

19978

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers projects, Texas, expenditures for construction, 1962-66 fiscal years—Continued

Bleders Creek Reservoir (New Braunfelds) ¹ -----	\$37,000
Belton Reservoir (Leon River, Brazos Basin)-----	527,000
Buffalo Bayou (Houston)-----	14,247,000
Canyon Reservoir (Guadalupe River)-----	2,058,000
Fort Worth Floodway (Trinity River Basin):	
West Fork extension-----	1,332,000
Clear Fork extension-----	296,000
Garza-Little Elm Reservoir (Elm Fork, Trinity River)-----	434,000
Cooper Reservoir (South Sulphur River)-----	1,195,000
Dam "B" Reservoir (Nueces River)-----	732,000
Freeport and vicinity (hurricane protection)-----	694,000
Lake Kemp Reservoir (Wichita River)-----	180,000
Navarro Mills Dam and Reservoir (Trinity River Basin)-----	5,188,000
Grapevine Dam and Reservoir (Trinity River Basin)-----	659,000
Proctor Dam and Reservoir (Leon River, Brazos River Basin)-----	11,959,000
Hords Creek Reservoir (Colorado River Basin)-----	252,000
Pat Mayse Reservoir (Sanders Creek)-----	3,756,000
Port Arthur and vicinity (hurricane protection)-----	1,306,000
Texarkana Reservoir (Sulphur River, Red River Basin)-----	1,068,000
Lavon Reservoir (East Fork Trinity River)-----	1,410,000
San Antonio Channel-----	3,902,000
San Angelo Reservoir (Colorado River Basin)-----	589,000
San Gabriel River (tributary to Brazos River)-----	760,000
Somerville Reservoir (Brazos River Basin)-----	20,094,000
Stillhouse Hollow Reservoir (Lampasas River)-----	11,912,000
Whitney Reservoir (Brazos River)-----	568,000
Texas City (hurricane protection)-----	6,916,000
Vince and Little Vince Bayous-----	247,000
Wallisville Reservoir-----	554,000
Waco Reservoir (Brazos River Basin)-----	34,432,000
Total -----	140,063,000

FLOOD CONTROL
MULTIPLE PURPOSE
INCLUDING POWER

Sam Rayburn Reservoir (Angelina River)-----	35,104,000
Denison Dam and Reservoir (Red River)-----	2,009,000
Total -----	37,113,000

NAVIGATION

Aquatic plant control-----	13,000
Brazos Island Harbor-----	1,635,000
Colorado River locks-----	84,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway-----	9,483,000
(Channel to Victoria)	
(Channel to Port Mansfield)	
(Channel to Palacios)	
Galveston Harbor and Channel-----	5,087,000
Fort Bolivar Dike (repair)-----	188,000
Houston Ship Channel (bend easing to 40-foot project)-----	13,448,000
Matagordo Ship Channel-----	13,109,000
Port Isabel-----	47,000
Sabine-Neches Waterway-----	6,197,000
Texas City Channel, 40-foot-----	400,000
Total -----	49,691,000

Grand total-----226,867,000

¹Declared inactive 1964 pending local interests' study of alternative.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

Funds have been requested in the 1967 budget for the restudy of the Trinity River navigation project (\$200,000) and \$150,000 to start advance engineering and design of the El Paso local flood protection project.

There are a number of projects which have been authorized for which funds are not currently available but will be activated later. These include the Chocolate Bayou navigation channel connecting with the Gulf Intracoastal waterway 65 miles south of Galveston.

Flood control projects authorized for future prosecution include: Highland Bayou, a small coastal stream in Galveston County; local protection for the City of Pecos; Taylor Bayou which drains the segment of coastal plain between Port Arthur and Galveston Bay; Rockland Reservoir on the Neches River, for flood control, water supply and hydro power; and Big Pine Reservoir, in Red River County.

Units of the Trinity River Projects, authorized but still in the future, include the Elm Fork Floodway; Dallas Floodway Extension; Duck Creek Channel Improvement; local flood protection at Liberty; Lakeview; Tennessee Colony, Aubrey and Roanoke Reservoirs.

The Corps of Engineers is cooperating with other Federal agencies and the State of Texas in formulating plans for development of the surplus water resources of eastern Texas for utilization in central and west Texas. This is designated the Texas Basin Study. A half million dollars is requested for fiscal year 1967 for this purpose.

Recommendations of the Corps and the other agencies will undoubtedly result in a large scale program of development in which the Corps will participate.

VIETNAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, two significant and interesting articles on the Vietnam conflict appear in the Washington Post for Sunday, August 21, 1966.

The first by Mr. Chalmers Roberts projects a deepening American involvement designed to secure an American decision by 1968.

The second is a discussion of Mr. Richard N. Goodwin's stimulating book, "Triumph or Tragedy: Reflections on Vietnam," as seen by the reviewer, Mr. Ronald Steel.

I ask unanimous consent that these two pieces be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 21, 1966]

THE GRIM VIEW: A HOTTER WAR BEFORE 1968—DOMINANT BELIEF HERE IS THAT L.B.J. WILL POUR MEN AND ARMS INTO VIETNAM BETWEEN ELECTIONS

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

In the corridors of power in Washington these days, one occasionally hears the view that a critical turn will come in Vietnam within a year, or even that the war will be over in the next 12 months.

This reflects, in part, a sort of Micawberish hope that something will turn up to end the bloodletting, and in part, it is an Occidental reading of an Oriental enemy—a deduction that the Communists have to fold because nobody could stand the military punishment they are taking.

But such views, albeit built partially on a now-receded wavelet of official optimism expressed by the President and his top aides in early July, are swamped by far grimmer readings from the corridors of power.

The overwhelming view is that a lot more men will head for Vietnam, that a lot more Americans will be killed and that there is no sign whatsoever that North Vietnam and its allies and agents in the South are headed toward a decision to call it quits.

The prospects for peace are minimal and far off; the prospects for a bigger war, close to the Korean pattern in many ways, are rapidly increasing.

THE HAWKS SOAR

An important date is likely to be Nov. 8, when Americans vote in the off-year elections for Congress.

President Johnson's conduct of the war will not, as Hanoi apparently thinks, be repudiated. The Democrats probably will lose seats in the House, and perhaps in the Senate, but the Republicans who replace them, in sum, probably will be more hawkish about the war than they were.

A number of Democrats who deplore the war's escalation have tried in primaries to make an issue of it, but they have been conspicuously unsuccessful. This has produced something of a deemphasis on the war as an issue though some peace candidates are still to be judged in coming primaries.

On the Republican side, the most publicized peace candidate, Oregon's Gov. Mark Hatfield, is finding himself in an uphill fight for a Senate seat that he appeared certain to win—all because he seems to be too much of a dove to the voters.

Ho Chi Minh has told visitors that he expects Mr. Johnson's political base for his military action to be shattered at the polls. Every sign thus far is that he will be vastly disappointed unless in self-indulgence he foolishly misreads the expected Democratic losses.

L.B.J. MAY POUR IT ON

Two years after November, President Johnson himself will face the electorate. His inclination between elections, reinforced by more hawks in Congress, is likely to be to pour it on in the war.

No President would choose to face the voters during a war, though some have done so successfully in the midst of a conflict supported totally by the people. No one is saying that the war in Vietnam is such a conflict, however; indeed, the politicians call it the most unpopular war in American history.

Furthermore, Mr. Johnson is all too painfully aware that, as the Republicans so often note, all the wars in this century began while a Democrat was President.

Hence, the best possible posture for Mr. Johnson in November, 1968, would be to stand before the voters with the war ended in a fashion most of the public would consider at least honorable even if not totally successful.

To reach such a happy day within two years, then, the President most probably will pour it on in Vietnam militarily while trying to confine the conflict to its present participants and geographic limits.

That he will do just that is the predominant view inside the Administration and in Congress. It is hardly necessary to add that no man is more unhappy about the war than the President, or more aware of the crimp it has put in his Great Society program and his hopes of ushering in an era of world peace based on a live-and-let-live relationship with the Soviet Union.

He wants to end this unpopular war, to respond to the mood of the Nation and to prove to the skeptics that he has been right all along.

THE WILL TO PROSECUTE

The other day, after conferring with Gen. William C. Westmoreland, the commander in the field, Mr. Johnson said that "the single most important factor now is our will to prosecute the war until the Communists, recognizing the futility of their ambitions, either end the war or seek a peaceful settlement."

August 26, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19977

The Palmetto Project, consists principally of Palmetto Bend Dam and reservoir located at the junction of the Lavaca and Navidad Rivers in Jackson County. The project would provide municipal and industrial water supplies to support economic growth and industrial development of the area. It would also provide fish and wildlife benefits and recreation opportunities. This project is now before the Congress for approval.

The Columbus Bend Dam and Reservoir Project, located on the Colorado River above the city of La Grange in Colorado and Fayette counties would provide additional dependable water supplies to meet the rapidly increasing downstream requirements for municipal and industrial water. It would also provide substantial fish and wildlife and recreation benefits, and incidental flood control benefits. This project too is awaiting congressional approval.

