming off on September 11, and who assured us that he sees no difficulty in transferring the reins of government from a military government to a civilian government. More important, I place great credence and great hope in his statement that he hopes that within 6 months after the consti-

tutional assembly has been elected on September 11 the people of Vietnam not only will have a constitution but also will have an elected constitutionally formed government, which will take over the reins of government in that country.

These are all things which point to a hopeful picture.

I join my colleagues in cautioning against too much optimism. Certainly it has been a long struggle. The fact remains that we are today unequivocally winning this war. Our forces have taken the initiative. We have denied the enemy all mobility and all initiative.

It may be that more troops will be needed in Vietnam. It may be that more bombings will be needed in Vietnam. President Johnson has properly stated that he intends to give General Westmoreland all he needs.

General Westmoreland will go down in history as one of the great generals of our Armed Forces. The President is ready to give to General Westmoreland whatever he needs to assure total victory.

For those whom I have heard question whether we have a plan for victory in Vietnam, I would recommend a visit to Vietnam. When they see the spirit of our American soldiers and when they see the deployment of our American troops and when they see the great teamwork, they will understand. There is only one goal, and that goal is victory for freedom.

I say there is a great tide of freedom sweeping through southeast Asia, in Vietnam, and the victory we are going to have in Vietnam is going to pace that tide of freedom.

I have every reason to believe that when victory is ours in Vietnam we shall have demonstrated to the enemy that big wars are too costly and small wars are too costly and indeed we can look forward to an era of prolonged peace in this world.

To that goal, I congratulate the men and women who are doing such an excellent job in Vietnam.

I am proud to have been a member of the delegation headed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY]. This has been one of the greatest experiences of my life. Certainly I can appreciate the great effort today more than ever before. I congratulate the gentleman for his initiative and the effort in putting together this task force to visit Vietnam.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

I should like to point out to the House that the gentleman enlisted in World War II as a private and rose to the rank of captain. He also was selected to lead a B-29 bombing raid in one of the first raids over Tokyo, Japan. He was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross and many air medals in that war. Because of his past career and experience, he made a great contribution to the conduct and understanding of the air war by the other members of the committee.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, much as we are aware that a 10-day stay in South Vietnam is hardly time to permit a candid appraisal of many of the key issues, it is nevertheless sufficient time to acquaint one with some of the difficult problems in this involvement.

First off I want to pay my respects, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman who has the time for this special order and who was kind enough to yield some of his time to me for this partial report. I believe Mr. MURPHY was an excellent chairman of our delegation and was most gracious in sharing his time with all members of the group. We were at all times free to ask questions of Ambassador Lodge, General Westmoreland, and General Ky. Mr. MURPHY was gracious in his tribute to our leaders and to General Shea of the Republic of Korea. Of course, I was particularly proud and pleased to be a member of his committee, and I am proud to take the floor now to pay tribute to my colleague on the way he handled this delegation. I am also grateful to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the President for having been included in this delegation.

I am pleased to have been able to report to the President last night at the White House on the results of our trip.

Many critics of the administration had questions often raised on particular matters. I am convinced a beginning toward an honest answer to these questions was made during the trip. If permissible by the gentleman from New York, I should like to take about 5 minutes to cover these questions and to indicate my answers to them.

Most critics of the administration limit General Ky's support to the military, merchants, and upper class, and ask "What is the U.S. interest in South Vietnam?"

At the present time, whether or not a majority of the citizens of South Vietnam would vote for a continuation of the Ky administration is begging a far more important question. There is no question at the present time but that a vast majority of the citizens of South Vietnam desire peace first and foremost. It is in the pursuit of this peace that General Ky's administration is doing the most commendable job. Therefore, I believe it follows, Mr. Speaker, most of the people of South Vietnam who are concerned with peace appreciate the fact that his leadership is making it all the more possible and all the more soon. He has every belief that there will be widespread participation in the September 11 election. Our talks with him, as well as was possible in our short time, convinced me, in any event, that General Ky established a framework of government upon which we can rely once peace is obtained. Peace must come first and then will come the planning, which will justify one particular administration's election as against another and the adoption of a democratic society by the free people of South Vietnam.

There are many disturbing factors, to be sure. I was disturbed to find French absentee landlords still owning rubber plantations in South Vietnam. A tax or levy is paid to Communists and the French managers still run the plantations.

What is the relationship between labor and the government in South Vietnam? We do not know, but we know if this *modus operandi* permits the preservation of these plantations and trees until such time as peace can be restored, we presume there will be a reason to justify these arrangements at the present time.

Question No. 2 which was most frequently asked by our critics is, "How free will these elections be?"

We believe there is little question but what they will be open to all people except the very hard core Vietcong and those neutralists dedicated to insurgency. It is hoped that all groups of all religious denominations will participate in South Vietnam's election of a constituent assembly. If they do not, it will be of their own free will and not because of any coercion by the government. The exclusion of dedicated Communists in an election in a free country was provided in Greece and other countries that had large Communist groups, and there is no reason why it should not prove as successful in bringing stability in Vietnam.

Question No. 3 is "What is the attitude encountered outside of the cities toward Ky in the war?" We were not long in getting an answer to this question. I believe the answer is to be found in the answer to question No. 1 above.

Question No. 4 is "What is the attitude of the Buddhists and the students?" It seems a few militant Buddhists hoped to be able to establish a theocracy, and in any event it is certain they sought to bring about a downfall of the government. Having overplayed their hand and come to the inevitable result of any group who would take such means in time of war, it is doubtful if they will again attempt similar strategy, at least not against the same administration.

Fifth. "Do one-third of all U.S. supplies go to the black market?"

As in all military engagements at all times, a far too large percentage of supplies do find their way to the black market. What can be done about this is an extremely complicated and difficult matter; we must keep constant vigilance in the hope that the problem can be attacked, the harms remedied, and corrections placed into effect.

Sixth. "How effective and how widespread is nonmilitary aid?"

Perhaps more effective and more widespread than anyone really knows in America. If there has been a failure to give credit where credit is due, it is in the tremendous work of pacification and in the civil action programs now undertaken by the South Vietnamese Government and more and more by the military troops of the United States. Much will be said on this particular program, and it is hoped that much more will be done in this tremendous field of assistance in every facet of South Vietnamese life. Political action teams are at work now in the villages and hamlets in a part of their own revolutionary development. These teams are made up predominantly of South Vietnamese trained also by cadres of South Vietnam in cooperation with our own Government officials. Terrorism is being abated, and much stability is being brought to the country.

There must also be concurrent with the waging of this war the teaching of political structures, establishments of political stability, and the constructing of physical assets that are being ravaged by the enemy.

The training of civil police also continues.

Building of public works, railroads, airports, airways, ports, and waterways continues a vital part of our program there. Public health and medical facilities need more attention and are in need of immediate and marked improvement.

Seventh. "What is being done for refugees from bombing and battle areas?"

There is admittedly a crowded condition in the hospitals near those areas that have suffered war damage. This is not without full attention of all officials, however, and we do believe improvements in this regard will be made as fast as is possible.

Eighth. "How deep is the anti-American feeling?"

The burning and ransacking of U.S. consulates is undeniable proof of anti-Americanism particularly by the militant Buddhist groups in Saigon and the northern Provinces. The superficial conclusion is that anti-Americanism prevails in all South Vietnam, but, Mr. Speaker, the problem appeared much more complicated. Time, the place and circumstances should be considered.

As for the time factor, this is war and there is no need to explain that anti-Americanism is one aspect of this war which we will have to deal with. Other factors in this war include the internal politics and unfortunately matters of religion in South Vietnam. When politics and religion are involved in a war in a country which still claims freedom as the only reason for its existence, there are those who raise anti-Americanism in order to gain popular support for their private cause. We also found, Mr. Speaker, that in South Vietnam, it is easy for the "anti" group to cry "Americans go home" and to find ready publicity channels available; but it is not easy for the "pros" to shout "Americans please stay" and find headlines available to their expressions.

Concerning the place factor, we Americans are exposed to a people still reeling from a hundred years of French misrule and abuse and a good bit of what may be interpreted as anti-Americanism now is nothing more than the understandable resentment of foreigners in their midst, particularly of some whose marauding complexes far overshadowed any desire to share the bounties of Asian life with whose sweat made them possible.

About circumstances, it is a known fact that a few anti-American slogans on banners carried by children in a square in Saigon may be read by millions of Americans on TV screens. But repeated expressions of gratitude to allied troops may not even come to the attention of official U.S. circles. Anti-American is a catch phrase and is ready made for use in Vietnam. It is, however, a matter which begs definitions. The problem will remain involved because none of the South Vietnamese leaders wish to waste time to define words at this juncture. We firmly believe that both the Ameri-

July 12, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

14689

can officials and the people of South Vietnam are now determined that there is only one decision at the present time and it is to forget the words and to go ahead with defeating the Communists. The peoples of both nations, South Vietnam and America realize that they have a common responsibility with all of the nations of the free world in this regard.

Ninth. "To what extent are the South Vietnamese people participating in this war?"

More and more the South Vietnamese people are being drawn into the struggle to preserve peace, in the pacifications of South Vietnamese villages and in returning the nation to the processes of order. A recent expression of the Armed Forces Council to include all segments of South Vietnamese society is an encouraging step.

PERSPECTIVE ON VIETNAM

Thus, Mr. Speaker, are the answers to specific questions often raised. What follows touches on the "big picture" our ultimate role as a result of these crucial days.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of valid ways to view the current conflict in Vietnam but some are more valid than others. One point of view comes from the reporting of day-to-day events, a picture which is often distorted by dramatic happenings such as bombings, demonstrations, and attempted coups. Of course, these events are of great importance but they are often exaggerated and their significance can be transitory.

Instead of emphasizing the isolated events, a broader perspective can be gained by analyzing the war effort in its entirety. It seems clear that there is no longer a threat of military defeat for South Vietnam, as opposed to the situation about 18 months ago. The Vietcong still control large parts of the countryside but they are extremely weak in the cities. United States and South Vietnamese forces are winning most of the big battles and the Ky regime seems to have found a few sources of hidden strength.

THE NLF

The National Liberation Front tactic has been an abject failure. The North Vietnamese commanders established the front in an attempt to gain the support of those South Vietnamese who would not support an avowed Communist organization. It is an old Communist tactic to establish the allegedly non-Communist front, which in reality is controlled by the central Communist organization. But not one prominent South Vietnamese citizen has joined the National Liberation Front. Its top executives include an architect and a lawyer, both of whom are considered "mavericks" by their professional colleagues.

Another indication of solid support behind the Saigon government came from the 1965 provincial elections, where over half the eligible voters cast ballots, despite a Vietcong order for a boycott of the elections. The Vietcong have called for several general strikes in South Vietnamese cities but their suggestions have gone almost totally unheeded. It appears the September 11 elections will not be boycotted to any substantial degree.

Another way of looking at the war is from the viewpoint of the international political system. The Vietnam war has damaged our understanding with the Soviet Union and France, while complicating our policy toward NATO.

THE ASIAN VIEW

But perhaps the most important perspective on the war is from the viewpoint of long-term trends in Asia. From this stance, it is clear that the rising power of China must be kept within certain limits, by military means if there is no other alternative, but more preferably by the same diplomatic processes of containment and communication. These processes led to a profound modification of the world outlook of the Soviet Union. Undue conciliatory advances on our part may not be wise at the present time, since they might run the risk of being interpreted as a sign of weakness in Vietnam. But we can look forward to and prepare for the day when the Chinese will conduct their policies on a basis of pragmatism, rather than on blind faith in a revolutionary ideology, and will join the responsible community of nations, as the Russians appear to have done.

We must keep in mind that there is a dichotomy between what the Chinese seem to be saying and what they seem to be doing. This is partly due to the immense cultural gap separating Chinese leaders from the outside world. The Chinese idea of world guerrilla counterencirclement may be a compensation for the actual isolation and military weakness of China.

When viewing the Vietnam conflict from an Asian perspective, it is clear that the region faces a problem which is a recurring one in international affairs. This is the problem of how to handle a rising power in the midst of a number of weaker states. The experiences with Germany and Japan should provide lessons on how not to handle the situation, while our approach to the Soviet Union seems to have been more successful. China has much in common with these other three states—her troublemaking, though motivated partly by defensive intentions, could still develop into a serious danger if wrongly handled, mainly because the philosophy behind it is so vague and opportunistic. According to W. A. C. Adie, in *International Affairs*, April 1966:

This vagueness is a function of the fact that Mao has not yet properly conquered China nor organized it as a coherent modern state within definitive borders; he estimates that it may take one or more centuries to consolidate his revolution. In the meanwhile the old confusion between China as a way of life and as a territorial state remains; is Mao Caesar, Pope—or Messiah?