Soil Conservation Service watershed protection and flood prevention program (Public Law 566 projects)—Watershed (years active)

	Amount 1962-1966
Agua Dulce Creek (1962 to 1966) ..	\$231,862
Alamo Arroyo (1966) ..	9,632
Attoyac Bayou (1966) ..	29,207
Auds Creek (1962 to 1966) ..	318,596
Big Creek (1965 to 1966) ..	1,929
Camp Rice Arroyo (1962 to 1964) ..	350,751
Caney Creek (1962 to 1966) ..	261,260
Castleman Creek (1966) ..	3,734
Chilitpin-San Fernando Creek (1962 to 1966) ..	621,927
Chocolate, Little Cho., L.B. (1966) ..	2,970
Cummins Creek (1962 to 1966) ..	192,969
Diablo Arroyo (1962) ..	817
Donahoe Creek (1966) ..	7,996
Dry Devils R. and Lowrey Draw (1962 to 1963) ..	22,255
Duck Creek (1966) ..	5,762
East Bay Bayou (1963 to 1966) ..	215,952
East Keechi Creek (1962 to 1966) ..	911,941
Escondido Creek (1966) ..	3,581
Hondo Creek (1964 to 1966) ..	183,053
Johnsons Draw (1966) ..	0
Kent Creek (1963 to 1966) ..	454,566
Kickapoo Creek (1962 to 1966) ..	754,769
Knob Creek (approved) ..	0
Langford Creek (1962 to 1966) ..	249,173
Logan-Slough Creek (1964 to 1966) ..	376,792
Lower Brushy Creek (1962 to 1966) ..	705,977
Lower Plum Creek (1962 to 1966) ..	448,837
Macho Arroyo (1962 to 1963) (credit) ..	16,409
Madden Arroyo (1962 to 1964) ..	17,035
Martinez Creek (1962 to 1966) ..	546,383
Mimms Draw (1962 to 1964) ..	33,998
Nolan Creek (1964 to 1966) ..	11,493
N.E. Tributaries of Leon River (1963 to 1966) ..	1,632,394
Omitos-Garcias Creeks (1962 to 1966) ..	976,130
Pine Creek (1964 to 1966) ..	426,474
Plum Creek (1962 to 1966) ..	919,227
Ramirez Creek (1962 to 1966) ..	54,145
Salado Creek (1963 to 1966) ..	20,978
San Diego-Rosita Creeks (1962 to 1966) ..	854,978
Sulphur Creek and Supplement (1962 to 1965) (net) ..	744
Tehuacana Creek (1962 to 1966) ..	1,284,619
Town Branch (1962 to 1966) ..	42,493
Turkey Creek (Approved) ..	0
Upper Bosque River (1964 to 1966) ..	1,012,255
Upper Bushy Creek (1962 to 1966) ..	878,595
Upper Lake Fork Creek (1962 to 1966) ..	671,924
Upper Las Moras Creek (1962 to 1965) ..	330,577
Valley Creek (1963 to 1966) ..	813,419

Soil Conservation Service watershed protection and flood prevention program (Public Law 566 projects)—Watershed (years active)—Continued

	Amount 1962-1966
Williams Creek (1966) ..	\$2,680
York Creek (1962 to 1966) ..	1,441,645
Total ..	18,277,575

Pilot projects:

Cow Bayou (1962 to 1966) ..	1,201,891
Escondido Creek (1962 to 1964) ..	60,894
Total ..	1,262,785

Flood prevention projects:

Middle Colorado (1962 to 1966) ..	9,319,271
Trinity River (1962 to 1966) ..	21,075,196
Total ..	30,394,467

Grand total Public Law 566, pilot and flood prevention, fiscal years 1962 to 1966

49,934,797

National Park Service—Expenditures, 1962-66

Big Bend National Park (Brewster County): Roads, trails, drainage structures, parking areas, walks, driveways, trailer park, water supply and distribution, sewage disposal system, comfort stations, house trailers and utilities in place, employee residences and utilities, rehabilitation of historic structures, bridge, signs, and markers, fencing of boundary, 1962-66 ..	\$3,262,600
Fort Davis National Historic Site: Signs and markers, rehabilitation of historic structures, employee residences, utilities, visitor center rehabilitation, roads, parking area and paving, 1962-66 ..	793,100
Padre Island National Seashore: Water system, picnic area development, comfort stations, employee housing and utilities, sewer and power systems, 1966 ..	610,300

Total National Park Service expenditures .. 4,666,000

Construction planned, 1967

Big Bend National Park: Construction of Nine Point Draw Bridge, Routes 1 and 2, and repair decks on Tornillo Creek bridges ..	\$127,800
Water system at Castolon ..	132,000
Rehabilitation of sewage disposal system at Panther Junction ..	20,000
Total for 1967 ..	279,800
Fort Davis National Historic Site: Entrance road, trails, and visitors' parking area ..	142,800
Stabilization of ruins, fencing, signs, and markers ..	25,900
Total for 1967 ..	167,700

Padre Island National Seashore: North end—Main road from boundary to developed area, campground roads and portions of circulating roads and parking area ..	649,300
Public use building and utilities ..	562,700
Sand stabilization, site preparation and signs ..	157,500

Construction planned, 1967—Continued

South end—Spur road and parking area ..	\$55,800
Utilities ..	67,100
Radio tower ..	31,600
Total for 1967 ..	1,524,000

*PROJECTION 1968, FISCAL YEAR AND BEYOND
Big Bend National Park*

Beginning in 1968 the North Entrance Road, Route 1 from North Boundary to Tornillo Road, 21 miles, will be reconstructed and Nine Point Bridge will be completed. By 1972 this project will be completed at an estimated cost of \$1,868,900. In 1973 reconstruction of Grapevine Spur Route 37, 8.9 miles, will be started, to be completed in two years for \$767,100. A similar amount will be expended in 1975 to reconstruct Dagger Flat Spur, Route 6 from Route 1 to Dagger Flat, 10 miles. Other roads and trails costing approximately \$777,500 are planned over a period of over a decade beginning in 1968.

In the period 1968-1975 construction of utilities, buildings, and various facilities are planned as follows:

Chisos Mountain Basin area ..	\$450,000
Panther Junction area ..	844,000
Rio Grande Village area ..	770,900
Castolon area ..	1,247,600
Park general ..	20,000

Total for 1968-75 .. 3,332,500

Fort Davis National Historic Site

The current building program will be completed by 1970 fiscal year. This calls for expenditures of \$17,400 for roads and trails and \$215,600 for buildings, utilities and miscellaneous facilities.

Padre Island National Seashore

Padre Island National Seashore's development will extend over a period of years. The Bureau of Public Roads will begin an access road of 20 miles at the North end in 1973 at a cost of \$2 million. At the completion of that road a 23-mile access road will be constructed at the South end with cost estimated at \$2,600,000.

Meanwhile a number of lesser circulatory roads into the seashore area will be completed in 1971 fiscal year at an additional cost of \$1,195,900.

A circulation and access road in the Murdoch Landing area will not be undertaken until 1976 or later, to cost \$800,000.

In the North Entrance area utilities to cost \$313,700 are planned for 1969 through 1971. Those in the South Entrance area, 1968-1970 will cost \$994,100; in the Murdoch Landing area, beginning in 1972 through 1974 planned utilities will cost \$950,000 and at Mansfield Cut, beginning in 1974, \$1,194,000.

Buildings for park use and visitors, including miscellaneous facilities for the same areas are:

North entrance area, 1969-73 ..	\$1,683,400
South entrance area, 1968-70 ..	1,098,200
Murdoch Landing area, 1972-74 ..	1,610,000
Mansfield Cut area, 1974-75 ..	3,435,000
<i>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers projects, Texas, expenditures for construction, 1962-66 fiscal years</i>	

FLOOD CONTROL

Abilene improvement channel (Brazos River) ..	\$60,000
Bardwell Reservoir (Waxahatchie Creek, Trinity River Basin) ..	10,334,000
Benbrook Reservoir (Clear Fork, Trinity River) ..	543,000
Big Fossil Creek (local protection) ..	1,822,000

August 26, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19979

The President added that "no one can say when this will be or how many men will be needed."

Probably there will be new peace efforts, but the big emphasis will be military. The President has denied there are studies estimating the war will go on for eight years and require 750,000 men. But this was hardly more than a technical denial at election time. The fact is that plans are well laid for increasing the manpower in Vietnam and doing it over whatever period is necessary.

Last May, in a much-discussed article in *The Washington Post*, S. J. Deitchman of the Institute for Defense Analysis calculated that, assuming a massive American escalation in Vietnam, the war's duration could be limited to about six years with the employment of some 675,000 men. The casualties, he figured, would total about 100,000 killed (compared to 83,629 battle deaths in the Korean war and 4,741 so far in Vietnam, plus 1,018 nonbattle deaths in Vietnam). Deitchman's chilling estimates have never had official sanction. But Sen. JOHN STENNIS (D-Miss.), who last January first suggested that 400,000 men would be needed by the end of 1966, is now saying that an eventual 500,000 to 600,000 men will be needed to win in Vietnam.

STENNIS' first estimate was very close; total American manpower in South Vietnam by the end of 1966 apparently will be between 360,000 and 380,000, not including the 40,000 to 50,000 men of the Seventh Fleet task force off Saigon or the airmen and troops in Thailand. The Thailand manpower is kept secret, but is expected to reach 32,000 by year's end.

Adding the higher figures gives a total of 462,000 men, compared to a Korean war peak of 472,882 men directly involved, plus what was termed "direct support" manpower.

Thus, the war's escalation looks like this in terms of Americans directly committed to Vietnam alone:

End of 1960-----	785
End of 1961-----	2, 000
End of 1962-----	11, 000
End of 1963-----	15, 500
End of 1964-----	23, 000
End of 1965-----	181, 250
End of 1966-----	360, 000-380, 000
Later-----	500, 000-600, 000

STENNIS is not alone in suggesting the future figures, but his sources of information as chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, and the virtual fulfillment of his earlier prediction, lend great credence to his estimate. (The Administration refuses to give an official estimate.)

Furthermore, the massive logistical build-up inside South Vietnam has reached a point where many more men can be absorbed. And the end of the monsoon season, now approaching, will add to the ability to move more men within the country.

CONTRASTING STRATEGY

But more than just men and equipment are involved, of course. One point Marine Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Jr., the Marine commandant, appeared to be making in the recently disclosed background briefings he gave in Saigon had to do with the strategy of fighting the war.

In sum, he appeared to be saying that Marines are fighting a take-and-hold strategy (on his return to Washington, he predicted that his men and the South Vietnamese would soon link the two Marine-held perimeters around Danang and Chu Lai into a single safe area). Only such a strategy makes possible a successful pacification program because Vietnamese civilians will not risk their lives to join in unless they are sure the allied forces will not move out.

But by contrast, Greene's implication continued, the Army is fighting a search-and-

destroy strategy—hunting out the hard core enemy units, but moving on after destroying them or spoiling their offensive plans. This has its military value, of course, but it is not as effective in the long run as holding territory taken.

But to hold the territory after all search-and-destroy operations would take more men than are now available in Vietnam. Indeed, to search-and-destroy thoroughly will take many more. But whether additional manpower and firepower will produce altered Army strategy remains a secret. It has in the past, however, as the American strategy changed more and more from counter-guerrilla tactics to seeking direct confrontation in the Korean war fashion.

All this assumes continued waging of war by the North Vietnamese. Experts here see no reason to doubt that they will. The recent evacuation from Hanoi of virtually all old people and school-age children, for instance, is an act of determination, not of desperation.

If the war must go on, some ask, why not attack the North with land and sea forces? Why not try a Vietnamese version of the famous Inchon landing by Gen. Douglas MacArthur's forces in Korea?

It could, of course, come to that. But Administration officials say they doubt that it will—not on military grounds but on political grounds. The premise of Administration escalation of the war thus far has been that Red China will stay out as long as the United States does not invade North Vietnam or threaten the existence of Ho Chi Minh's regime. Mr. Johnson has said over and over that the United States has no intention of threatening the regime and does not covet a foot of the North's soil.

The use of nuclear weapons is ruled out—unless, of course, China enters the war and it becomes a vast Asian or world conflict.

The United States does not want war with China, but it wants to deny China a proxy victory in Vietnam. The China experts here differ on just what "flashpoint," as some put it, would bring China into Vietnam, but in general they believe Peking will stay out as long as America stays out of the North—however much we bomb military targets there.

The net of all this is the dreary prospect of escalated war and more American casualties, which the Administration sees no way of avoiding. The only hope one hears expressed in official circles is that a crack will develop in Hanoi's resolve if we turn up the heat—a crack that could lead to a peace conference, a cease-fire or, at a minimum, a reversion of the war to Vietcong guerrilla attacks in the South.

Of course, the Macawbers in the Administration could be right. The unexpected often happens in world affairs and some factor now hidden by Communist secrecy could reverse the trend. Or, on the other side, a new upheaval in Saigon's political structure could destroy the base under the American effort—as has been perilously close to the case on several occasions.

But with those limited caveats, Washington is grim and determined to see it through—and most everybody thinks President Johnson will order the military heat poured on to the fullest possible extent sooner rather than later.

WHAT ARE WE DOING IN VIETNAM?

(By Ronald Steel)

(Ronald Steel, the author of *End of Alliance*, is currently completing a book on American foreign policy to be published by Viking.)

"Triumph or Tragedy: Reflections on Vietnam," by Richard N. Goodwin, Random House, 142 pages, \$3.95.

Beneath the rival polemics of hawks and doves, the pragmatic justifications of escalation, and the anguished search for a political settlement, lies the greater tragedy of the war in Viet Nam: the erosion of the belief by the American people in the virtue of their cause. Within the tragedy of Viet Nam, there is an American tragedy as well. Confidence in national leadership has been replaced by doubt, commitment by baffled acquiescence, moderation by a growing impatience with stalemate. This is a war where open dissent has become a matter of course, where draft-dodging is not considered unpatriotic, where the Administration has lost the support of its own party in Congress. This is a Presidential war, for today, as Richard Goodwin comments in this provocative essay on our involvement in Viet Nam, "the Congressional power to declare war is little more than a ratification of events and acts already past."

For the first time in our history, we do not know why we are fighting, who our enemies are, or even what we mean by victory. Are we trying to contain China, to punish aggression, to show that wars of liberation cannot succeed, to build an anti-Communist bastion in South Viet Nam, or, as the President said recently in Omaha, to "determine whether might makes right"? Does anyone really know? Have the American people ever been honestly told? The President says he seeks a negotiated settlement, yet he pursues a course of military escalation that implies a search for total "victory." He has transformed this confusing struggle among dissident groups of Vietnamese into an American war against the tiny state of North Viet Nam. He has tried to force the leaders in Hanoi to negotiate with him by progressively devastating their country, yet he has not been able to break their will. His policy of escalation has been a military monstrosity and a political disaster, yet, as Mr. Goodwin observes, "Every step that falls calls forth not an admission of miscalculation but a demand for something more. It is the whole history of this war."

No one can doubt that the President is sick of this war, that he would like to turn American power away from the incineration of pajama-clad peasants to the achievement of his Great Society here at home. Yet he seems to have become obsessed by this war, letting it destroy his sense of proportion and inflate his rhetoric, just as it has swollen our involvement from a few hundred advisers to an army approaching half a million men. He claims that his war aims are modest, yet he is trying to achieve the virtually impossible task of creating a democratic, popularly supported, pro-American government in a land torn by revolution. He speaks of our "moral purpose" in words that would sound like the most cruel cynicism if they did not come from a conscience so obviously troubled. But he has not been able to define what that moral purpose is, or how it can be achieved by the devastation of the two Viet Nams, by the mounting sacrifice of American lives for a regime in Saigon which does not even have the allegiance of its own people, and by a continuing escalation that will almost certainly, as Mr. Goodwin warns, provoke the mass intervention of Hanoi's 300,000-man army and quite possibly lead to a war with China.

This is the impasse to which our Viet Nam policy has led us, and perhaps no one is better placed to analyze its origins than Mr. Goodwin, who was one of the brightest lights of the Kennedy intellectual team and also a special assistant to President Johnson before retiring temporarily from the corridors of power to his present post at Wesleyan University. His celebrated essay from *The New Yorker*, now in book form and padded with a collection of relevant docu-

19980

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 26, 1966

ments, is an illuminating and penetrating analysis of a war that happened more by accident than by design, of a commitment in which "each individual decision seemed reasonable, carefully limited, even necessary," but where men entrusted with the fate of the nation "looked cautiously ahead while the door closed slowly, ponderously behind us." Marred only by an opening section in appalling taste and an equivocal conclusion, this is an eloquent and incisive study that merits wide attention.

"Why should we try to contain China?", asks Mr. Goodwin, going to the heart of the question. For it is only on the assumption that we somehow are containing China that the intervention in Viet Nam can be justified. The question is direct, but the answer rather fuzzy. China must be contained because her expansion would undermine "the central world purpose of the United States—the creation of an international order of independent states." Further, he adds in a tantalizing, but unexplained, aside, such expansion "would inevitably feed the dark undercurrent of repression and militarism never wholly absent from American life." These are debatable answers at best, and it is unfortunate that Mr. Goodwin does not explain an argument which seems to rest on a combination of national purpose and national therapy. Similarly, he argues that we have a vital interest in denying China a sphere of influence in Asia, since "nations have no natural or God-given right to dominate those close to them"—which is perfectly true, yet this is what we grant the Russians in Eastern Europe and demand for ourselves in Latin America.

Yet even though he believes that America's "central world purpose" demands the containment of China, his scale is a relative one. "We are not compelled to fight for every inch of Asian soil or hazard war each time Chinese influence begins to grow," he comments in pointing out that Chinese control of Tibet cannot be measured on the same scale as an assault on India. Switching over from moral purpose to *Realpolitik*, he maintains that the crucial question is not whether Chinese influence is spreading, but where it is spreading. America's "central world purpose," it seems, is bounded by cold calculations of geopolitics and strategy.

On this scale, the fate of Viet Nam involves no vital American interest, and Mr. Goodwin observes quite correctly that "had the Communists succeeded in taking over the entire country, as they almost did, no sensible American would now be demanding that we go to war to recapture South Viet Nam." Demolishing the conventional reasons given for our involvement in Viet Nam—the SEATO pact, the belief that this is a testing ground for wars of national liberation, or the beginning of the fall of dominoes—he states with commendable frankness that we are fighting in Viet Nam only because we have foolishly committed our prestige. Our only vital interest in this war is "to establish that American military power, once committed to defend another nation, cannot be driven from the field. It is not to guarantee South Viet Nam forever against, the possibility of a Communist takeover."

Given this interpretation of our stake in Viet Nam, Mr. Goodwin believes that we must simultaneously follow the road of negotiation and the road of combat; negotiation which will permit the Viet Cong to be admitted to a share of power in an ultimately neutral Viet Nam; combat to "pacify" the South until negotiations take place. With persuasive eloquence, he urges a cessation to the bombing of the North and an honest American initiative for a settlement based on a cease-fire, withdrawal of foreign forces, free elections, and neutralization.

All this is eminently reasonable, and indeed the approach the Administration claims it favors. But in trying to limit the stake

in Viet Nam to one of national prestige, Mr. Goodwin does not give adequate weight to arguments which have now become more compelling in Washington. We may be fighting to save our prestige, as he suggests, but why did we commit our prestige in the first place? Was it not for the purpose of preventing a Communist, or perhaps even a neutral, South Viet Nam? Does anyone really believe that this Administration, having committed 400,000 soldiers and the prestige of the United States as a world power to the defense of an anti-Communist government in Saigon, will close up its bases and go away once the North has been crushed and the Viet Cong forces dispersed—leaving it to the Vietnamese to set up a neutral government? This is possible, but if it is true, it makes the entire war a colossal fraud. Mr. Goodwin is probably correct in his belief that since ritual anti-Communism is not a purpose worthy enough to justify American intervention in a strategically unimportant state like Viet Nam, our only vital interest is to salvage our prestige. But this is not the Administration's position, and in failing to address himself to problems it considers to be vital—such as the containment of China through United States protectorates along her frontiers—he is not really offering an alternative policy.