It is significant that the message of a contemporary Chinese dance-drama is that Mao is the savior of mankind, as well as of China.

Chinese nationalism is motivated by the same revolutionary ideology that once spurred the Soviet Union; its aim may be the same as that of the Japanese militarists who wanted to establish the hegemony of a single state over southeast Asia; it also has certain affinities with Hitler's nazism, arising from similar conditions. As Adie states:

Both countries suffered from humiliating defeat and fragmentation of a patriarchal society; this created the need for a mass-nationalist "cement" to turn the "sheet of sand" Sun Yat-sen complained of into a rock. Both idealize mass hysteria and berserk fury. In both it is the march that is important rather than the direction.

There is much to indicate that the leaders of other Asian states also see Vietnam from this broader Asian perspective. Although, with the exceptions of Thailand, the Philippines, South Korea, and Formosa, the Asian states have not openly professed support for our efforts in Vietnam, there have been reports that their leaders privately back our commitment there. They are glad that someone is fighting the Communist insurgency to keep it away from their borders.

THE PROTECTIVE SHIELD

In many ways, the U.S. effort in Vietnam is providing a shield behind which the rest of southeast Asia can develop. The war in Vietnam is providing a diversion which keeps China and North Vietnam occupied and prevents them from interfering freely with peaceful change in the rest of the area. As an editorial in the Honolulu Sunday Advertiser of July 3, 1966, put it:

To only buy time can sometimes be worth the price.

There are indications that buying time in Vietnam has been worth the price in shielding Thailand. In Eastern World, May-June 1966, Simon Head reports that one consequence of the escalation in South Vietnam has been a reduction of Communist pressure on the other two areas in Indochina most vulnerable to Communist subversion—Laos and northeast Thailand. With the increasing involvement in South Vietnam, the Communists are unwilling to risk U.S. retaliation on a second front.

This explains why, in northeast Thailand, Communist strategy has not yet progressed beyond preliminary stages. There has been infiltration only in a few isolated areas, directed toward establishing "liberated zones" which can be used later as bases for operations on a larger scale.

These activities have prompted the Thai Government to embark upon a program of rural development. Rural poverty in the northeast is accounted for by the fact that most families make their living from growing rice in areas totally unsuited for its cultivation. Yields are low because of inadequate rainfall and poor soil. A farmer can rarely increase his income by producing a surplus—even when he does, it may not be worthwhile to send it to market due to the bad roads.

There is no landlord problem in the area—almost 90 percent of the land is owned by the farmers. The fact that the benefits of increased production do not have to be shared with a landlord increases the impact of the reforms and deprives the Communists of their most powerful propaganda weapon.

There is enormous scope for agricultural development. Even on the unfavorable northeast soil, it is possible to treble the annual production of rice by the application of fertilizers and insecti-

14690

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 12, 1966

cides and the use of higher quality seeds. But the effect of these discoveries has been limited by inadequate supplies of seeds and fertilizers and a shortage of trained agronomists. Authorities have enough resources to operate effectively in only one or two chosen villages. In some of these, extension services have worked well and spectacular increases in production have been recorded.

According to Head:

But the fact remains that the majority of villages are hardly affected and their continuing poverty will always be a source of potential strength to the Communists.

The area in northeast Thailand where the Communists have been most active has been chosen for its suitability as a base area because of its proximity to Ho Chi Minh trail. In some places, it is only 20 miles away. This reduces the problems of supplying and reinforcing a guerrilla organization.

This demonstrates further that the war in Vietnam must be seen from the broader Asian perspective. It is encouraging that our leaders take this view.

PRESIDENT'S VIEW SUSTAINED

In President Johnson's 1965 address at Johns Hopkins, he spoke these wise words:

Let no one think for a moment that retreat from Vietnam would bring an end to conflict. The battle would be renewed in one country and then another. The central lesson of our time is that the appetite of aggression is never satisfied. To withdraw from one battlefield means only to prepare for the next.

This makes it clear that the value of our commitment in Vietnam must be assessed in conjunction with the overall situation in Asia. This determination shows that we must continue to pursue our present difficult task of diplomacy in southeast Asia which requires a mixture of containment without isolation, firmness with restraint, and tenacity with flexibility.

Mr. Speaker, given these guides, it is not too much to hope that within the foreseeable future we may see peace and stability in southeast Asia. If so, the peace of the world will have been secured for the time of our lives and quite possibly for the time of several generations to follow.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that at the beginning of World War II the gentleman from Wyoming enlisted in the U.S. Army. The gentleman served with the 1st Division for 3 years and participated in the invasion in north Africa, Sicily, and Europe. The gentleman was decorated many times and is the wearer of the Silver Star.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, along with a number of my colleagues from this House, I have just returned from an inspection tour of Vietnam. I went on this tour to get a firsthand look at both our military and nonmilitary activities there.

I would like to make a few brief observations about our trip and what we saw.

First of all, I want to mention that we stopped in the Philippine Islands on our way to Vietnam. We visited our troops at the Clark Air Force Base Hospital. This is one of the most modern and up-to-date hospitals it is possible to have. Just about every day a planeload of wounded are brought in from Vietnam. These wounded troops receive better medical attention than we have managed to provide in any other war. I am sure the helicopter is one of the contributing factors because of the speed with which our wounded can be evacuated. Clark Air Force Base also sends a planeload of wounded just about every day back to hospitals based in the United States. This excellent followthrough on medical care for the wounded is an indication of the kind of treatment that our troops are receiving.

Once we arrived in Vietnam, I was immediately impressed by the esprit de corps of our troops. They know they have a job to do. They want to clean up this situation as soon as they can. They are determined to do the job.

I had an opportunity to visit with many troops in the field. I was especially pleased to be able to talk with many GI's from Illinois. The equipment they have is more than sufficient for the military tasks they are carrying out. I ate with troops in the field. Their food is as good as any I had during my 4 years in military service.

I am happy to report, Mr. Speaker, that our military supply situation will be even better when Saigon's port facilities are improved. We are also building port facilities at Cam Ranh Bay, and this additional unit will further improve the supply situation.

As we all know, Mr. Speaker, the Vietcong have won no major battles recently. We have captured thousands of tons of rice that the enemy had stored and hidden away in secret supply area in South Vietnam. We have been capturing many, many North Vietnamese. Many of the enemy troops are defecting, which is a development that will improve the situation by demoralizing the North Vietnamese leaders and troops.

Our field commanders in Vietnam told me that our American troops there are superior to any we had in World War II or the Korean war. Our Air Force and Navy pilots are doing an outstanding job of air support for our ground troops.

I think that Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge is the right man for the job. I was very impressed by Gen. William C. Westmoreland. He has surrounded himself with the best generals and staff members available in our time.

I went to Vietnam, Mr. Speaker, to make a grassroots, personal inspection of the military and nonmilitary situation there. Having made this inspection, I am satisfied that our troops are doing an outstanding job, that our military and nonmilitary funds are being spent wisely and to the best advantage, and that we are well on the road to victory.

I would like to make mention of our nonmilitary efforts in South Vietnam. Because of my previous experience as a

teacher, I was especially impressed by the progress being made in elementary and secondary education. Projects by the Agency for International Development and the Department of Agriculture will do a great deal toward creating a society which will develop an immunity to the promises and false blandishments of communism. This is peaceful, constructive activity being carried on by our Government agencies, and I am delighted to know that alongside our military efforts, we are waging another war—the war against poverty, hunger, and disease.

I would like to note, Mr. Speaker, that our efforts in Vietnam appear to have the support of the people there. The Vietnamese people seem to be more than glad that we are there.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say something about our own attitudes here at home toward this war in Vietnam. Our GI's are very conscious of what we are thinking here at home. They know that most of us are in full support of what they are doing, what they are trying to accomplish. But more than one of them remarked to me that they fail to understand the motives of the draft card burners and the demonstrators who parade in opposition to our policies in Vietnam.

I personally think it is high time, Mr. Speaker, that the draft card burners and the demonstrators go home, wash their feet, and take a new look at the world. Our servicemen in Vietnam are demonstrating with raw courage and weapons in combat, while others here at home are demonstrating with dirty feet, placards, and beards. Somebody has their sense of values turned around, and I can report without qualification that it is not our men in Vietnam.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word in behalf of President Johnson's conduct of this war. Everything that President Johnson has done has been a calculated risk. But what he has done has been right. As long as we continue on this course he has charted, we will come out all right.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois and point out to my colleagues that he is a veteran of service during the Korean war and that he served for 3 years overseas and is an expert in gunnery both on the B-29 and the B-26 aircraft.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of the Members are aware that 9 days is all too short a period in which to absorb all that we are doing and all that we should do in southeast Asia. It is too short a period of observation in which to reach conclusions on the merits of what we are doing and what we should do to restore peace to that troubled part of the world.

And yet we are forced to reach such conclusions as we can, as we vote on measure after measure setting the policy of this country. Those of us who have made the trip to Vietnam are infinitely better equipped to make these decisions than we were before we went.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 12, 1966

It is easy, sitting in this country and reading the self-anointed expert columnists' prophecies of gloom to become discouraged. It is easy to feel that this country is hopelessly divided and that we are floundering in a morass of indecision and doubt when we read the constant and sometimes virulent criticism of this country's Asian policy by certain present and would-be Members of the Congress of the United States, as well as others outside of Government. And I have no doubt but that is exactly the impression which the Communist leadership in Hanoi and Peiping have gained as they scan our papers for an indication of our future course of action.

But this is not the feeling in Vietnam. There is no indecision there. There is no doubt as to why we are there nor of the importance of what we are doing there. There is a feeling of dedication to duty, of guarded optimism as to our ability to succeed both militarily and in solving the political and social and economic problems of the region, and a spirit of cooperation between the branches of the service and between the military and civilian officials of Government from the Cincpac headquarters in Hawaii to the private in the field in the central highlands of Vietnam and the AID official working in the hamlets of the delta region.

So much does this sense of mission and accomplishment pervade the air in southeast Asia that I find myself amazed, after only a 10-day absence, to return to a reading of the American newspapers and the reports of the differing viewpoints of all of our "statesmen," viewpoints which offer "doubts" and criticism but which do not offer constructive suggestions of courses of action not already tried.

The fact of the matter is that our problem is not with the hamlets of South Vietnam. The problem is with the Shakespearean-type "Hamlets" in the United States. This war will not be lost in South Vietnam, but it can be lost on the political battlefields of the United States. The Communists do not forget that the French lost their struggle, not at Dienbienphu, but in France. I believe that the Communists know that they cannot win militarily in South Vietnam, but they believe they can win if the United States loses its will to win.

Well, I say let them be disabused of any such hope. Let each of us, in both parties, take the message to the American people. This is a time of crisis for the United States and the free world. This is a time for political cooperation, not political dissension. This is not Johnson's war or McNamara's war. This is an important free world struggle in which America must take the lead and has taken the lead. It is just as important today that Communist tyranny not take over Asia as it was that in 1941 Japanese tyranny did not prevail.

The Governors of the United States recently met, and with the single exception of the Governor of my State, endorsed our policy in southeast Asia. In dissenting, our Oregon Governor follows again the lead set by the senior Senator from my State.

The significant thing about the vote of the Governors is not the Oregon Governor's dissent, but the unanimity of the other 49 Governors' support of our policy. And when I am critical of the dissension and the disagreement which I hear in the country today, I am not being critical of the right of free speech. My political record, both in the State legislature and in the Congress of the United States, has been one of unfailing support of the right of free speech. But I have always taken the position that this constitutional right of free speech carries with it a correlative obligation to speak responsibly, and to point out specifically the defects of our policy and to offer some constructive suggestions as an alternative. It is in this area that the critics are failing, and I have never yet seen one of them who has felt the slightest reluctance in criticizing my support of American policy in southeast Asia, without a thought for the right of free speech, which I am entitled to, and do claim for myself.

I think that all of us who went to southeast Asia are convinced that militarily things are going well. There are significant problems, the main one being to find and maintain contact with the elusive enemy. The strategy and tactics of General Westmoreland seem adequate to cope with this problem.

Most of us, I think, agree that the oil depots were a legitimate military target. I think there are others, particularly powerplants, which ought to be considered. I know that the President has problems, but they ought not to be considered as immune.