Mr. Goodwin's argument is also blunted by a certain inconsistency. While he believes that the United States has no vital interest in what kind of government rules Viet Nam, he argues that "in the South we have no choice but to continue the war," clearing guerrillas from the countryside and pursuing "a long, bloody, inconclusive war of attrition until returning sanity brings a political settlement." But if a Communist government in Saigon is no threat to American interests, whom should we fight a long, inconclusive war of attrition for a settlement we could have tomorrow? Either we are willing to accept a Communist Viet Nam—in which case we dump the Ky regime, install a neutralist government which will negotiate with Hanoi, and withdraw to our coastal bases until we can gracefully retire from the scene. Or else we seek a military "victory" that will maintain South Viet Nam as an anti-Communist bastion—in which case we pursue the policies of pacification outlined by Mr. Goodwin. Either America has a vital interest in the political future of Viet Nam or it doesn't. If it does, the Administration's policy is correct, although its rhetoric is hypocritical. If there is no such vital interest, then we can save our prestige by working out a deal with the Viet Cong. What does not make sense, however, is to continue full-scale combat in the South, while allowing the North to supply the Viet Cong with men and materials.

Mr. Goodwin is a man of considerable intellectual acuity who has written a lucid and forceful analysis of the tragedy in Viet Nam, but he has not fully come to terms with the contradictions of his own position. Straddling the fence between the role of an Administration spokesman ("we are under attack and withdrawal is impossible and unwise") and an uncommitted critic ("a substantial section of the community of power believes that military victory is our principal, perhaps our only, objective"), he compromises his own argument. The architect of our Viet Nam policy is not in the State Department or in the Pentagon, where Mr. Goodwin has searched for villains, but in the White House. It is here, for reasons best known to him, that this brilliant, but not altogether persuasive, prosecutor has refused to look.

UPTON SINCLAIR

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the most remarkable Americans in re-

cent history is Mr. Upton Sinclair. Perhaps best known for his celebrated novel, "The Jungle," Mr. Sinclair has carved out a place in history as a tireless and courageous champion of many progressive causes.

Last Sunday's Washington Post, August 21, 1966, carries an interesting reflection on this distinguished citizen by John Carmody. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AT 88, HIS WORLD IS LARGELY MEMORY—
UPTON SINCLAIR: LION TURNED TABBY
(By John Carmody)

The left hand was always busy, clutching a pillow, running along the top of the settee arm.

A thin, liver-freckled hand keeping time to memories that only Upton Sinclair could hear now, up in that 12th-floor apartment where he had come to rest, the journey nearly run.

"He is a saint, you know," his wife said, "such a sweet, dear man."

And now in the manner of loving old couples, she was leaning forward in her chair, prompting him with a Bernard Shaw anecdote for the visitor, Upton Sinclair's 88-year-old face alive with laughter at that 1912 visit. Or was it 1926?

"No, that was before the Lanny Budd stories," he said. "Love's Pilgrimage in 1911. Yes."

Yes. And H. G. Wells and G. K. Chesterton and the English Socialists when Socialist was a dirty word in a younger America and the white-hair-haloed old head bobbing with pleasure at the untold stories that shimmered in his mind.

"THE JUNGLE"

"The world has given its judgment," he said. "The Jungle" is what they'll remember.

"One of those publishers that makes fancy books brought out an elegant \$10 edition a few years ago. And I sat down in a friend's house and signed 2,500 sheets and sent them up to New York for the auto-graphed editions that cost \$25."

Sixty years ago: "The Jungle" ripped the Chicago packing house industry to shreds, prompted a Congressional investigation and struck a blow for the laboring man and consumer in this country that resounds still.

The year it was published, 1906, he stood for Congress from New Jersey on the Socialist ticket. A Socialist on the docks in Jersey. What angry memories are shimmering in that handsome head today.

LIKES TO READ

He paused. "They're bringing my library from the house in Monrovia (California) in a van. That's what I like to do now. I like to read. I don't like to do anything else."

"It was such a big empty house after my wife died," he said. "You must hear how I met my present wife." A broad smile as he summons the story he has told a hundred times in the five years since.

"No romance, now," said the former Mary Hard Willis, a South Carolina belle of 84, the teller of jokes, the prompter, the pourer of pineapple juice for her diabetic husband. A gracious, kindly woman who might be 20 years younger.

Sinclair and his wife of five years, are soon to move into their own apartment at the Grosvenor Park apartments near Rockville, two floors below her son-in-law's home they are temporarily sharing now.

August 26, 1966

19984

8. Plan for securing right type of U.S. leadership as short, intermediate and long term personnel for the project.

4. Develop an adequate plan for step by step process of turning project over to indigenous leadership. Take adequate time before releasing the project.

5. Training of village leaders. (Illustration) *Faith and Farm Program of Nigeria*. Study of moral and spiritual requirements coupled with practical work as Peter Batchelor, an Agricultural Missionary, has done in Nigeria. The Bible and other sacred books can become practical basic texts as used by Mr. Batchelor. Many leaders are adapting the above methods.

V. AN OVERRIDING ISSUE

Honesty, integrity and a sense of personal value and worth are essential. There needs to be developed a sense of mutuality and cooperative sharing along with the development of sound business practices. These are interdependent and are a necessary part of development, service motive is necessary if worthwhile changes are to be accomplished anywhere. Voluntary groups have a major role in helping this and the following generations to understand, maintain and develop this concept. This approach will greatly aid in meeting and solving the "root causes" of hunger.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America are emerging upon the international scene at a time of turmoil and tension. Their own colonial backgrounds have left them with an inherent suspicion of Western countries and Western standards. Theoretically, such countries should be likely prey for the false gods of Marxism, of rapid industrialization, and a quick transformation into automated, modern societies.

But the fact is that, because communism has been so close at hand, it has not been able to mask its own particular kind of reality. In a recent address before the Australian Council of Churches Geoffrey Fairborn points out that these nations "know by now that communism is a vast confidence trick perpetrated against peasants. They know—that where communism successfully grows out of the barrel of a gun, the peasants are herded on to collective farms as state slaves. The result is economically appalling. For example, the per capita production of grain in the Soviet Union was higher in 1913 than in 1961. The same thing happened in North Vietnam after the Communist conquest of 1954."

No place in the underdeveloped world have men and women voluntarily chosen communism. They have seen that communism means brutal tyranny, and that it does not result in economic advance, but in almost total economic decay.

The resources of North Vietnam, as of other Communist states, are not used to improve the lives of the people but are used to pursue a policy of aggressive expansion.

Our allies in the free world are coming to appreciate the real meaning of the conflict in Vietnam in the light of the proclaimed goal of world communism to stimulate so-called wars of national liberation throughout the world.

In his address, Mr. Fairborn, a scholar, teacher, and political writer, presents his assessment of this conflict:

I simply see no alternative to the American commitment in South Vietnam and our support of it. For this is not an attempt by the West to put down an indigenous peasant rising, "a response to economic and political conditions" as some intellectuals believe. What is happening in South Vietnam is not only an invasion through methods of revolutionary guerrilla warfare: it is part of a grand design by China to alter catastrophically the balance of world power. And should it succeed then world war is virtually inevitable.

The view presented by Mr. Fairborn is a view which is growing throughout the non-Communist world, especially in Asia where the menace of Chinese power is so immediately threatening. I wish to share this analysis with my colleagues, and I therefore ask unanimous consent for its insertion in the RECORD at this point.

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

[Item No. 113, documents of the Council Against Communist Aggression, March 1966]

ADDRESS TO THE "UNCO GOOD"

(By Geoffrey Fairbairn, Canberra, Australia)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Geoffrey Fairbairn, who is a gentle scholar and teacher and political writer today, as he was a quiet but tough commando officer and early expert on the new and old guerrilla warfare developed both during and after World War II, is as aware as anyone of the odd, illogical, off again-on again but highly opinionated role of individual and organized churchmen, particularly in strongly Protestant countries during the rise and fall of Hitler and, even more notably, his (Hitler's) affectionate admirer, Joe Stalin and successors. Fairbairn has won a hearing and won support of students for his "profreedom" and "face the world's reality" appeal of the informed anti-Communist forces of the world. His appeal to Australian churchmen, so tardy on Hitler and worse than tardy on Mao and Ho Chi-minh, stands on its merits and the rather tragic facts of past history.)

(This article is the text of Geoffrey Fairbairn's address . . . to a Sydney conference of the Australian Council of Churches. (The Bulletin, Sept. 11, 1965).)

WHERE I STAND

A personal statement on Vietnam

Mr. Chairman, Reverend Sirs: I believe that the Americans and Australians in South Vietnam are fighting for world peace, and I propose to explain why I believe that. I do not stand here as some tame apologist for the present Government. I have again and again attacked what I believed to be its insouciance about the great issues in Asia. I have many times criticized its attitudes towards Asians.

I have a kind of foster-son—for years while he grew to manhood I was in effect his foster-father—who lives in Burma near the Chinese border and I am conscious all the time of the dangers that he and his Australian wife and their children face today. When I speak about guerrilla warfare I do not speak as an academic. At every local discussion such as this one, a large part of my mind is in other places: the road between Kutkai and Namkham where that great medical missionary Segrave worked until he died in the hospital that he and his wife and his sister built with their own hands out of stone laboriously moved from the Shwe-Li River, the border between Burma and China. It was on that road that the Shan Burmese family, of whom I am an honorary member, learned that guerrillas had the same day inadvertently killed their small niece. They were not Communist guerrillas.