Logistically there have been problems, but considering the tremendous buildup of men in 1 year, the results have been amazing. Some shortages have been apparent, but never without acceptable substitutes being available.

All of our military people and all of the Vietnamese with whom we talked are well aware of the importance of the second war—the war on economic, social and political problems. The effort by the military, by AID, by the Vietnamese, needs more emphasis. Its success varies from province to province, according to the degree of pacification and according to the ability of the Vietnamese Government.

Colonel Diep in Vinh Long seems to be a good one, a good soldier who is clearing his province with provincial troops, a good civil servant who uses his elected provincial council, and who works at developing schools, hospitals, powerplants, and water systems. Other provinces are not so fortunate. It is their country and their war, but there are weaknesses in administration, in some of the provincial capitals, which we must work with the administration in Saigon to clear up.

Our people ought to have more training in speaking the Vietnamese language. Not enough do. Where some of the Special Forces people speak the language, the contact is so much more valuable, and we should not forget that the Communists do speak their language.

We visited schools built by self-help, which are most appreciated. Far more kids are in school in South Vietnam now than there were 2 years ago. The big

cry was for more cement, and we must get more cement to them.

The civilian hospitals we visited are deplorable. In one province of a half million people, there was only one hospital which had only two doctors.

There is almost no sanitation. People are two and three to a bed. The Seabees are at work constructing a surgery, and we are making efforts here, but more must be done. The public health problem in Saigon is a tremendous one. With over 1 million refugees flowing into that city, the garbage and sewage disposal problems are tremendous. This is an area in which we must work harder.

I, too, am convinced there will be elections. I am convinced of this for a number of reasons, not the least of which is the independence of the Government of South Vietnam to achieve the status of legitimacy. They were born through a coup. Premier Ky is aware that Bao-Dai is still in existence and is now a French national. He still makes a claim to South Vietnam. They fear above all a return of De Gaulle to South Vietnam, after having suffered under French rule for over 100 years. Premier Ky is no George Washington, but he has achieved a certain unity and he has weathered several severe political crises. He is only one man on the Directorate which has brought stability to South Vietnam. But we do not suggest that Ky or any other one man in South Vietnam could bring peace, stability and freedom to this country.

It is significant that we saw not one single unfriendly face or heard one unfriendly voice in southeast Asia. If they want us to leave, it certainly was not apparent to us.

This war is not over. It may be long and arduous. If we are as determined as are the people in southeast Asia, it can be terminated and this immense area preserved to the free world and not lost to the Communists.

Morale in Vietnam is high. We must unite to raise morale in this country.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Oregon for his activities and to remind the Members of the House that the gentleman in World War II served as an aviator overseas.

In conclusion, I would like to point out that President Johnson is carrying on a commitment that the last five American Presidents have made, and that is to stand by our treaty obligations, particularly in the defense of freedom. The United States is fighting on the soil of Vietnam so that we here in the citadel of freedom may enjoy it fully.

The President has attempted to open efforts for negotiation through the North Vietnamese, with other countries, and to try through his intermediaries to bring about settlement.

The bombings, as we have pointed out, we feel are necessary to bring a total military decision to this farflung battlefield. We are using an economy force in this area, but we are using enough force so that in the future Communist aggressors will know that it is just too

14692

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 12, 1966

costly to dare to try to transgress on freedom-loving people everywhere.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think the RECORD should show that I agree with the position of the Governor of Oregon, and I have listened here today without objection, simply out of courtesy due to my colleagues who requested this special order for time to discuss their observations with respect to their trip to Vietnam.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, early today, the House of Representatives voted on the conference report on the defense procurement bill. I would like to explain my absence at the time of that vote.

Mr. Speaker, had I been present I would have voted in the affirmative. However, it was impossible for me to be present because of adverse flying weather conditions and flight scheduling difficulties.

REPORT ON TRIP TO SOUTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McGRATH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. McGRATH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the honor of being permitted to take this trip to Vietnam over the Fourth of July recess. I am grateful to the President and to the Speaker for approving this trip.

I join in the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY], the chairman of the delegation, and compliment him for his very comprehensive narrative of our trip.

I would like to touch upon a few of the incidents that impressed me during this trip. I was in Vietnam last December. It appears to me that both the military and the political situations in South Vietnam have improved tremendously since my visit there 7 months ago.

I might remind the House that the members of this delegation were permitted to go anywhere in Vietnam that we expressed a desire to visit.

We now have more troops in South Vietnam. The amount of supplies going into that country has doubled since December. Excellent progress is being made in readying new port facilities to improve the supply situation even further.

I believe it was the unanimous conclusion of our delegation of 10 Democrats and 4 Republicans that the U.S.

presence in southeast Asia is in the national interest and that our policy in Vietnam is the correct one.

We also agree that the leadership being shown by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge and Gen. William Westmoreland is excellent, and that the morale of our troops is at an alltime high.

About the most impressive indication that our conclusions are correct came from talking to a defector, a former North Vietnamese Army captain, who said that the North Vietnamese and Vietcong leaders now realize they cannot win a military victory. Other prisoners and defectors have verified that attitude.

On the political side, it is obvious that Premier Ky has consolidated his position and that the September elections will proceed as planned. The Buddhist and Catholic groups have withdrawn their opposition and announced they will participate in the September elections.

When we stopped at Clark Field in the Philippines we learned that there were about 55,000 people—Filipinos, American civilians and armed services personnel—in that area. The Air Force hospital at Clark Field services all these people. While touring the hospital I talked with a young helicopter pilot who had been shot with a machinegun bullet in the leg and arm. As a result of this wound his kidneys went into shock and stopped functioning. While I was talking to him, he was being serviced by an artificial kidney machine. The doctors in the hospital informed me that they had two artificial kidney machines in that hospital plus a portable unit that they could take out to the field. I doubt that any hospital in the United States in a city of 55,000 people has that kind of equipment, such as we found in the Air Force hospital at Clark Field.

In addition to the fine hospital treatment that our wounded servicemen are receiving in the hospital, I was impressed by a program of people-to-people assistance. Philippine doctors, nationals of the Philippine Islands, are serving residences in the Air Force hospital at Clark Field in various specialties. I believe this is very helpful to the relations between the United States and the Philippines.

While we were in Vietnam, of course we talked with Ambassador Lodge and General Westmoreland. I was happy that we had an opportunity to talk with Charles Mann, our AID Director there. After talking with Mr. Mann, I bumped into one of my constituents in Vietnam, Mr. Jim Habron, who resides in Pleasantville, N.J., in my district. Mr. Habron works for the AID program in Vietnam, and at that time was working on a bridge project at Nha Be, several miles south of Saigon. Since I have come back to the States I have read in the newspapers that South Vietnamese Army units are conducting operations to rid the Nha Be area of Vietcong.

We also went to Camranh Bay. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that when the facility at Camranh Bay is completed South Vietnam will have the best port between Singapore and Hong Kong. The

installation at Camranh Bay will greatly alleviate the shipping problem caused by congestion in Saigon.

We also had the privilege of visiting with the Republic of Korea Tiger Division at Qui Nhon.

Now, this is a crack infantry division of Koreans. The Korean troops put on a demonstration for us of taekwondo, which is a form of self defense. I think it is interesting, Mr. Speaker, that one of the creeds of taekwondo may be stated as follows:

We will be the cornerstone of anticommunism by training ourselves with the Taekwondo art.

Later that same day we went to An Khe where the base camp of the 1st Cavalry Division, the famous Air Mobile Division, is located. We were briefed by the chief of staff there, Colonel Beatty, and I think it is an indication of the caliber of officers and troops in that division to point out that Colonel Beatty learned to fly a helicopter in his forties after serving practically 20 years as a ground Army officer. I had been at An Khe with the 1st Cavalry in December of last year. At that time most of the division was contained within the base camp. Last week I was informed that all six of their battalions were out in the field fighting the Vietcong and the North Vietnam regulars. I think it is a significant sign of the aggressive attitude of our Armed Forces in Vietnam.

I was also particularly impressed by my visit to the U.S.S. *Intrepid*, a great naval aircraft carrier. While we were on the *Intrepid* that ship was launching and recovering air strike missions which had been in air operations in support of ground troops in South Vietnam. In between the launching and recovering of these aircraft the U.S.S. *Intrepid* refueled and also rearmed underway at sea.

We went to a Special Forces camp at Song Be near the Cambodian border. This village was overrun about a year ago by the Vietcong. However, it is now built up and is being protected by our Army units. We crossed the Song Be River in dugout canoes, and I was very happy there to meet Capt. H. R. Taylor, Jr., of the U.S. Army Special Forces, the famous Green Berets, who was stationed there. He is from my district in New Jersey. He told me how important it was in his opinion that the United States stay in South Vietnam and defeat the Communist aggression there.

Following my visit to South Vietnam last December I was quite concerned about the congested nature of the Saigon Harbor. On this trip I went to the 1st Logistics Command at Saigon. We flew over the entire Saigon River port area in a helicopter. The Army there is building a new quay in the Saigon River which will be able to handle deep draft vessels and is also building a new port on the Saigon River where they will have two LST landing ramps and various warehouses. The intention is to build a berth at the new port which will handle four deep draft vessels. The cargo unloaded at the new port facility will be able to bypass the Saigon city traffic and be shipped immediately out into the field to support our troops.

July 12, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

14693

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I have consistently supported President Johnson and his policies in Vietnam and in south-east Asia, and on the basis of my experience in South Vietnam last week, I intend to follow that course, because I think the President has maintained and pursued a sound policy for the United States of America in the manner in which he has conducted our affairs in Vietnam.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McGRATH] and to express my appreciation upon his report from the standpoint of one who is well versed in the field of naval affairs.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to my colleagues that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McGRATH] is a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis. The gentleman served in both our Atlantic and Pacific fleets and is an expert in the Pacific waters, particularly having won five battle stars in the Korean war where the gentleman served on the U.S. battleship *Missouri*.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

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

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McGRATH] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, no one, and certainly not I, can harbor pretensions about being a Far Eastern expert on the basis of a week's trip, but it is possible for me to report to the House certain personal impressions and observations about our activities in Vietnam, and our general involvement in the Far Eastern theater. With all deference to my distinguished colleagues on the committee that made this trip, I shall undertake very briefly to offer my comments.

When our committee left Washington on the evening of July 2 for the Far East, I had three basic questions in mind about our situation in Vietnam, and I hoped to be able to come back with some sort of answer for each of these questions because I believe them to be matters of the greatest concern to everyone in America. The questions were:

First. Do the people of South Vietnam really want the forces of the United States to remain in their country, despite the devastation and suffering that war inevitably brings?

Second. Do our men in Vietnam—serving both in the military and in civilian services—believe in the job that they have undertaken? Do they believe their task worth doing despite the sacrifice and suffering involved? Do they think

that they can successfully achieve the goals that have been set for them?

Third. What is the possibility of a meaningful and reasonably free expression of the popular will of the people of South Vietnam in the election that the Government has announced for September 11? Is there enough of a social and political fabric left in the Republic of Vietnam, and will conditions permit what we would regard as a reasonable election?

In reverse order, I can offer some answers to all of these questions with some real confidence in my knowledge of the kind of factual information which necessarily forms a basis for answers to questions like these. I am satisfied, for instance, that there is a very good chance—barring some sort of violent civil tumult in the next 2 months—for an honest and orderly election in September. It should be understood, however, that the election is for the purpose of choosing, by popular vote, a Constituent Assembly of 117 Members who will write a new constitution for the Republic of Vietnam, while the country will continue to be governed by a directorate, which includes 10 generals and 10 civilians. Following the promulgation of the new constitution to be written this winter, it is then proposed that a national election be held sometime late next summer, 1967, to fill the various posts established by the terms of the constitution.

The members of our committee were privileged to attend a dinner given on the evening of July 6 by Lt. Gen. Phan-Xuan-Chieu, who is president of the Vietnam Veterans Legion, and Secretary-General of the Directorate, which presently is governing the country. During the evening I had the pleasure of spending a considerable period of time with Mr. Tran Van An, who was elected chairman by the members of the election law drafting committee, established on May 5, by the Government and empowered to draft the election laws to be employed on September 11.

The ELDC was composed of 32 members including all elements of the Vietnamese body politic—except the Vietcong—and specifically such groups as the Buddhists, both moderate and militant, Catholics, Cao Dai, and Hoa Hao, various political parties, northern, central, and southern regional groupings, provincial and municipal councils, ethnic minorities such as the Montagnards, and ethnic Cambodians, professional groups, and trade unions. Mr. Van An had been a respected publisher and national leader in South Vietnam for many years, and if anything his stature was increased by the fact that he spent 9 years in prison during the Diem regime for criticizing editorially the authoritarian tendencies of that administration. My conversation with Mr. Van An, as well as with others, convinced me that a meaningful election is not only possible, but highly probable on September 11, and, as Mr. Van An wryly concluded, the Vietnamese hope for a voter participation in this election somewhat better than the Americans experience in the presidential years.

On the question of the attitude of our troops, and our civilian personnel in

Vietnam, you have heard from some of my colleagues on the committee, and you will unquestionably hear from others. Our opinion, I think, is unanimous and categorical: the attitude and demeanor of our men and women in Vietnam is nothing short of magnificent.

I could—but will not—spend hours talking about the day that two of my colleagues and I spent with some of our AID people down in the Mekong Delta country, including a regional director of the AID program who is a lieutenant colonel on loan from the Defense Department who has extended twice his tour of duty in Vietnam to carry on his very dangerous but very rewarding work of rebuilding the social fabric of that tormented region.

I could tell you of the warrant officer, helicopter-pilot I talked with in the Clark Field Hospital outside of Manila, who was, during our interview, hooked up to a kidney machine because his kidneys had stopped functioning after his left leg and right arm were shattered by a 30-caliber bullet. This young man has won 10 Air Medals and two Distinguished Flying Crosses, and his only concern is how rapidly the medical people can get him patched up to the point that he can return to his duties in Vietnam.

I could tell you of the two American civilian nurses, who have just arrived in a civilian hospital in the provincial capital of Vinh Long, where they have volunteered for a tour of duty in an area which has been for years terrorized and dominated by the Vietcong.

Or I could comment about the young Special Forces captain who drove me in a jeep over a rough trail near the Special Forces camp at Phouc Binh, who drove with an M-16 rifle across his knees, because he felt "more comfortable" that way, but who, at the same time, carried a pocketful of candy for the Montagnard kids.

Perhaps the best indication of the extraordinary attitude of our people in Vietnam can be conveyed by reading the nine rules issued by General Westmoreland for the conduct of our troops in Vietnam:

NINE RULES FOR PERSONNEL OF U.S. MILITARY ASSISTANCE COMMAND, VIETNAM

The Vietnamese have paid a heavy price in suffering for their long fight against the communists. We military men are in Vietnam now because their government has asked us to help its soldiers and people in winning their struggle. The Viet Cong will attempt to turn the Vietnamese people against you. You can defeat them at every turn by the strength, understanding, and generosity you display with the people. Here are nine simple rules:

(Distribution—1 to each member of the United States Armed Forces in Vietnam.)

1. Remember we are guests here: We make no demands and seek no special treatment.
2. Join with the people! Understand their life, use phrases from their language and honor their customs and laws.
3. Treat women with politeness and respect.
4. Make personal friends among the soldiers and common people.
5. Always give the Vietnamese the right of way.
6. Be alert to security and ready to react with your military skill.

14694

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 12, 1966

7. Don't attract attention by loud, rude or unusual behavior.

8. Avoid separating yourself from the people by a display of wealth or privilege.

9. Above all else you are members of the U.S. Military Forces on a difficult mission, responsible for all your official and personal actions. Reflect honor upon yourself and the United States of America.

All of us on this trip were combat veterans of World War II or Korea, and I think it is fair to say that none of us has ever experienced such an attitude on the part of American troops as is presently being displayed by our people in the Far East, who fully realize the complex and delicate nature of the job which confronts them, and of the fact that they have two wars to win: the military pacification of South Vietnam, and the rebuilding of the social and political fabric of the country. They are working with equal fervor and dedication on both fronts.

In all candor, I must admit that I did encounter two people who were highly skeptical about our national effort in Vietnam, about the motives underlying it, and about its chances for success. Both were newspaper correspondents stationed in Saigon, a fact which may help us to understand why the American people do not fully appreciate what we are doing in southeast Asia.

On the first, and possibly most important, question of the attitude of the South Vietnamese people toward our continued presence in their country, I can only report that in our very brief stay, I encountered no one who wanted us to leave the area and permit them to deal with their problems unaided. This was true of Premier Ky; it was said by Tran Van An, by Tran Van Do, by General Chieu and his legionnaires. Our continued presence was fervently urged by the two province chiefs we talked with, by the lone doctor in the civilian hospital at Vinh Long, by the hamlet chieftain of a primitive Montagnard tribe in a little village on the Cambodian border; in other words, by everyone we spoke to whether of low or high degree.

Even those we could not speak to indicated that the presence of Americans was more than welcome. One of the most eloquent expressions of that welcome was on the part of some local, provincial soldiers who were manning the pathetic little mud forts, established along the length of Route 4 in the Mekong Delta, south of Saigon. These brave men are fighting night after night a lonely and desperate struggle to keep the roads open and clear of the Vietcong, so that their fellow-villagers may move their rice into the market, and when we passed by they stood on the walls of their forts and waved to us and saluted. Down in that area of Vietnam, the war is an ugly, brutal, savage encounter fraught with stealth and terror, and the bravery and dedication of those humble people would move a heart of stone.

I hope, at a later time, to request the privilege of addressing the House under special orders to describe in more detail and in greater depth the nature of that desperate conflict, but at the moment, suffice it to say that I hope that our people at home have the courage to match

the courage and dedication of our men in the field, both military and civilian, and to match the bravery and dedication of the men and women of Vietnam who are toiling and fighting for the chance to live in decency, security and peace.

I again thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for having yielded me this time to offer this report to the Members of the House.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Members of the House that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLIGAN] served for 27 months during World War II as a lieutenant (jg) in the U.S. Naval Reserve. He acted as a destroyer gunnery officer in the Atlantic, Mediterranean, and Pacific Theaters. He was awarded three area campaign ribbons, five battle stars, and two naval unit citations. At Okinawa he was awarded the Silver Star for gallantry when his destroyer was hit by a Japanese kamikaze.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

(Mr. HATHAWAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, you can read about a country until your eyes water, you can listen to lectures about a foreign land until your ears ache, but you cannot get the all-important feel of the situation until you have been there. Contact with reality brings all of your senses into play and indelibly stamps in your makeup a gestalt—the place becomes a part of you. To be sure a 10-day trip to southeast Asia does not make you an expert on the area, but it does give you an awareness that you could never get from periodical readings and stateside briefings. This trip has given us an experience we shall never forget, an understanding that cannot adequately be conveyed by words, and opinions that deserve attention.

Our group made up of veterans with previous combat experience departed Andrews Air Force Base at 6 p.m., July 2, stopped at Travis Air Force Base, near San Francisco, for refueling, on to Honolulu for a briefing by CINCPAC, a tour of Pearl Harbor with its stinging memories, and a brief respite before going on to Saigon via the Philippines where we stopped briefly at Clark Field to tour the logistics base, and the general hospital. Saigon hits you like Washington, D.C.—hot and humid. We arrived in the rush hour; made our way to the hotel through streets that were jammed with small cars and bicycles built for one, but oftentimes carrying as many as four.

The next morning at 9 a.m. we received a thorough briefing from Ambassador Lodge and his staff on the military, political, and economic situation in the Republic of Vietnam. This was followed by an enjoyable luncheon at the Lodge homestead where we met General Westmoreland and had an opportunity to question both Mr. Lodge and the general at some length. After lunch we proceeded to MacVee Headquarters where General Westmoreland and his staff gave us a detailed briefing on the military

situation. After this we visited with General Ky for half an hour or so and obtained his views. In the evening we attended a dinner hosted by Lt. Gen. Pham Xuan Chieu. The next morning we began intensive tours of military bases and installations in South Vietnam starting with the logistics base at Cam Ranh Bay. Then on to the 12th Tactical Fighter Wing, the Korean Qui Nhon Division, 1st Cavalry Division, the aircraft carrier *Intrepid*, a Vietnamese division in the field, 25th Infantry Division, and the 5th Special Forces. Some of our group visited the 1st Marine and 1st Infantry Divisions. In all of these areas, most of which were in close contact with the enemy, we were given intensive briefings and had an opportunity to talk to the troops. On the eve of our departure we had dinner with General Westmoreland which was also attended by Ambassador Lodge, and we again had an opportunity to question both of them about the observations we had made. Saturday, we went to Bangkok, Thailand, where we received a briefing on the situation there. On Sunday we flew to Taipei, Taiwan, and the following day we had the pleasure of talking at some length with the Vice President and President Chaing Kai-shek.

Although the time spent in Vietnam was only 4 days, they were 4 days crammed with activity, giving us an opportunity to observe just about every aspect of life in that country. I carried a tape recorder with me and taped most of the briefings and many of the interviews, but at this time, the day after my return, I have not as yet had a chance to play back the tapes and garner from them some of the detailed information I was able to obtain. Consequently this report I consider as only an initial report based on the outstanding recollections of the trip. I intend to supplement this report in more detail at a later date.

Based upon these first arrival recollections of the trip my evaluation of the total situation is that militarily, economically and politically the situation is generally good.

With respect to the military situation, it would appear that our intelligence is excellent, that we are being constantly informed as to the whereabouts of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese. This is borne out by the fact that in recent months there has been no successful ambush of our troops by the enemy. It is further borne out by the fact that our group was able to travel to various camps in the field located not far from the enemy without even the threat of a mishap. The overall administration of the war is excellent. No commander or individual complained about the lack of supplies. The supply lines from United States to the front line is running very smoothly. Our operation from a strategic point of view is geared very well to the type of war that is being fought there. This is entirely different from World War II and the Korean conflict. There is really no front line. The enemy is in various pockets throughout the Republic, but with the ingenious use of air power, in particular helicopters, we are able to ferret out and annihilate these hostile pockets.

July 12, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

14695

It was heartwarming for a former Air Force man to hear infantry men highly commend the good close air support they have been receiving even from high altitude flying B-52's which have been pinpointing targets close to our troops and doing it successfully, something unheard of in World War II.

I would say that the military aspect of the war is well in hand. The part of the conflict that is going to take some time is the securing of the villages after the enemy has been driven out. This is being accomplished through pacification units composed entirely of Vietnamese who are trained to come into a village and make it secure against counterinfiltration by the Vietcong. The recruiting and training of these units will take some time. It is difficult to say at this time how long it will be before all the villages will be secured. This war is essentially one of fighting against gangsters and we will not be assured of peace in Vietnam until we have a large enough police force to protect the villages and hamlets from the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese terrorism.

The political situation appears to be fairly stable at the present time. I would predict that the elections scheduled for September 11 will come off without being boycotted to any great extent by any group. The presence of our soldiers in Vietnam has boosted the morale of the people. There are no "Yankee Go Home" signs. They have at least realized that, unlike the French, we are not there to stay. We do not intend to colonize the Vietnamese and our presence there fighting for a cause along side their troops has given the people a spirit of nationalism which heretofore they never had.

Economically the country is making great progress under our AID programs. There is the danger of inflation which will have to be watched and against which necessary steps will have to be taken from time to time. The Vietnamese people are not materially well off, but nearly all of them are employed at some task or other and no one is starving.

It is difficult to make a prognosis. I would venture to say that within a year the situation would be such that any reasonable enemy leader would quit. It is difficult to tell just exactly what Ho Chi Minh will do. I am sure he realizes that he is losing, but whether or not this will force him to negotiate is highly speculative, probably doubtful. He has to save face as well as his head, and he undoubtedly will make an effort to hold on as long as possible. It does not appear that our actions, even if escalated, would bring in either Russia or Red China.

I would recommend that we continue to hit more military targets in North Vietnam and that we send more troops. In advocating that we send more troops I do not mean we are going to increase our losses. I make the recommendation only to make it easier on our fighting forces over there. At the present time we do have a great ratio of firepower to the enemy firepower, and due to our flexibility and mobility we are able to cope

with any situation; that is, we can move a battalion or regiment from one division to help another with very little difficulty. If we were to send more troops, such movements would be obviated and make the war considerably easier to conduct.

Let me conclude by saying that there is no question of Communist aggression from Peiping in southeast Asia, and that this aggression manifests itself in the form of well organized terrorism. The Communist plan being to begin at the remote villages and eventually move into the larger cities. There is no question in my mind that we have an obligation to stop this aggression, and it appears that our mission in this regard is presently meeting with great success.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I was happy to hear the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY], comment on the use of our airpower in Vietnam. The gentleman from Maine served on active duty with the U.S. Army Air Force in World War II from 1942 to 1946. He entered the service as a private and was discharged as a captain. While serving as a navigator on a Liberator bomber he was shot down in an air attack on the Ploesti oilfields and finished World War II as a prisoner of war in a Rumanian prison-of-war camp. He was awarded the Air Medal and the Purple Heart.