I keep remembering the faces of my Arkanese friends in Western Burma the day the Burmese Army—an army representing a very Left-wing government—had bombarded a village, killing some innocent people, in order to attack local Communist guerrillas. I remember the frightened faces of rubber tappers in Malaya during the height of the Communist insurrection in Johore in 1951—and remember my own fears as the very brave Welsh plantation manager drove me through the shadowy lines of the rubber plantation, where his assistant had been killed not very long before. I remember the gentle face of a Vietnamese Army officer, seconded to civilian duties in the Central Highlands of Vietnam in 1962, and the frightened young—oh, so very young—faces of his militia boys as they awaited attack from Vietnamese Communist guerrillas. Indeed, I even keep remembering a day 20 years ago when I went up-river behind the Japanese lines in Borneo; remember the fear on the villagers' faces lest our operation be unsuccessful and bring Japanese reprisals upon them. I also remember a little boy on a beach in the Philippines a little earlier: his right arm a bandaged stump, the result of our bombardment earlier in the morning . . . oh, no, I loathe both guerrilla war and the methods involved in its putting down.

I simply see no alternative to the American commitment in South Vietnam and our support of it. For this is not an attempt by the West to put down an indigenous peasant rising, "a response to economic and political conditions" as some intellectuals believe. What is happening in South Vietnam is not only an invasion through methods of revolutionary guerrilla warfare: it is part of a grand design by China to alter catastrophically the balance of world power. And should it succeed then world war is virtually inevitable.

Contained by the wills of free men in Western Europe, the Soviet Union has been forced to take stock of its position and of the realities of the thermonuclear balance of terror. It turned its energies toward social betterment, toward a hitherto undreamed-of humanism, toward a real effort to cooperate in keeping world peace. China acted differently. China is biologically unafraid of a nuclear holocaust. China talked, and talks today, in terms of war "as the highest form of struggle"—"war will become a bridge over which mankind will pass into a new era of history." A "beautiful new future," according to this viewpoint, will be built upon "the debris of a dead imperialism." I do ask you, most humbly, if we have not in such a viewpoint a truly terrible threat to world peace? Have the Americans ever talked in those terms? I ask you at this point to remember that American airpower could tomorrow, in a matter of hours, reduce the Red River Delta of Tonkin to a raging flood, against which the energies of the Vietnamese people have been bent for over 2000 years. Instead of doing this, young Americans are dying in and around Maquis D, around Chu Lai, Da Nang, Dak Sut, Kontum, Pleiku—dying individually near places whose names are probably unfamiliar to you. The Americans could end the war tomorrow by bombing the river control system of North Vietnam. They do not do so. Do you really believe the Chinese would not do so if the positions were reversed?

I must confess to finding the present situation here rather eerie, rather unreal. When the campaign against South Vietnam was launched through means of revolutionary guerrilla warfare, there were very few Americans indeed in Vietnam. The number of village officials, and their wives and their children, assassinated or kidnapped each year by the Vietcong vastly exceeded the number of American advisers. I hope that the churchmen protesters against American-Australian involvement today protested against those murders and kidnappings. (Ed.: they did not

August 26, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19983

13. Poor educational techniques, systems and dissemination of basic knowledge

- (a) Lack of understanding of what is needed in practical education and information which will help people meet their basic needs
- (b) Little understanding of types, values and needs of trade schools
- (c) Too great a desire for classical education which often gets in the way of economic development rather than assisting it

14. Slow industrial growth

- (a) Too great a percentage of the population on the land
 - (b) Not enough people producing consumer goods at prices people can pay
 - (c) Lack of capital and broad based understanding of economic development
 - (d) Lack of understanding that industry must be of the size and nature to be practical for a given area and at a given time (Agriculture is basic but other development must be kept in balance and grow along with agriculture.)
- (Additional points listed elsewhere in the outline apply in this section.)

15. Little understanding of nutritional needs and resources

- (a) Limited knowledge of the values of many foods, a taste for, and a desire to eat them (In certain countries abundant peanuts are pressed into oil with the cake being used as fertilizer, for which it has little value, when it could be finely ground and used as a high protein food in their native breads and other foods.)
- (b) A new appreciation is needed by all nations as to the basic contributions of nutritionists and home economists
- (c) Lack of understanding that most nations can produce high protein foods at reasonable costs or secure them from other nations in exchange for local products

16. Poor health conditions

- (a) Often caused by malnutrition
- (b) The sick and lethargic produce inadequate food supplies
- (c) Many children born but only few reach adulthood
- (d) Improved health conditions result in population explosion—spiral of poor health begins again

17. Unsound government policy and often lack of responsibility to the governed

- (a) Corrupt governments
- (b) Poor tax systems (not basic to local or national needs)
- (c) Basic ignorance of modern economic business methods in government
- (d) Inadequate use of available funds for development purposes
- (e) Long histories of being governed or controlled by outside governments (colonialism)

A basic tenet of section I: Principles of honesty, integrity, sense of personal worth and motivation for improving oneself and sharing with others are implicit in the Christian heritage and are needed. In economic development these are basic to the concept of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man and have some basis on which to build in many religions. Religious principles, however, are without form and void if they are not involved in all the programs, concepts and forces of life related to overcoming the root causes of hunger among all the peoples of the earth. Solving the root causes of hunger is the overwhelming challenge of our time.

II. SOME STEPS AND ANALYSES IN DEALING WITH THE ROOT CAUSES OF HUNGER

1. Preliminary Study of Types and Kinds of Programs with Analysis of Their Successes and Failures

- (a) U.S. AID programs in a given country
- (b) FAO and other UN agencies
- (c) Foundations and related groups
- (d) Cooperatives and other private businesses

(e) Missions programs of the denominations and other church groups

(f) The work of other voluntary agencies

(g) All levels and kinds of educational institutions (government, private, extension)

(h) The general attitude and stability of the government of the country from village to national and reverse (Knowledge of what present programs include.)

2. In gathering information from these groups, also get suggestions of projects to meet unmet needs. Study several countries, analyze steps in mobilization of resources and necessary groups to achieve purposes of any development program, project or program selection.

3. Remember that most of the technicians and supervisors from America are lay churchmen. They can help decide what the major role of each group is and how the groups can work together. The role of the church needs to be understood and accepted by all, as does the role of other groups.

III. AN APPROACH TO A COUNTRY BY VOLUNTARY GROUPS

(This would include groups like Church World Service, CARE, Foundations, Educational Groups, etc.)

1. Send appropriate persons to the country to do preliminary study of present programs of the group involved, using I and II above as a guide. In cooperation with national leaders, select a comprehensive new project where resources are available, using the above valuation and principles.

2. Develop an agreement with one of the colleges, universities or other educational institutions in planning a work-study training program. Enroll only those persons who will work on the project and spend part time in study (short term training.) Find the best training institutions which have something to contribute and will work under these principles.

3. Use U.S. personnel paired with native personnel. Secure U.S. farmers, cooperative managers, extension personnel and vocational agriculture teachers as basic leaders. Such persons can be secured on loan from other agencies and groups to develop church and other voluntary group programs. (The 1966 Food for Freedom Bill makes this possible.)

4. Continue study of what groups have done and are continuing to do. Do regular evaluations, with complete yearly analysis.

5. Go into a project or program only after all denominations or other groups responsible have agreed on what is to be done, how it is to be done, and under whose authority and responsibility it is to be done. Attempt comprehensive projects only after long term agreements are reached. If another group can better do the project let it take the leadership but cooperate in the project. Jealousy among agencies is one of the greatest hazards to successful programs.

6. Carefully select only those new major projects or programs which have a good opportunity for success. Plan some projects for quick success, some for intermediate and some for long term development.

7. Continue to adapt and rebuild present programs in the light of steps and principles found in this outline.

8. Develop literature and other educational materials out of experience in the field. Most materials must be prepared on the spot. Use U.S. agencies, AID, foundations and cooperative materials prepared for the area. (Much promotional work must be by practical demonstration and by direct contacts.)

9. Prepare materials for U.S. understanding and support. There is not enough information sent to the groups that furnish the money to keep their support.

10. Hire an executive for the country where a comprehensive program is being developed, who can deal with top level persons in government and all agencies as listed in II who

can be helpful in launching programs. This will create new status and will put voluntary groups in a much more favorable light in many countries.

IV. PROJECT SELECTION

The following illustrations are given as examples which are now being supported as development techniques in various parts of the world. The same principles may be applied and questions asked in other types of projects or programs.

1. Example 1—Developing a credit program

- (a) Analysis of the type of credit needed
- (b) Percentage of assets which can be secured and developed locally
- (c) Securing other needed assets which are basic to the operation
- (d) Credit to the borrowers at terms which meet local needs.
- (e) Agreement on proper purposes for borrowing
- (f) Borrowers understanding of how to use funds for productive purposes
- (g) Create proper governmental attitudes and understanding
- (h) If an agency in the U.S. has any supervisory control over the program its consent and understanding is needed in developing the program

(1) Comprehensive educational programs in the use of credit among the executives, directors, and borrowers who are in any way related to the program (Many books and booklets are available on the subject of credit for almost any kind of credit program from government agencies, foundations and cooperatives.)

2. Example 2—Water well drilling

- (a) A comprehensive study of the proper location of wells to adequately serve an area and not destroy the permanent water supply
- (b) Cost of bringing water to the surface
- (c) Storage of water
- (d) Decision on priorities in use of water such as:

- (1) direct human use
- (2) livestock
- (3) irrigation
- (4) industrial use
- (e) Irrigation
 - (1) cost of land leveling
 - (2) types of canals
 - (3) distance to fields
 - (4) cost of distribution of water
 - (5) how water is owned (cooperative, etc.)
 - (f) Use of additional crops produced because of irrigation
 - (1) storage for home use and commercial sales
 - (2) method of distribution
 - (3) cost of each segment of operation
 - (4) what does the farmer and each person involved get out of it?

3. Example 3—Poultry

If a specific program or project is selected (poultry, as an example) some questions must be answered: (Use the same process of analysis for any project.)