TAX RELIEF FOR COMMUTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the recent increase in the New York City transit fare underscores the mounting cost, in terms of both money and ordinary comfort, exacted each day from millions of Americans who struggle valiantly, against enormous odds, to get to work. I speak of the plight of the dashing commuter.

New York's fare increase is the latest offshoot of the persistent neglect and paralysis afflicting urban mass transportation, and it is invariably the commuter who must pay the price in terms of higher fares and steadily deteriorating service.

I have consistently taken the floor here to explore this crisis in urban transportation. It is still with us, and it is getting worse. Fare increases are only one indication of a situation which threatens the welfare and well-being of the cities.

The House Banking and Currency Committee, on which I serve, recently approved a bill increasing authorizations under the Mass Transportation Act and providing for technological research grants for the development of new forms of commuter service. This measure should break new ground in attempting to modernize our means of public transport.

I shall continue to press for an amendment to the Mass Transportation Act which would correct the discriminatory State limitation on the amount of funds available to any one State. This now

stands at 12½ percent of the total authorization. It is obvious that such an allocation cannot possibly begin to meet the problems with which the Nation's major cities are faced. And yet it is precisely these sprawling metropolitan areas where conditions of public transport are most acute; the premise and validity of the legislation is indeed discolored by the very fact that these large cities are not receiving the proportionate attention to which they are entitled.

Today, I am introducing a bill to grant the commuter a yearly Federal income tax deduction for expenses incurred in traveling to and from work. Together with other perfecting legislation I am sponsoring, this new tax approach will help to offset the growing financial burden of commuters who depend upon mass transit as a necessity. The legislation provides a deduction of up to \$200 annually.

I believe the Congress should recognize, additionally, that transportation costs to and from work are in essence a legitimate business expense. I urge that this matter, and that the variety of other pending legislation on this question of mass transit, be given prompt and close attention in Congress.

CONCENTRATING FOREIGN ECONOMIC AID

(Mr. JACOBS (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. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, we are concerned, as are all Americans, with the question of whether the money we spend for foreign aid is going where it will do the most good—for the people of developing countries and for our own.

The proposed foreign aid program for fiscal year 1967 calls for an intensified policy to direct most of our aid to the countries whose need is greatest, the countries which have clearly shown they will match our assistance with strong self-help efforts of their own.

Call it a policy of selectivity if you will, or good administration, or even a hard-boiled approach to foreign aid. But whatever the term, it makes good sense.

Before a country qualifies of assistance, AID takes a careful look at the type and purpose of the proposed development program, the availability of assistance to the country from other sources, the ability of the country to make effective use of U.S. aid, and above all, its determination to make maximum use of its own national resources to promote economic and social development.

Because of this realistic policy, the great bulk of the AID program next year as last will be directed to a relatively few countries—those where the need is greatest, or those that have proven, by outstanding self-help, that they can best use substantial U.S. aid.

More than 90 percent of AID's direct country assistance next year will go to just 20 major countries of Asia, Africa,

and Latin America. Eighty-four percent of all AID development loans will go to only eight—India, Brazil, Pakistan, Turkey, Colombia, Korea, Chile, and Nigeria. These countries are engaged in strong, self-help, development programs.

Ninety-three percent of AID's supporting assistance—which is used to further our urgent foreign policy or national security objectives—is slated for five countries: Vietnam, Laos, Korea, Jordan, and the Dominican Republic. Vietnam alone will account for 72 percent of this support.

This instead of a widely scattered approach as was true a few years ago, our foreign aid today is a purposeful program aimed at specific objectives.

Besides concentration of economic aid in a few selected countries, there are other encouraging new aspects of the aid program.

Ten years ago, about two-thirds of our aid was for military assistance, and much of our economic aid went to help threatened countries resist Communist pressures. Today, the situation is reversed. Two-thirds of our assistance is now economic, providing capital and technical assistance the developing countries need for long-term development and progress toward self-support.

And even where survival is still at issue, as in Vietnam, we are helping industrial and agricultural development go forward behind the defenses built up by our military assistance programs.

We are helping other nations of the free world guard their independence through military assistance, but at the same time we are making a concentrated and determined effort to build solid foundations for their future economic growth.

Those are two of the most significant changes in our foreign aid program—concentration on countries and concentration on their economic and social progress.

They are wise changes. They are promising changes. And they are two of the reasons why I believe that the foreign aid program we are now considering is the most practical and effective ever sent to us, and deserves our fullest support.

A BILL TO PROVIDE PAYMENT OF COMMERCIAL AIR TRAVEL EXPENSES FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

(Mr. MULTER (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. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we are fighting a war in Vietnam, and we are asking hundreds of thousands of our young men to travel many thousands of miles at their own expense in emergency situations or when they are coming home to convalesce from wounds received in battle.

It is my belief that one of the least things we can do for these men is to pay their commercial air transportation costs in these situations: emergency leave, convalescent leave, and leaves before go-

ing overseas or upon returning from overseas. I have therefore today introduced legislation to authorize the particular service Secretary concerned to pay such expenses pursuant to appropriate regulations.

I hope that the Armed Services Committee will take immediate action on my bill.

A PROPOSAL FOR IDENTICAL POWERS FOR COMMERCIAL BANKS AND MUTUAL SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS

(Mr. MULTER (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. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Federal Reserve Governor James L. Robertson has recommended that Federal and State legislatures grant identical powers to both commercial and mutual savings banks subject to their jurisdiction.

The Council of Mutual Savings Institutions has endorsed Governor Robertson's proposal and has issued the following statement and resolution calling for the enactment of legislation to accomplish Governor Robertson's suggestions and urging that each type of institution be defined only as to its corporate structure.

The council's statement and resolution follows:

COUNCIL OF MUTUAL SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS SUPPORTS ROBERTSON PROPOSAL OF IDENTICAL POWERS FOR COMMERCIAL BANKS AND MUTUAL SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS

NEW YORK, N.Y.—Termination of the constant strife between the two types of financial institutions (commercial banks and mutual savings institutions) would result if the legislative bodies at the state and federal levels would grant identical powers to the commercial banks and the mutual savings institutions subject to their jurisdiction, as recommended by Vice Chairman James L. Robertson of the Federal Reserve Board in a recent address, according to a resolution adopted at a meeting of the board of directors of the Council of Mutual Savings Institutions held here during the past week and released yesterday by George L. Bliss, President of the Council.

"It must be recognized that the days are over when commercial banks largely limited their field of operation to demand deposits and their investments to short-term loans and highly marketable securities, while savings institutions and life insurance companies, whose deposits and policy reserves constituting long-term funds were the major source of mortgage and other long-term credits," said Bliss. "Although there may be some argument as to which group started it," he continued, "the fact is that it was the McFadden Act, passed by Congress in 1927, which first granted commercial banks at the federal level the authority to invest in mortgage loans. Since then, the commercial banks have been steadily increasing their volume of long-term credits. While at one time the commercial banks had little interest in savings accounts, and in some states were specifically prohibited from accepting them, the bars and inhibitions which held them back have been removed. This has led the mutual savings institutions to seek broader fields of service. The result has been a continuous hassle between the two groups, for the past couple of decades or

more, and which the legislative bodies have been "called on to referee."

In endorsing Governor Robertson's proposal, the resolution of the Council of Mutual Savings Institutions calls for commercial banks and mutual savings institutions to be "granted identical statutory authority with respect to the services they may provide," the only distinction to be as to the type of corporate structure. The Council's resolution provides that such institutions, "if organized on a privately-owned capital stock basis, shall be known as commercial banks; and, if organized on a mutual or cooperative basis, shall be known as savings institutions."

"The directors of our Council," Bliss said, "believe this course would be in the public interest, since the competitive element would relate to the type of organization, i.e., stock or mutual, and not as to the nature of the services available." He suggested that the bill to authorize federal chartering for mutual savings banks, now under study by the House Banking and Currency Committee and which the Council has endorsed, would be an appropriate legislative vehicle for the first step in such a program. "The directors of the Council of Mutual Savings Institutions," Bliss concluded, "urge the commercial banking groups to withdraw their opposition to this bill, including any expansion of services now included or that may be added, whereupon the mutual savings groups should suspend their opposition to legislation which would enlarge the services authorized to be provided by the commercial banks."

COUNCIL OF MUTUAL SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS

Whereas, for many years it was the traditional concept of sound banking operation in this country that commercial banks, as demand deposit institutions, should restrict the investment or lending of their funds to a short-term basis; and that deposits in savings institutions and policy reserves of insurance companies, which constitute long-term funds, in fact, should be the major source of long-term credits, and

Whereas, over a period of years the commercial banks have been steadily increasing their volume of long-term credits, which change in policy has been rationalized by aggressively seeking, and in numerous instances accomplishing, legislative amendments empowering them to accept savings deposits and to extend long-term credits in the mortgage loan and other fields, and

Whereas, this development has spurred the savings institutions, the great majority of which are chartered or organized on a mutual or cooperative basis, to act defensively by seeking an expansion of their powers into other fields of investment, and

Whereas, the public press has reported that the Honorable James L. Robertson, a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in an address delivered at Peoria, Illinois, on May 17, 1966, proposed that "all depository institutions be permitted to become comprehensive lenders and borrowers, subject to uniform bank-style limitations on the exercise of their powers," now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the Council of Mutual Savings Institutions does hereby endorse in principle the proposal thus advanced by Governor Robertson, to wit, that the commercial banks and the savings institutions be granted identical statutory authority with respect to the services they may provide, subject to the distinction that such institutions, if organized on a privately-owned capital stock basis, shall be known as commercial banks; and, if organized on a mutual or co-operative basis, shall be known as saving institutions, and be it further

Resolved, That the officers and appropriate committees of this Council be, and they are

July 12, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

14707

he said. Although Mr. Truman did not refer to Israel, a similar problem has confronted many Israelis.

A FRESH START

"So we meet here to try to make a fresh start," Mr. Truman said. "Here we will give serious consideration to any new practical approach that could help to advance the cause of peace."

"All will be welcome," he added. "There are no restrictions as to national origin, ideological commitment or religious differences."

He said that the annual peace award was now in effect and that he hoped to "greet the person" who in the judgment of the trustees will have been responsible for "significantly advancing the cause of peace in the year of 1966." Mr. Truman asserted that "the emphasis is on significantly advancing."

Earlier Mr. Noyes had said Mr. Truman had received many telegrams of good wishes, including one from President Habib Bourguiba of Tunisia, whose call to his fellow Arabs to adopt a more realistic attitude toward Israel created a sensation.

Mr. Bourguiba said he would be unable to attend the ceremonies, but he wished Mr. Truman "every success in your enterprise."

A HOPE FOR SHARING

Mayor Teddy Kollek of Jerusalem said he hoped that some day the center "will serve both sides of the city," which has been divided since 1948. Last week, a group of students urged that the old Hebrew University campus on Mount Scopus, abandoned in a demilitarized enclave in the Jordanian sector of Jerusalem, be reopened as a peace university concentrating on Mideastern studies and be open to both Jews and Arabs.

Thurgood Marshall, who had been asked by Mr. Truman to attend the ceremonies, received prolonged applause when he rose to speak. He accepted the ovation on Mr. Truman's behalf although much of the warmth was obviously intended for the distinguished Negro leader, who has been associated with the struggle for civil rights.

"Not only is the occasion unprecedented but the undertaking is audacious," Mr. Marshall said. "In a smoldering world, we here give physical embodiment to our faith in the capacity of reason and science to bank the fires of violence, to seek out the causes of war, to lay out paths to peace."

The Solicitor General, said that the peace center would be well situated in the soil that first nourished the principles of a social order worthy of man.

JOHN STEINBECK SAYS STOP THE WHOLE WAR NOT JUST OUR HALF

(Mr. TENZER (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. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished American Pulitzer and Nobel Prize winning novelist has broken his silence on the war in Vietnam, with a thunder which will be heard "around the world" in less than 80 days.

In his reply to a plea from Soviet Poet Yevgeny Yevtushenko, urging him to protest American policy in Vietnam, the author of "The Grapes of Wrath" said:

I am against this Chinese inspired war, I don't know a single American who is for it. But, my beloved friend, you ask me to denounce half a war, our half. I appeal to you to join me in denouncing the whole war.

John Steinbeck, an outstanding American intellectual, whose 20-year-old son John is now fighting as a U.S. soldier in

Vietnam, in his "Dear Genya" letter tells of his detest of all war and his particular and personal hatred for this war.

Mr. Speaker, the full text of John Steinbeck's "Dear Genya" letter contained in a press release from Newsday, Garden City, N.Y., is set forth at length because I share the sentiments of John Steinbeck that we must "stop the whole war—not just our half." I commend it for reading to my colleagues in the House:

GARDEN CITY, N.Y.—John Steinbeck replied today to a plea by Soviet poet Yevgeny Yevtushenko that the Pulitzer and Nobel prize-winning American novelist speak out on the war in Vietnam.

In a poem published July 7 in a Moscow literary newspaper, Yevtushenko had chided Steinbeck, among U.S. intellectuals, for his silence and urged him to protest against the bombing raids on North Vietnam. Today Steinbeck, a resident of Sag Harbor, replied to Yevtushenko in an open letter published in Newsday, the Long Island newspaper, for which he has been writing a nationally-syndicated weekly column.

Steinbeck asked Harry F. Guggenheim, editor and publisher of Newsday, to make his copyrighted reply available simultaneously to all other news media. In releasing the letter, Guggenheim said that Steinbeck's own 20-year-old son, John (Catbird) Steinbeck, is now fighting as a U.S. soldier in Vietnam.

Following is the full text of Steinbeck's open letter to Yevtushenko:

MY DEAR FRIEND GENYA: I have just now read those parts of your poem printed in the New York Times. I have no way of knowing how good the translation is, but I am pleased and flattered by your devotion.

In your poem, you ask me to speak out against the war in Vietnam. You know well how I detest all war, but for this one I have a particular and personal hatred. I am against this Chinese-inspired war. I don't know a single American who is for it. But, my beloved friend, you asked me to denounce half a war, our half. I appeal to you to join me in denouncing the whole war.

Surely you don't believe that our "pilots fly to bomb children," that we send bombs and heavy equipment against innocent civilians? This is not East Berlin in 1953, Budapest in 1956, nor Tibet in 1959.

You know as well as I do, Genya, that we are bombing oil storage, transport and the heavy and sophisticated weapons they carry to kill our sons. And where that oil and those weapons come from, you probably know better than I. They are marked in pictograph and Cyrillic characters.

I hope you also know that if those weapons were not being sent, we would not be in Vietnam at all. If this were a disagreement between Vietnamese people, we surely would not be there, but it is not, and since I have never found you to be naive you must be aware that it is not.

This war is the work of Chairman Mao, designed and generated by him in absentia, advised by Peking and cynically supplied with brutal weapons by foreigners who set it up. Let us denounce this also, my friend, but even more, let us together undertake a program more effective than denunciation.

I beg you to use your very considerable influence on your people, your government, and on those who look to the Soviet Union for direction, to stop sending the murderous merchandise through North Vietnam to be used against the South.

For my part, I will devote every resource I have to persuade my government to withdraw troops and weapons from the South, leaving only money and help for rebuilding. And, do you know, Genya, if you could accomplish your part, my part would follow immediately and automatically.

But even this is not necessary to stop the war. If you could persuade North Vietnam to agree in good faith to negotiate, the bombing would stop instantly. The guns would fall silent and our dear sons could come home. It is as simple as that, my friend, as simple as that, I promise you. I hope to see you and your lovely wife Galya soon.

With all respect and affection,

JOHN STEINBECK.

Mr. Speaker, in a news article in the same newspaper under the byline of David R. George, after referring to John Steinbeck's reply he includes some references to Yevtushenko's poem as follows:

In his poem published in Russia's Literaturnaya Gazeta, Yevtushenko, 33, recalled Steinbeck's visit to Moscow in 1963 and his advice to young writers then under attack for criticizing shortcomings in Soviet society. Steinbeck said, at that time: "Well, young wolves, show me your teeth."

The time has come, the Soviet poet said, for the 64 year-old Steinbeck, "an old wolf," to "show his teeth" against the U.S. bombing raids on North Vietnam.

Yevtushenko has been, intermittently, a daring critic of the Soviet scene, as Steinbeck was of his own country during the Depression. The young Russian poet has been officially censured for poems denouncing anti-Semitism and for attacking the traces of Stalinism which remain.

"Grapes of Wrath"

Referring to the foremost of Steinbeck's novels, "The Grapes of Wrath," which depicted the ordeal of Oklahoma farmers forced from their land during the Depression, the Soviet poet wrote to Steinbeck:

"Some other writers 'Grapes of Wrath' /Are still to come/But is it possible that yours/Are only in past?/You always were able to hear the voice of time./Do you hear /From far-off Vietnam?/Through the jungles to New York and Moscow/There files/The cry for help/'Mama, Mama.'"

"Not to Be Silent"

Yevtushenko reminded Steinbeck that "you, yourself, taught us not to be silent" and asked why the American novelist did not speak out on Vietnam:

"Is it not dreadful for you these nights, /When a pilot flies to bomb the children, /And perhaps/Is carrying with him your book about Charley?/The winter of our discontent/Is now,/It is impossible to live quietly/For if the politicians are lying/They /Lose their right to politics./You may say: /'Why get involved in politics?/Everyone knows that politics is a whore./No, John./ /Politics also is bravery and honor./When carried out in the name of conscience and ideals.'"

Yevtushenko said in an introduction to his poem that many of his friends in America "are fulfilling their national and international duty by speaking out against war . . ." He cited poet Robert Lowell, who rejected a White House invitation to an arts festival a year ago in protest against the Vietnam war, and folk singer Joan Baez, who has refused to pay taxes to be used for war. Yevtushenko wrote:

"Not a Warrior"

"Joan Baez, of course, is not a warrior, /But listen,/Joan Baez sings/In the name of: /'Mama, Mama' in Vietnam."

In concluding his poem, Yevtushenko said he hoped Steinbeck would not regard him merely as a strident propagandist. He wrote:

"These lines are not a provocative trick, /But I cannot remain silent and isolated. /Yes, we are little wolves./But John, you're an old wolf./So show your teeth./The teeth of John."

Mr. Speaker, John Steinbeck's voice is raised at a most appropriate time, a time

14708

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 12, 1966

when there appears to be on the international scene a new peace offensive, Ambassador Goldberg's visit to the Vatican, Mrs. Indira Gandhi's call for a new Geneva conference, Prime Minister Wilson and Mrs. Gandhi's forthcoming visits to Moscow, all seem to indicate that there is developing a world recognition that peace cannot be unilateral. Let us hope and pray that all the forces who truly "seek peace and pursue it" will unite to "stop the whole war—not just our half."

ADMINISTRATION'S EFFORTS TO CUT COSTS AND INCREASE EFFICIENCY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, it seems desirable to bring to the attention of the Congress and of the American people specific instances of the administration's efforts to cut costs and increase efficiency. Instances of supposed waste and inefficiency get publicity from sources that may not wish the administration well.

I therefore request that the accompanying letter from the President to the Honorable William F. McKee, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, be printed in the Record.

The letter does two things very clearly and very directly: It points out the excellent job being done by the FAA and its distinguished Administrator. Second, it illustrates the President's close watch over the details of the multitudinous agencies for which he is responsible.

The FAA is one of the agencies coming under the purview of the House committee on which I have the honor to serve. Naturally I am gratified to have the President's approval, in which I heartily concur. Further, I wish to note with satisfaction the President's invariable practice to commend good work wherever he finds it.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 6, 1966.

Hon. WILLIAM F. MCKEE,
Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOZO: I have noted with satisfaction the excellent work which you and your associates at the Federal Aviation Agency have been doing in reducing costs and manpower while absorbing additional workload and improving service to the public.

I have taken particular note of your cost reduction program under which you saved \$47 million during the 1966 fiscal year. These savings have been accompanied by a reduction in Agency employment of more than 3,500 employees—eight percent, since 1963. The Agency has succeeded in combining economy in administration with a safety program which has helped the commercial air carriers of the United States achieve the best safety record in the world and the best record for any five-year period in the history of American aviation. You have clearly demonstrated that outstanding performance in a critical and complex program can be continually achieved while reducing costs.

I am pleased to observe that the House Appropriations Committee, after thoroughly reviewing your program and budget for the 1967 fiscal year, singled out the Federal Aviation

Agency for special commendation for the efficiency and economies achieved in recent years.

As you know, in my budget message for the 1967 fiscal year, I stressed the importance of strengthening the coordination of Federal programs in the field and giving more freedom of action and judgment to the people on the firing line. The FAA has provided an example of what can be done to decentralize management to field officials who have the authority to act promptly and effectively in meeting the needs of the public. Your success in establishing regional and area centers of field supervision while simultaneously reducing employment in field offices has demonstrated that decentralization can mean better public service and more productive use of field personnel.

I shall count on you and the good people at the Federal Aviation Agency to continue to provide examples of public service at its best.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CONABLE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the balance of the week, on account of death in the family.

Mr. MATSUNAGA (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. KING of New York (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through July 21, on account of illness.

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

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for Tuesday, July 12, 1966, 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. STAGGERS (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. KUPFERMAN) for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. WHITENER (at the request of Mr. RONCALIO), for 30 minutes, on tomorrow, July 13, 1966; 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. HORTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE following the remarks of Mr. HOLIFIELD.

Mr. HOLIFIELD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (at the request of Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina) to follow the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mrs. KELLY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) to extend his remarks during

debate on H.R. 15750 in the Committee of the Whole today, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HANNA (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the Record and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$286.

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

Mr. QUILLEN.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.

Mr. HALPERN in three instances.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. KEITH.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. BRAY in three instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK in three instances.

Mr. KUPFERMAN in three instances.

Mr. RUMSFELD.

Mr. HALL.

Mr. WATKINS.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. DOLE.

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

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. RONCALIO to revise and extend his remarks on the special order of Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. CALLAN.

Mr. MULTER in three instances.

Mr. KEOGH.

Mr. ST. ONGE in three instances.

Mr. MARSH.

Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. PATTEN.

Mr. RONCALIO in five instances.

Mr. JOELSON in two instances.

Mr. DYAL in six instances.

Mr. FISHER in two instances.

Mr. MOSS in six instances.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in 10 instances.

Mr. MOELLER in two instances.

Mr. MATSUNAGA in three instances.

Mr. CAMERON in five instances.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. WOLFF in three instances.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS.

Mr. HAMILTON in two instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.

Mr. WELTNER.

Mr. TENZER in five instances.

Mr. MORRISON in two instances.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia in three instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

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

S. 309. An act creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 1312. An act to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A3640

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 12, 1966

"On this day of devout remembrance, dedicated to them, this day of prayer, of fond recollection for departed loved ones, let us once again, as we have done for so many years, throughout the grand history of our beloved citadel of liberty, turn our hearts and our prayers to them with tender, enduring thoughts of appreciation deeply harbored in the heart of every American."

GREAT HEROES

"Hail to these great heroes, hail to these men, and these women too, of revered and honored memory, who have bequeathed to us such a precious, noble legacy of true Americanism, and who have consecrated with their blood, their sacrifices and their love, the shrines of this great country and the exalted purposes for which it exists."

"Their sacrifices have not been, and will not be, in vain. They will live forever in the hearts and minds of true Americans. These heroes will be revered and they will be emulated, as they have been throughout our history, to the end of time, and as long as men and women strive, struggle and sacrifice to be free from oppression."

"This day, and these days of struggle, turmoil and strife serve to remind us of the price that a great free people are always willing to pay to defend and preserve their liberties."

"Today, our honored dead, resting in their eternal, heavenly bivouac, speak to us again in the voice of freedom, in the example of their spirit of sacrifice and loyalty, more eloquently than words, and more nobly than we can describe."

BURDEN OF CALL

"It is for us today, as it always has been for real Americans, to take up the burden of their call, to give living expression to the memory and example of their sacrifice, to carry out the inspiration they have given us to defend our blessed free country and the priceless liberties that have made it great against those who seek our destruction, and who strive to turn this free nation and the free world into a fiery shambles of conflict and tyranny."

"With prayerful tribute and flowers and the flag for which they fought and died, let us honor and exalt on this day of remembrance, all those who have served us so gallantly, so faithfully and so well with such imperishable devotion, sacrifice and love."

"Let us in our time, make very sure that their example shall never die, and that their sacrifices will never be forgotten by a grateful American people who owe them so much."

Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, an excellent address on the subject of freedom was delivered recently by Lt. Col. George A. Maloney, U.S. Army, at the Fourth of July observance at the Monument grounds in Washington, D.C.