1. Is there a potential market at reasonable cost? Can training and facilities be made available for

- (a) Developing a hatching program for broilers and laying flocks.
- (b) Assurance of control of disease problems (Usually a poultry department at an educational institution is necessary.)
- (c) Developing an adequate supply of formula feed
- (d) A feasible and economical marketing program

- (e) Securing credit at reasonable rates
- (f) Availability of necessary leadership to be trained for the entire operation
- (g) Develop salary scales above yet in harmony with the economy of the area.

2. Necessary analysis of local desires vs. possibilities of success. (They often dream the impractical.) How to bridge the two and help them find success.

August 26, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19985

either individually or collectively, even once.) Otherwise quite clearly a double standard of morality is being insinuated upon the Australian public. When over 50,000 North Vietnamese were executed after atrocious public humiliations I hope the protesters of today publicly protested (Ed.: they did not and don't even know it yet)—since this was the inevitable consequence of Communist victory in the North, as it will be in the South. I hope protesters are aware of what will happen to supporters of the South Vietnamese Government should the Communists win. I hope that when the state power of the North Vietnamese Communist society trained artillery upon the protesting peasants of Nghe-An, Ho Chi-minh's home province, the clerical protesters of today protested then; and when Hanoi University was closed down in order to prevent some kind of teach-ins. Otherwise a double standard of morality is being imposed upon Australian citizens.

Now today I refuse to get side-tracked into technicalities. I would rather put this to you; South-East Asia is composed of new nations that might well be supposed to favor Communist ideas. They all have, in varying degrees, memories of humiliations imposed by Westerners. They have all discovered disabilities in themselves, since independence, so far as modernising techniques are concerned. They are all disappointed by their own political and economic achievements, and so they are all only too apt to talk in terms of an economically dominating neo-colonialism (and there is truth, economically, in this talk). They are chiefly Left-wing in point of social policy. But no where have the presumably "higher ideas" of Communism issued in a Communist government by popular acclaim, through elections.

The chief reason for this is that they are peasant countries and they know by now that Communism is a vast confidence trick perpetrated against peasants. They know—that where Communism successfully grows out of the barrel of a gun, the peasants are herded on to collective farms as State slaves. The result is economically appalling. For example, the per capita production of grain in the Soviet Union was higher in 1913 than in 1961 (Mr. Khrushchev's figures, not mine). The same thing happened in North Vietnam after the Communist conquest of 1954. Production in the South grew by 20 per cent, it dropped by 10 per cent in the North.

I look forward to a day when China, when the great energies of Chinese civilisation are forced back by the wills of free men to the task of bettering its own people. I look forward to the day when the nations of South-East Asia—Left-wing and Right-wing—are united in the common purpose of harnessing the Mekong River. I look forward to the day when an Australian Peace Corps will be active in the villages of South-East Asia.

But first the Chinese "line," the Chinese attempt to extend violence of a brilliantly systematised kind throughout South-East Asia, Latin America, and Africa, must be repulsed. Peace depends upon this repulsion. Hope depends upon this repulsion. This repulsion simply must not be stayed on its way by the neuroses and double standards of morality and political gormlessness. I am not prepared to stand in some apologetic stance, even before such an august audience as this. It is we who represent the open future for the hearts and minds of men and women—we, not the totalitarians. By "we," I do not have to add that I mean those South-East Asians who are fighting and bleeding and dying—the South Vietnamese armed forces have suffered casualties equivalent to those of Australia during World War II, fighting for the freedom to choose their future. I want to quote a man who once symbolised the dour, enduring decency of free men, Winston Churchill: "Never give in. Never, never, never, never. Never yield to

force and the apparently overwhelming might of the enemy. Never yield in any way, great or small, large or petty, except to convictions of honor and good sense."

After all, we are back in 1938 now.

PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD two additional statements given by witnesses before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments on the question of prayer in the public schools.

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

SYNAGOGUE COUNCIL OF AMERICA AND NATIONAL COMMUNITY RELATIONS ADVISORY COUNCIL

Testimony presented to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Judiciary Committee on the Dirksen Prayer Amendment (S.J. Res. 148) August 8, 1966, by the Joint Advisory Committee of the Synagogue Council of America and the National Community Relations Advisory Council, 55 West 42nd St., New York, N.Y. 10036. Constituent Organizations of the Synagogue Council of America and National Community Relations Advisory Council—American Jewish Committee; American Jewish Congress; B'nai B'rith—Anti-Defamation League; Central Conference of American Rabbis; Jewish Labor Committee; Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A.; National Council of Jewish Women; Rabbinical Assembly; Rabbinical Council of America; Union of American Hebrew Congregations; Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America; United Synagogue of America.

I am Rabbi Seymour J. Cohen, a member of the Conservative rabbinate, Rabbi of Anshe Emet Synagogue in Chicago, and President of the Synagogue Council of America.

With me are Rabbi Henry Slegman, a member of the Orthodox rabbinate, and Executive Vice President of the Synagogue Council of America, Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch, a member of the Reform rabbinate, and Director of the Religious Action Center of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in Washington, D.C., and Mr. Milton I. Goldstein, an attorney from St. Louis, Missouri, who is Vice-Chairman of the Commission on Church-State and Interreligious Relationships of the National Community Relations Advisory Council.

The Synagogue Council of America represents the American Jewish religious community through its constituent rabbinic and congregational groups. The organizations which constitute the Synagogue Council of America are the Rabbinical Assembly (the rabbinic group of Conservative Judaism), the United Synagogue of America (the congregational group of Conservative Judaism), the Rabbinical Council of America (the rabbinic group of Orthodox Judaism), the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America (the congregational organization of Orthodox Judaism), the Union of American Hebrew Congregations (the congregational body of Reform Judaism). These rabbinic and congregational groups include in their membership virtually all religiously committed and synagogue-affiliated Jews within our country.

The National Community Relations Advisory Council is composed of the three congregational bodies just mentioned, six other major national organizations—American Jewish Committee; American Jewish Congress; B'nai B'rith—Anti-Defamation League; Jewish Labor Committee; Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A.; National Council of Jewish Women—and 79 Jewish community relations councils in local communities across the United States.

We are here today as representatives of

the Synagogue Council of America and the National Community Relations Advisory Council, and their respective constituent agencies. The policy statements on which this testimony is based have been approved overwhelmingly in the respective General Assemblies of these agencies.

As clergymen and religious leaders in our respective branches of Judaism, and as spokesmen for Jewish lay organizations, we are deeply committed to a vision of a society that is guided by religious values and that is imbued with a transcendent sense of Godliness permeating every human activity. It is a vision described in our liturgy "of a world perfected under the Kingdom of God." That is our daily prayer, and in our various enterprises and activities, as Americans and as Jews, we strive and hope to make that vision somewhat more of a reality.

We are thus spiritually attuned and practically oriented to what is surely the very antithesis of secularism. Our goal is the "holy" society. But, as we will indicate presently, there is a crucial difference between society and state. In our plural society, the state must be truly neutral if society is to achieve holiness. It is for these reasons that we appear before you, to voice our deep concern over the issues raised by the proposed amendment to our Constitution.

Like all American citizens, we cannot view with equanimity any effort whose effect—whether intended or not—may be to diminish our Bill of Rights in any way. As religionists, we have an additional and very special stake, because this Bill of Rights, and particularly the First Amendment, have since the founding of our Republic assured a climate which has made for unparalleled growth of religious activity and affiliation in this country. We would therefore oppose any effort to tamper with this precious heritage, unless such a change were to serve an overriding and urgent social need which could not be achieved in any other way. Our position, stated plainly and in brief, is that the proposed amendment would result in consequences which are undesirable constitutionally, and fundamentally inimical to religious interests.

The legal effect of S.J. Res. 148, it should be noted, is by no means clear. It purports to be designed to permit "the voluntary participation by students or others in prayer" in the public schools. If this means only the "voluntary" offering of prayers by children in accordance with what they have been taught at home or in church or synagogue, the Amendment is unnecessary. Nothing in any of the recent Supreme Court decisions interpreting the First Amendment bars such activity and no school authority, so far as we are aware, had so interpreted them.

The Court's decisions deal with something altogether different—organized religious practices in the classroom. And discussion of the decisions has dealt almost exclusively with such practices. Hence, it is reasonable to assume that S.J. Res. 148, despite the ambiguity of its wording, is also directed at this area. It would presumably permit a number of practices that cannot be termed "voluntary" in the sense described above. Thus, Senator DIRKSEN's statement accompanying introduction of the Resolution makes it clear that he intends it to permit joint recitation of prayers by children in the classroom and the presentation of plainly sectarian celebrations of Christmas and other religious holidays.

The key words in the Resolution, stressed by Senator DIRKSEN in his statement, are those that allow public school authorities to provide for as well as permit classroom prayer. Thus the Amendment would sanction placing the full authority of the school establishment behind certain religious practices. That authority would in no way be

19986

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 26, 1966

impaird either by dubbing the practice "voluntary" or by barring state determination of the prayer's form and content. For example, school public address systems could be used to pipe into the classrooms specific prayers selected by student committees.

The concept of organized religious activity in the public school classroom totally free of the influence of the state is, we submit, a delusion. It is our impression that that delusion is not shared by the principal sponsors of S.J. Res. 158. Senator DIRKSEN, at least, has made it entirely clear that religious practices should be affirmatively fostered by government in the public school. While we profoundly disagree with that point of view, we respect it. We urge, however, that discussion of S.J. Res. 148 be on the basis of its true intent and effect—not in the fairyland of a theoretical and totally non-existent voluntarism.

The Supreme Court decisions holding that the First Amendment bars organized religious practices in the public school rest primarily on the Amendment's ban of any establishment of religion by the state. It has been argued that the decisions ignore the Amendments equally important guarantee of religious freedom. That guarantee, we submit, does not in any sense require governmental support of religion which is what S.J. Res. 148 would foster. It requires rather that individuals be allowed to act according to the dictates of their conscience with only that minimum of restraint by the state necessitated by compelling public needs. It not only does not require, it forbids, support from governmental authority.