Colonel Maloney, a graduate of West Point and the recipient of a number of military decorations and awards, has served in Korea, Iceland, Okinawa, and southeast Asia. He recently completed a 3-year tour with the 1st Special Forces Group, which included duty in Vietnam as commander of the 1st Corps, U.S. Special Forces, at Danang.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include Colonel Maloney's address which follows:

FREEDOM

Tonight we celebrate a great national holiday. A day which has meaning for free-men throughout the world. A day which marks the attainment by our forefathers of an individual, political, spiritual and national freedom, previously unknown. A freedom for which our forefathers paid a heavy price. A freedom which successive generations of Americans have rebought with their blood. In the 190 years of our freedom, we have learned that freedom brings responsibilities to defend it as well as rights to enjoy it.

We have learned that freedom isn't free, that it can be lost and once lost is seldom regained. We have learned that freedom lost anywhere, weakens free men everywhere. We have learned that to surrender freedom anywhere invites attack on free men everywhere.

Because we have learned this, tonight, at this very moment, this generation of Americans is making another payment for freedom. On the other side of the globe, closer to us now than California was 20 years ago, 30 nations of the free world are united in a struggle to keep the peoples of southeast Asia free.

We lead this struggle as we have led others in the past 20 years for our heritage of freedom includes the burden of free world leadership. Our forefathers pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor to their struggle. The four most recent Presidents of the United States have pledged that we will honor our commitment in southeast Asia and we shall.

Our Vietnam commitment is total and extends from national to village level. Our military men, statesmen, medics and builders make their contributions both to freedom and to the improved living standards, which make freedom meaningful.

Our Viet Nam commitment is both similar to and different from others we have honored. Similar in that we are containing aggression in the form of Red inspired, Red supported, and Red directed infiltration forces. Communist forces that disguise their true identity and purposes. The Chinese Reds of Mao Tse Tung called themselves agrarian reformers. The Cuban Reds of Fidel Castro called themselves liberators. The Vietnamese Reds would be known as civil warriors and reformers.

We know better. We know them as scavengers of human misery found wherever poverty, disease and illiteracy make men desperate. We know them as false promisers of peace, progress and liberty but deliverers of immediate violence and the eventual captivity of a state society.

Our Viet Nam commitment is similar to Korea in that once again we find ourselves fighting in a difficult place. Once again, we are at the end of a long supply line, once again in a terrain which limits the effectiveness of our military machines and saps the strength of our men. Once again fighting for a small nation whose divisions and confusion are exploited by the same Communist techniques that would divide and confuse our American people.

Our Viet Nam Commitment is similar to Korea, Berlin and Cuba in that the threat of nuclear war hovers in the background limiting our efforts and lending urgency to the requirement for eventual success.

But there are also differences in our Viet Nam commitments. To a greater degree than before, people are both the objective and the tools of war. This is a war in, amongst and for people. We fight, not for cities, roads or other terrain features, but for the hearts and minds of men.

There are also differences in the timing of

the efforts of our national agencies in Viet Nam. In prior wars, the military fought, then the statesmen made peace and finally the aid specialists rebuilt the devastated areas. But in this war, all of our agencies operate concurrently under a single control at the very top level of our government.

Finally and sadly, this war is different in that a small portion of our people have manifested a violent and irresponsible dissent to our national purposes and efforts. I speak not of those who seek to clarify issues within our democratic process but of those whose dissent is neither reasoned nor honest. Whose dissent reflects their craven self interest, their cruel distortion of facts and their callous support of causes detrimental to our common defense of freedom. In so doing they sully that common resolve, that unity of purpose, that universal determination which has characterized our national will in every past war. They distract our attention from the utterly magnificent fashion in which our valiant youth are conducting their defense of freedom.

I see a requirement that we insure that those of these splendid men who must die for us do so free of doubt that their sacrifice is unappreciated.

I see a requirement that we so broaden and pass on this priceless heritage of freedom that it can never be said of us that we were so involved in enjoying freedom that we couldn't successfully defend it.

His Holiness Pope Paul VI Continues His Quest for an End to the Fighting in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, His Holiness Pope Paul VI has been untiring in his efforts to bring about peace talks to resolve the Vietnam conflict, and in this quest His Holiness deserves the thanks of all mankind. I would like to insert the following excerpts, released by the National Catholic Welfare Conference, in the RECORD. I commend the Pontiff's remarks on the Vietnam question to the careful attention of my colleagues. The Holy Father's patient devotion to peace should be an inspiration to our Nation's leaders not to falter in the vital task of bringing a just peace to Vietnam.

[From the N.C.W.C. News Service]

POPE PAUL CONTINUES PEACE EFFORTS

VATICAN CITY.—Pope Paul VI is determined to press his thus-far fruitless campaign for a negotiated settlement of the war in Vietnam.

He said that although his suggestions for neutral arbitration of the war have not been successful, "we are not on this account disheartened in the pursuit of our efforts."

Vietnam, he said, is "tormented by a conflict and by struggles that make it suffer greatly and seem to have no end." He continued:

"With the worsening of the situation and the terrible prospect of a possible extension of the conflict, the demands of our apostolic ministry have spurred us to strive in every way, even blazing new trails, that a solution may be sought and achieved through frank and honorable negotiations."

July 12, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3639

fortunate that any segment of our society should feel this way. And, it is to such groups that the fringe of unscrupulous, un-American hangers-on attach themselves. It does not take a large force of well trained, Un-American individuals, indoctrinated with some foreign ideology to transform a rabble of individuals into an active violent mob. Thus, we project an image to the world of a dissatisfied people, which on the whole is not true. Certainly, many of us do not agree with many things going on in Washington but we will attempt to use our ballot to change matters rather than the violence in the streets.

Now, we are having hearings in Washington regarding the draft. I believe and have so stated previously that the draft was a war time measure and should be abolished. However, if we must have it let us at least administer it constructively. For example, why should a young man wait around until 24 or older before he is called. In the interim he cannot secure a career job since companies know he is subject to the draft. Why not induct each youth at age 18 or upon graduation after that birth date. He would spend one year in the Armed Forces during which time he would undergo fair and impartial screening and testing for aptitudes and College potential. Then, if he shows such potential he would be released to go to College at his own expense if possible or at Government expense if necessary. Others would be screened out or into other areas of service for their country. The salary scale would be raised materially for military service to encourage those qualified to make such service a career. I believe through these efforts we would solve the problems of our youth and maintain an adequate fighting force composed of men who are there because they want to be. What do you think?

Tight Money—Remedial Legislation**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, presently, the economy of the Nation is faced with the growing scarcity of bank credit. Commercial banks cannot supply the present credit demands. Today, credit at the Federal Reserve is available at the discount rate of 4½ percent but only on eligible assets and then only for 15 days. These eligible assets are Treasury securities and certain short-term paper. Other assets like customers' loans and other obligations are eligible, but at a penalty rate of an additional one-half of 1 percent and also for 15 days. This penalty and this limitation of time are the rub. In today's economy, these are costly burdens and are contributing to tighter money. These restraints and limitations should be removed if commercial banks are to serve adequately business and industry generally.

Banks are competing one with another for funds in all markets in all sections of the country. When banks thus compete with each other, no new credit is established to meet growing demands. They are hampered by their ineligibility to borrow readily and economically from

the 12 Federal Reserve banks which comprise the country's central banking system.

The outmoded and obsolete borrowing restrictions are intensifying present difficulties. The Federal Reserve has recognized a need for change and has recommended legislation. There is a bill pending in the House, which has already passed the Senate last August. It is S. 1559. It is presently lodged in the House Banking and Currency Committee. The proposed bill would permit a member bank to borrow from a Federal Reserve bank on the security of any assets acceptable to the Reserve Bank without paying a penalty rate of interest. The 15-day limitation would be removed.

William McC. Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, has stated:

As long as member banks hold a large enough volume of Government securities, they need not, of course, be particularly concerned as to the eligibility for discount with the Reserve banks of customers' paper held by them. Since World War II, however, there has been a sharp net decline in the aggregate holdings of Government securities by member banks. If a continuing substantial increase in economic activity should cause banks further to reduce their holdings of Government securities in order to meet increased credit demands, many banks would be obliged to tender other kinds of collateral if they should seek to obtain Federal Reserve credit.

In order to avoid cumbersome administrative procedures and problems arising from the necessity of distinguishing between "eligible" and "ineligible" paper, the Reserve Board urged Congress to move in and revise and update the law so as to eliminate the existing restrictions with respect to "eligible" paper.

The administration approves of this new procedure.

This legislation would remove technical impediments to ready access to Federal Reserve credit without penalty. The Federal Reserve Board wants to make the discount window an effective means of supplying funds to commercial banks.

Enactment of this measure would benefit all banks—large and small—in all sections of the country. It would relieve the pressure and reduce destructive competition for funds among banks and between banks and nonbank financial institutions.

Clinton Memorial Day Observance**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1966

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on May 30 this year, I was privileged to participate in the stirring and impressive Memorial Day exercises in my own hometown of Clinton, Mass., and under unanimous consent I insert in the Record the news account of this event which appeared in the Clinton, Mass. Item.

The material follows:

MEMORIAL DAY RITES OBSERVED IN CLINTON

"Memorial Day is a great, nationwide, spontaneous outpouring of tribute, honor, gratitude and remembrance of the gallant and the great, of those in every American generation who thought so much of American freedom and the American way of life that they willingly laid down their lives."

So said Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, in his Memorial Day address in Central Park Monday while hundreds of Clintonians participated in the annual ceremonies there to honor their dead loved ones.

In both Woodlawn and St. John's cemeteries, graves were decorated and prayers were said as taps were sounded and the National Guard firing squad saluted deceased veterans from all past wars.

Three bands and the Joannette Drill Team from Leominster highlighted the musical portions of the parade and marchers included the Veterans units, their auxiliaries, Gold Star mothers, Boy and Girl Scouts, Cubs and Brownies.

Parade marshal was Lt. Col. William M. Duncanson U.S. Army Ret., assisted by Gerald Ruberti, Francis M. Ponysa and Donald McGuirk. Prayers were read by the Rev. Richard L. Harding of the First Baptist Church, Miss Nancy L. Anderson (highest honor pupil at CHS) delivered the Gettysburg Address, and John Bandalewicz Commander of the Polish American War Veterans from Maynard read the general orders.

The musical units were: The Clinton High School Band, the Clinton Junior High Band and the Shirley P.A.L. Band.

ALL AMERICANS

The Congressman's remarks follow in part: "Memorial Day has deepest significance to us and to all Americans. The day was first officially established following our Civil War and many gallant young men of Clinton served and fought in that bloody conflict to establish national and civil rights.

"Most of the bitterness of that fratricidal conflict has disappeared, but the memory of these gallant heroes remains, and their devotion to country is permanently enshrined in the hearts of our people and inscribed upon permanent monuments in our beautiful park, side by side with fitting memorials to the gallant service and sacrifice of those who fought and died in the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II and veterans of other Americans wars.

"While Memorial Day came into being to commemorate the brave veterans of the Civil War, it has thus been extended to pay fitting tribute to all those who have given of themselves, who have made the supreme sacrifice, or who have served faithfully and heroically to uphold American liberty and justice."

OUTPOURING OF TRIBUTE

"Today, Memorial Day is a great, nationwide, spontaneous outpouring of tribute, honor, gratitude and remembrance of the gallant and the great, of those in every American generation who thought so much of American freedom and the American way of life that they willingly laid down their lives, or offered their lives, most of them in the flower of their youth, in order that this great government dedicated to human freedom might survive, grow, prosper and become, as it has become, the greatest nation in world history.

"No honor we could confer upon them would be enough to express our thanks, and the thanks of the country, to these valiant veterans for what they have done to protect, preserve and save this great nation, its homes, its freedoms, its vaunted institutions of enterprise and justice.

"No monument, no plaque, no words can measure their noble sacrifices. They rest in honored glory. They are enshrined in grateful American hearts with eternal love, devotion and gratitude.

July 12, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3641

He recalled that he had made "reiterated appeals both public and private" for peace in Vietnam and had left no stone unturned "to hasten the meeting of minds." He also recalled his proposal for a Christmas truce and his hopes that it would be not only prolonged but would serve as "a base for launching peace negotiations."

He indicated that he had channeled his suggestions for neutral arbitration in Vietnam through the United Nations: "Trusting once more in the work of the United Nations—that organization that works for peace and in the 20 years of its existence has prevented so many conflicts and settled so many others—we thought it good to suggest arbitration, to be confident in neutral nations, for a pacific solution of the grave problem."