S.J. Res. 148 would place the force of government behind prayer. Any doubt that this would be the effect of the proposed Amendment can be removed by considering the context in which it would appear. It would be seen as emerging from the unfavorable reaction to the Court's prayer decisions. Hence the tendency would be to assume—and to act on the assumption—that the school prayers which had been ruled unconstitutional by the Court are now allowed. (That the laborious and historic process of constitutional amendment had been invoked without any consequent change would certainly seem most unreasonable.) To most people, who are not familiar with legal minutia, this will simply mean that school-conducted devotional ceremonies with which the Court decisions dealt "are in again."

But even where conscious efforts will be made to abide by the amendment's provision that school officials may not prescribe the form or content of any prayer, the result will inexorably be the same. Anyone remotely familiar with the dynamics of the classroom situation knows that that is inevitable. The phrase "voluntary participation" is obviously not intended to suggest a situation in which each child recites his own prayers aloud; this could only result in disorder and chaos. To have children pray in unison requires that someone choose a particular prayer. It requires, furthermore, the supervision and direction of a teacher, and the teacher's supervisory role constitutes the sanctioning by the State of a particular prayer, irrespective of how the choice of prayer was made. We are therefore right back to the problem of an "establishment of religion" by the State.

Furthermore, all children who happen to be assigned to the same class irrespective of their religious affiliation, must participate together in this "free exercise," or be silent, or to ask to be excused from the room. To these children, the proposed amendment would deny the free exercise of religion. We refer members of this committee to the voluminous testimony before the House Judiciary Committee during the 1964 hearings on the Becker amendment in support of the contention that children can never be wholly free of constraint in a setting whose entire atmosphere is one of compliance and conformity to group activities.

But Constitutional considerations aside, we find such a prospect objectionable for religious reasons. Here, the insights of Jewish tradition may perhaps throw a somewhat different and helpful light on the problem.

Jewish tradition, not unlike most other religious traditions, knows of two kinds of prayer: private prayer, and public prayer. There is hardly a place or activity that in Jewish tradition renders private prayers inappropriate. A Jew is bidden to recite private prayers before he eats or drinks, on the completion of his meals, on beholding the beauty of God's nature, when putting on a new garment, upon hearing good tidings—in short, there is virtually no aspect of human experience that a Jew is not bidden to sanctify with prayer. There is, therefore, nothing inappropriate, from a Jewish religious point of view, and we might add, from a Constitutional point of view, in a student reciting private prayers during the course of his school day, provided he does not obstruct or impede the normal school program.

Public prayer is an entirely different matter again. Let us be clear about the nature of the problem. The difficulty is not the location as such, nor is it essentially what some critics have prejudicially described as "routine, formalized, mechanical recitation." In Jewish tradition, public prayers can be recited virtually anywhere (though the synagogue is its most appropriate setting.) Our prayers, not unlike the public prayers of most other faiths, are formalized both as to content and manner of recitation. This is necessarily so, for prayer is the singular expression of a particular faith community, shaped and formed by, and giving expression to a unique historical encounter with the Divine. For this very same reason, however, it is an act of gross religious insensitivity to involve in such a deeply sectarian experience children of differing faiths. This kind of indiscriminate and superficial religiosity leads to a trivialization and desecration of genuine worship.

This, then, is the religious ground, as distinguished from the political, on which we base our opposition to sectarian prayers in the public schools. It is on this same ground that we would oppose non-sectarian prayers. Prayer that is not rooted in specific faith and in distinctive religious commitment is a meaningless, empty exercise. Moreover, given the intimate, spiritually and historically unique character of religious faith and commitment which characterizes each individual faith community, there is no greater enemy of religion than a state that promotes non-sectarian religion.

The knowledge, worship and obedience of the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, or the God of Jesus, or the God of Mohammed or instilled within the total life of unique historical faith communities. The non-sectarian god who is taught under the sponsorship of the state is at best a banal one. At worst; he turns out to be an idol against whom the witness of all genuine religions is directed.

Does this mean that God and religion are to be banished from our national life, or that the religious foundations of this national life are being challenged? The answer is clearly and emphatically, "no!" We are in fact a predominantly religious people in our origins and in our traditions. As clergymen, we seek to make religion an even more effective part of our society's life than it is. Certainly, there is room in American life for a broadening and deepening of genuine religious commitment. But this spiritual heritage and this religious character is to be attributed to the American people and to American society as such, and decidedly not to the American state as such.

The state derives its authority from society, and within that limited authority it governs society. But the state is not society. Because we are a religious society our Founding Fathers deliberately subtracted from the state any competence in the area of religion. They wisely understood that religious neutrality

of the state is the essential condition of religious freedom in a pluralistic society.

A government that does not interfere with religion is thus secular in character, but it is not secularistic. While it does not promote religion, neither does it promote secularist ideologies that are inimical to religious faith. It assumes a neutral stance. Such neutrality, far from suggesting hostility or indifference, creates an atmosphere in which the synagogue, the church and the home are free to develop and strengthen religious commitment. Any breach of this neutrality, far from aiding religion, can only lead to a violation of the integrity of our religious communities.

Our Constitution can of course be amended; the procedures for amendment are provided for within this same document. But we are here to assert that if the Constitution is amended in accordance with S.J. Res. 148, then let no one who supports this measure delude himself or his countrymen that he has rendered religion or liberty a service. In a plural society, it is not and should not be the business of government to aid religion, and if it does assume that role, then, in the very process and precedent it establishes, it does religion a harm and disservice that will far outweigh the intended benevolence. For it will have compromised that free and unfettered exercise of religious liberty without which religious faith cannot for long retain its integrity and independence. Our profound respect for the role of our legislature and for the sacrificial desire of its members to serve the common good leads us to say to members of this committee: your business is not the promotion of religion. It is rather the preservation of a free and just society, for that, and nothing other and nothing less, offers the surest safeguard for the preservation and strengthening of our religious heritage.

STATEMENT OF DR. CARL MCINTIRE FOR THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF CHRISTIAN CHURCHES IN SUPPORT OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 148, THE DIRKSEN PRAYER AMENDMENT

(Presented to Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, August 5, 1966)

Gentlemen: I appear in behalf of the American Council of Christian Churches of which I am a member of the executive committee. This Council consists of 17 Protestant denominations in the United States.

I am president of the International Council of Christian Churches with 111 denominations over the world, of which the American Council is an affiliate. The American Council is in no way to be confused with the National Council of Churches; in fact, it is comprised mainly of church bodies and local churches which have withdrawn from the National Council of Churches.

The denominations affiliated with the American Council of Christian Churches have, in various ways, indicated their support of prayer in the public schools. We know of no local church or even an individual in any of the churches that is opposed to the youth of this country praying, on a voluntary basis, while in our public schools.

The Dirksen Amendment, we believe, should become a part of the Constitution of the United States as soon as possible. The Dirksen Amendment in no way alters or changes the First Amendment. The effect of this amendment is to correct this condition produced in the country as a result of a decision of the Supreme Court, June 17, 1963, and to restore to all of the American people the liberty that they formerly enjoyed under the First Amendment and also the Ninth and Tenth Amendments before the Supreme Court's action.

Further, in no way does this proposed amendment alter or interfere with the doctrine of separation of church and state which the American Council is zealous to maintain.

August 26, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19989

vides that such men must start their training within four months of enlistment but the Army's training facilities are so swamped with draftees that these men—of draft age—are, legally, draft exempt.

Defense Department sources, moreover, estimate that 170,000 Army reservists and 300,000 National Guardsmen of draft age have completed their training but otherwise have done no active service in the nation's behalf. Many, it is thought, have the M.O.S.'s (military occupational specialties) urgently needed in Vietnam, including helicopter mechanics, warehousemen and others with special skills.

SUBTLE HINT?

To tap this rich source of manpower, Senator RUSSELL prevailed on the Senate this week to vote 66 to 21 to empower—but not oblige—the President to call up individual reservists who had completed their training for approximately 18 months active duty, presumably in Vietnam.

The measure, co-sponsored by Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican of Massachusetts, provides that consideration shall be given to those with (A) family responsibilities and (B) employment deemed necessary to maintain the national "health, safety or interest." But it makes no provisions for educational (college) deferments.

The measure is intended, primarily, to sweep up the young men who have volunteered, legally and perhaps even patriotically, in the Army Reserve and National Guard but who, until the law changes, may be permanently spared active duty in Southeast Asia.

The "scandal" to which Senator RUSSELL alluded appears on its way out. So far the White House and Pentagon have refrained from any major reaction and it may be that the Russell-Saltonstall measure, if accepted by the House, will be ignored by the Commander in Chief, President Johnson.

[From the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Daily Republic, Aug. 23, 1966]

SIX HUNDRED THOUSAND AVAILABLE

The Ready Reserve and National Guard, more than 600,000 strong, will be available for service in Viet Nam at the President's call under legislation passed by the Congress. The action bypasses the need for the President to declare a national emergency in order to resort to this military pool.

President Johnson did not ask for this authority and may be loath to use it. But Congress has become restive about the high draft calls while the Ready Reserve and Guardsmen, who were trained and who could be sent almost at once, were not called.

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, argued that it was a "scandal" that young, untrained men were being drafted while Reservists and Guardsmen were enjoying sanctuary because they had signed up for these services and trained for six months and then should be called to active duty.

"We're scraping the bottom of the barrel, taking men with lower mental and educational standards than is required for reservists," RUSSELL said. "It is not fair for Reservists and Guardsmen to enjoy sanctuary with only brief training periods while volunteers and draftees carry the brunt of the military buildup."

Congress responded overwhelmingly for the call to the Reservists and Guardsmen because they have been hearing from their constituents about the unfairness of letting them off active duty while the draft calls are rising to 40,000 and more a month.