He continued:

"You well know the inconclusive outcome of our sincere and unselfish efforts in favor of peace. But we are not on this account disheartened in the pursuit of our action, for we are anxious to foster in the society of men the concord and brotherhood proclaimed by the Gospel message."

"Meanwhile we renew to the heads of state and to all men of good will—who have so generously and enthusiastically responded to our solicitude as universal father and shepherd—our sincere and profound gratitude, and the appeal to focus their thoughts on a just peace that may give those peoples liberty, order and prosperity."

Budget Bureau Policy Threatens To Endanger Soil Conservation Service Watershed Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1966

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my deep concern over the Bureau of the Budget's recently adopted policy with regard to new projects under the U.S. Soil Conservation Service watershed program.

Since last December, the Soil Conservation Service has sent 51 new watershed work plans to the Budget Bureau for review. In the past, the Budget Bureau has checked watershed work plans and, if no objections to their economic feasibility were found, has transmitted the projects to the Congress for review and approval by the appropriate committees of the House and Senate. Under provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, projects with a single structure of more than 4,000 acre-feet capacity are sent for review and approval to the House and Senate Public Works Committees, and projects with a single structure of less than 4,000 acre-feet capacity are sent to the House and Senate Agriculture Committees. The provision for review and approval by congressional committees has been part of the law since it was enacted in 1954.

Within the last month or so, however, the Budget Bureau has changed its long-established policy and has refused to send any new watershed projects to the Congress for review and approval, re-

gardless of the merits of any of the individual projects. As a result, all 51 new watershed work plans are still pending in the Budget Bureau and, even though there has been no change in the law, the appropriate committees of the House and Senate have not been given an opportunity to review and approve these new watershed projects. This new policy of the Budget Bureau threatens to endanger one of the most effective programs for soil and water conservation.

It is my understanding that the Budget Bureau has held up these watershed projects because of a contention that the provision for congressional review and approval of individual projects is an unconstitutional infringement on the power of the executive branch. Very frankly, I do not think this matter involves any great constitutional crisis. The Soil Conservation Service watershed program has operated under the provision for congressional review and approval of individual projects for a dozen years. During this time, the House and Senate Agriculture Committees have approved 293 projects, and the House and Senate Public Works Committees have approved 153. In other words, 446 watershed projects have been approved under the present provisions of the law, and there have been no previous complaints that this law violated the Constitution. Only last year the Congress, with the approval of the executive branch, amended the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act so as to permit Soil Conservation Service to provide assistance to watersheds with structures of up to 12,500 acre-feet flood detention capacity. Nothing was said at that time about the possible unconstitutionality of review and approval of these projects by congressional committees. In fact, it was not until late May of this year that Soil Conservation Service officials first learned of the Budget Bureau's objections to this procedure.

If the Budget Bureau's new policy is not reversed, and if the new watershed work plans are not sent to the Congress for review and approval, it will be extremely unfair to the local officials who have spent years preparing detailed plans for these projects. Among the projects now being held up by the Budget Bureau is the Three Mile Creek Watershed, which is of great importance to the Union County area in Iowa. This project was officially proposed in 1958 and it has been in the planning stage since January 1961, more than 5 years ago. After a great deal of hard work on the part of the local sponsors, plans for the Three Mile Creek project were sent to the Budget Bureau on April 25, 1966. This project, which I have been following closely for more than a year, would provide valuable soil conservation, flood control and recreation benefits to the Union County area. In addition, it would offer a source of municipal water supply to the town of Afton, which has been hampered by acute water shortages in the past. And, in the long run, the Three Mile Creek Watershed would provide the basis for future economic growth in the area. I feel it would be most unfortunate if this project, as well as the others pending with the Budget Bureau, were

delayed by a dispute over abstract legalities.

In my opinion, the Soil Conservation Service watershed program is far too valuable to be endangered by arguments over the alleged unconstitutionality of a law which has been in operation without previous objections for a dozen years. Any question as to the constitutionality of the provision for congressional approval of projects can be resolved at a later date, when the Congress has the time to consider the matter with care. In any event, if there is anything certain about this dispute, it is that nothing in the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act authorizes the Budget Bureau to deliberately hold up projects which merit approval. I therefore think the Budget Bureau should reverse its policy of holding up watershed work plans and allow this program to move forward, as it has in the past, under the procedures established by law.

Statement Made by Irvin M. Frankel, President, American Society of Travel Agents, Presentation of Plaque to Senator Magnuson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, my friend Mr. Irvin M. Frankel, of Atlanta, Ga., is president of the American Society of Travel Agents.

The society recently paid tribute to Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON for his contribution to the travel agency industry and the public which it serves. Because of my respect for Mr. Frankel's distinguished leadership in the travel industry, I place his statement on that occasion in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT MADE BY IRVIN M. FRANKEL, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN SOCIETY OF TRAVEL AGENTS, PRESENTATION OF PLAQUE TO SENATOR MAGNUSON, JUNE 23, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Honored Guests and Fellow Members of ASTA, thank you very much for taking time from your busy schedules and important responsibilities to participate in this occasion.

I know that I voice the sentiments of all the members of the American Society of Travel Agents when I say that we long have looked forward to this opportunity to pay tribute to our guest of honor, WARREN G. MAGNUSON, who—although a Senator representing the State of Washington—is, in our opinion, a Senator representing all of the United States.

During his more than 30 years of public service in the House of Representatives and the Senate, he has demonstrated that imperative quality which, in the words of Alexander Hamilton, distinguishes a representative of all the people as contrasted with a parochial approach.

"Learn to think continentally," Hamilton admonished his contemporaries.

Senator MAGNUSON, in answer to the demands of the present and in response to his own profound awareness of the course of history, has exceeded that heretofore valid injunction and thinks internationally.

A3642

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 12, 1966

The important legislation which marks his career in public service is monumental testimony to his fidelity to the philosophical observation that "the difference between a politician and a statesman is that a politician thinks only of the next election and a statesman thinks of the next generation."

Every proposal advocated by WARREN MAGNUSON, every piece of legislation which he has authored, sponsored and successfully has brought to enactment, is incontrovertible evidence of his fidelity to this concept.

We, in the American Society of Travel Agents, long have watched with deep and personal interest his devotion to furthering the best interests of all—his steadfast adherence to the principle that all legislation must be based upon equity and justice.

We are here today to express our deep appreciation of his inspired leadership and recognized wisdom during his many years of public service.

His sound imagination has assisted materially in creating a strong, self-sufficient air transportation system. He prophetically pioneered in an appreciation and understanding of the benefits which would be derived by our national economy from travel and tourism. And he, time and time again, has directed the specific attention of the nation to the tremendous contribution to our gross national product made by the independent, private enterprise businessmen—who constitute the Travel Agency industry.

He has listened sympathetically and perceptively to our problems, lauded our effort to serve the public in accordance with the highest standards of responsibility and professionalism and has given us that sound advice which is the distillation of experience and statesmanship.

No single tablet of bronze adequately could describe our appreciation of his services to our nation and, of course, to our industry.

So—we are forced to be content with the following phrases which, even at their best, are inadequate to express the full extent of our genuine sentiments.

On behalf of the American Society of Travel Agents, Senator MAGNUSON, and in accordance with the resolution adopted by our Officers and Directors, we present, with pride and pleasure, this testimonial of appreciation in recognition of your distinguished leadership and positive contributions to the Travel Agency industry and the public which it serves; and for your significant achievements in the development of travel and tourism.

We wish you many more years of similar outstanding service to our peoples and our nation.

This tribute, Sir, is from our hearts.

Scramble for Cash Unprecedented

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the President is not sending a tax increase bill to Congress at least until after the elections. Instead, he is trying to check escalating inflation resulting from wild and wasteful Federal spending by applying the monetary brakes.

Now no one knows whether the public is going through the windshield or up through the roof. L.B.J. has reached the point where, having spent too much to try to create prosperity, he is now

drying up the market of free money which can create a depression. This is the price of butter and guns together. The unemployment rate is rising again and serious unemployment, particularly in the building trades, may be the result. Meanwhile, we are going up and down on an economic roller coaster.

The banks have been encouraged to buy what are called "certificates of deposit" for 5½ percent and, under the rules, a little more. This looks good because it increases their deposits. But these "certificates of deposit" are relatively short term, often 3 months. A bank must earn better—and usually far better—than 6 percent quickly to pay these high interest rates. This has shoved, and is shoving, the price of money for borrowers to ruinous rates. It is hitting the construction and other trades and will hit more. This is a new twist on robbing Peter to pay Paul and only this corkscrew administration could have nurtured it.

By unanimous consent, in this connection, I introduce in the RECORD an article by Harold B. Dorsey in the Washington Post:

SCRAMBLE FOR CASH UNPRECEDENTED

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

NEW YORK, July 10.—The scramble for cash that has been so evident in the past few weeks has reached a stage that has only rarely been experienced in this country during the 20th century. The competition for money by the savings institutions, commercial banks, non-bank lenders, Federal agencies and business borrowers is now on a knock-down, no-holds-barred basis.

One result of this condition is a distortion in normal interest rate relationships which is tending to cause violent shifts in cash flows. For instance, the recent increase in dividends paid on savings and loan shares is probably more than some of the S&L's can afford to pay out of interest earned. Nevertheless, the boost in the rates seemed to be necessary to restrain an even more embarrassing outflow of deposits to higher yields obtainable elsewhere. But the yields obtainable elsewhere are also rising in this most unusual scramble for money.

One cannot help but wonder what is going to happen to the approximately \$43 billion of ordinary passbook savings deposits of the weekly reporting commercial banks. The ceiling interest rate on these deposits is only 4 percent. The depositor can probably put his money in the savings bank or the S&L next door and obtain 5 percent. Some of them could probably do better than that if they wanted to buy Certificates of Deposits issued by commercial banks or to invest their money in top quality relatively short-term debt issues of the Federal agencies and corporations.

Over \$17 billion of the deposits of the commercial banks is represented by Certificates of Deposits on which the ceiling is 5½ per cent. But in the secondary markets C.D.'s maturing in six months are available on a 5.60 per cent basis. A substantial portion of the C.D.'s represents a temporary investment of the surplus cash of corporations.

But to the extent that the commercial banks lose the C.D. money, and it ultimately comes back to them in the form of demand deposits, the money available to the commercial banks for lending and investing would be reduced because the reserve requirements on demand deposits is nearly 3 times the recently upward revised requirement on C.D.'s.

Meanwhile, the 4½ per cent Federal Reserve discount rate (the rate which the

Fed charges for its loans to member banks) is now further out of line with most other interest rates than has been in many years—if ever. The historical interest rate relationships suggest that the discount rate should have been boosted a couple of months ago.

I suggest that it has not been raised because this particular rate is considered a symbol of monetary ease or tightness and an increase under present circumstances might be a psychological shock to the financial system—although anybody that does not already know that the credit situation is extraordinarily tight doesn't read the newspapers.

The rarity of this financial situation makes it difficult to envision just where the scramble for cash is going to end, and what its consequences may be. It is clear that the cause of the condition is the most unusual demand for credit necessary to finance the abnormally high rate of demand for goods and services. These pressures certainly would have been less excessive if the government had decided late last year to siphon off \$5-\$7 billion of the purchasing power of the private sectors by boosting tax rates.

Since this step was not taken, the correctives are coming in the form of extreme tightness in the capital and credit markets and also in the form of higher prices, which reduce the ability of the economy to move units of goods and services into consumption.

How AEC Report Pictures Ann Arbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the interest of the Michigan delegation in this and the other body of Congress in the location of the Atomic Energy Commission's 200 Bev. accelerator facility on a site in our State is, I am sure, well known to all Members. I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the Detroit News on Sunday, July 10. This article, written by Mr. Robert L. Pisor, of the News Washington bureau, is one of the most lucid and comprehensive I have had the privilege of reading on this complex subject.

Mr. Pisor writes of the role of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. VIVIAN], in leading the Michigan effort to secure the Atomic Energy Commission research facility. The gentleman's efforts on behalf of the Michigan site have been tireless. His colleagues in the Michigan delegation have been much impressed not only with his broad knowledge of scientific and research matters, based on his background as a scientist and businessman, but also with his seemingly boundless energy on behalf of his State and his district. This work is well documented in Mr. Pisor's article.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Pisor emphasizes the facts, well known to many of my colleagues, regarding the failure of the Federal Government, to date, to bring about an equitable geographical distribution of Federal research and development funds. He points out the