The action was bipartisan. It was led by RUSSELL and the ranking Republican member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL of Massachusetts.

However, the legislation only authorizes the President to call up Reservists and

Guardsmen. He is not compelled to do so, and is not apt to unless things get much worse in Viet Nam. The members of Congress have discharged their duty as they see it, leaving the ultimate decision where it belongs—with the commander-in-chief.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM AND THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a historical essay captioned "Lincoln's Battle with 'Doves' During the Civil War," by Henry Owen, which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of June 12, 1966. I feel that this essay is particularly timely and pertinent because of the light it throws on some of the difficulties we are experiencing in connection with the conduct of the war in Vietnam.

Today we are confronted with a still small but growing minority of people who feel that peace could be restored in Vietnam if only we were prepared to negotiate on reasonable terms.

Lincoln in his day was also confronted by a restive articulate minority which held that peace and the Union could both be restored if only the President were disposed to be more reasonable—which, if it meant anything, meant he would not insist on the abolition of slavery.

Today the administration is assailed by critics who tell us that we can never win the war in Vietnam.

The Lincoln administration in its day was also assailed by critics who sang a similar tune. Mr. Owen, for example, quoted Mr. Clement Vallandigham, who had been exiled for antiwar agitation, as saying:

You have not conquered the South. You never will. It is not in the nature of things possible . . . Stop fighting. Make an armistice. Accept at once foreign mediation.

The conduct of the Vietnam war has been handicapped by teach-in movements and demonstrations; assailed by petitions and editorials, and opposed by political elements, ranging from the Communists on one side to the pacifists and isolationist Republicans and Democrats on the other side.

But the opposition encountered by President Johnson in the prosecution of the Vietnam war is really small stuff compared with the opposition encountered by President Lincoln. Mr. Owen notes that the 1862 congressional elections went heavily against the Lincoln administration in the Midwest, and that after this election the Illinois House of Representatives passed an antiwar resolution by a large majority, while the Indiana Legislature refused appropriations for raising troops.

Mr. Owen also noted that:

The roster of American newspapers calling for peace included the New York Daily News, the New York Tribune (on-and-off), the Cincinnati Enquirer, the Columbus Crisis, the Detroit Free Press, the Indianapolis Sentinel, the Chicago Times, and many others.

Mr. Owen also recalls that in August 1864 the chairman of the National Republican Committee warned Lincoln that he had lost so much support that if an election were held at that time

Lincoln would probably be beaten. He notes that 1 month later, in September:

The Democratic Party nominated Gen. McClellan for President on a platform, drafted under Vallandigham's leadership, which proclaimed that "after four years of failure to restore the Union by the experiment of war . . . justice, humanity, liberty and the public welfare demand that immediate efforts be made for a cessation of hostilities . . . on the basis of the Federal Union of States.

President Johnson has been called upon by critics of various political hues to deescalate the Vietnam war in the interests of peace. Here, too, there is a parallel between the situation which today confronts President Johnson and the situation which confronted President Lincoln. As Henry Owen tells the story—

Lincoln turned a deaf ear to pressures for "de-escalation". He called for another 500,000 men to be drafted (even though the draft was highly unpopular—witness the extensive draft riots in Ohio and New York the previous year.) He told the armies to press ahead, as hard as they could: "Hold on with a bulldog grip and chew and choke as much as possible".

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD at this point the full text of the article by Mr. Henry Owen in the Sunday Star for June 12, 1966. I earnestly hope that my colleagues will find the time to give it the careful study which I believe it merits.

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

LINCOLN'S BATTLE WITH "DOVES" DURING THE CIVIL WAR

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is an essay in history, not current policy. These facts are interesting in their own right, not as a guide to what we should or shouldn't do today in wholly different circumstances.

(The author is acting chairman of the Policy Planning Council in the State Department.)

(By Henry Owen)

The peace movement in the North during the Civil War reflected:

An instinctive feeling that it was wrong to try to deal with a political problem (secession) by force of arms.

Objections to the draft and, as the war continued, to heavy Union losses.

Despair at the prospects of victory over what seemed to be not just any army, but an entire people.

A growing feeling that peace and the Union could both be restored if Lincoln would only negotiate sensibly (i.e., if he would not insist on abolition of slavery).

The peace movement had two centers of strength, New York City and the Ohio-Indiana-Illinois area. It first showed major political strength in the 1862 Congressional elections, which went heavily against the administration in the mid-West.

REFUSED FUNDS FOR TROOPS

A Republican leader noted: "The people have furnished men and means in abundance for all purposes to conquer the enemy; but after a year and a half on trial . . . we have made no progress in putting down the rebellion . . . and the people are desirous of some change, they scarcely know what."

After this election, the Illinois House of Representatives passed an anti-war resolution by a large majority; and the Indiana legislature refused appropriations for raising troops. Gov. Yates dealt with the fractious Illinois legislature by the simple expedient of

19990

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 26, 1966

adjourning it until 1865; Gov. Morton kept Indiana in the war only by a barefaced dictatorship.

The 1863 elections generally favored pro-Union forces, but there was a startling development in Ohio.

Clement Vallandigham, who had been exiled for anti-war agitation, not only gained the Democratic nomination for Governor but won two-fifths of the votes cast in the general election.

This was the same man who, a short while before, had told his fellow Congressmen: "You have not conquered the South. You never will. It is not in the nature of things possible . . . Stop fighting. Make an armistice. Accept at once foreign mediation."

NEWSPAPERS URGED PEACE

A month later, in December 1863, the United States House of Representatives tabled a resolution calling on the President to open negotiations with the South. The vote was 98 to 59.

In the spring of 1864, as Grant's offensive against Richmond brought heavy losses, peace sentiment waxed.

Large peace meetings were held in major cities of the North.

The roster of American newspapers calling for peace included by now the New York Daily News, the New York Tribune (on-and-off), the Cincinnati Enquirer, the Columbus Crisis, the Detroit Free Press, the Indianapolis Sentinel, The Chicago Times, and many others.

In August 1864, the Chairman of National Republican Committee wrote Lincoln that "the tide is setting strongly against us . . . Were an election to be held now in Illinois we should be beaten . . . Pennsylvania is against us . . . Nothing but the most resolute action . . . can prevent the country from falling into hostile (i.e., Democratic) hands."

He attributed the party's misfortunes, in part, to the "widely diffused suspicion . . . that we can have peace with the Union if we would."

McCLELLAN NOMINATED

He urged Lincoln to demonstrate the falseness of this view by appointing a peace commission to negotiate with Jefferson Davis, on only one condition: The supremacy of the Constitution be acknowledged.

Later that month, Lincoln recorded his belief that he would be defeated in the election, and that the new President would be unable to continue the war because of peace promises made during the election.

In early September, as if to bear out his prediction the Democratic Party nominated Gen. McClellan for President on a platform, drafted under Vallandigham's leadership, which proclaimed that "after four years of failure to restore the Union by the experiment of war . . . justice, humanity, liberty and the public welfare demand that immediate efforts be made for a cessation of hostilities . . . on the basis of the Federal Union of States."

The peace movement had reached its peak.

LINCOLN'S RESPONSE

There were four main elements in Lincoln's response to this movement:

1. War aims. He sought to define the purposes of the war in terms of "an issue which had so great an emotional content that all the differences and uncertainties of the popular mind would be swallowed up in loyalty." (The quote is from Prof. Kirkland.)

That issue, Lincoln decided, was the survival of the Union and of representative government. This meant that the people of the Union should be able to settle their differences under the Constitution without, in Lincoln's words, "successful appeal from the ballot to the bullet."

This objective was set down in the Johnson-Crittenden resolution, which passed both houses of Congress by big majorities in 1861:

"This war is not prosecuted upon our part in any spirit of aggression, nor for any purpose of conquest or subjugation, but to defend and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution . . . and to preserve the Union . . . and as soon as these objects are accomplished the war ought to cease."

CHAIN OF REASONING

In his major addresses Lincoln returned again and again to this theme: That the war was being fought to ensure that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from this earth." How could representative government succeed, he asked, if its judgments were to be overthrown by force of arms?

Thus, like Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence, he related the conflict to timeless beliefs about the nature of man and government. And he did this not merely by rhetoric but by a chain of reasoning which the man in the street found clear and persuasive. (Indeed, Lincoln's straightforward arguments generally got a better reception from the public at large than from members of Congress.)

2. Negotiations. Having defined his war aim, Lincoln wanted to show that it was Jefferson Davis, not he, who blocked peace on terms consistent with that aim.

To this end, he encouraged private probes of Confederate intentions, in 1863-64, by such enthusiastic "doves" as Horace Greeley, Col. Jaquess, and James Gilmore. He allowed them to travel to Canada and Richmond, in order to discuss peace terms with Confederate representatives (including President Davis himself), and he promised to listen to their reports.

Lincoln made clear that the U.S. government would only enter negotiations if these emissaries could report that President Davis would agree, in such negotiations, to restore the Union and the Constitution. This was one issue on which Lincoln could not compromise without jeopardy to his essential war aim. By making this clear beforehand he reassured the "hawks" (Republican Radicals).

PRESSED ABOLITION

The "hawks" also pressed him to make the abolition of slavery a pre-condition to peace. As the war went on, Lincoln had come increasingly to support abolition. Yet to make its immediate achievement a condition of peace would be to place in jeopardy the support for the war that he was getting from responsible "doves," the moderate Democrats.

The result: Masterful unclarity on Lincoln's part. In his famous "To Whom It May Concern" statement in mid-64 he cited two pre-conditions to peace: preservation of the Union, and abolition of slavery. When the Democrats protested that Lincoln was thus creating new obstacles to peace, he wrote private letters to peace leaders in the North, suggesting that if Jefferson Davis wanted to propose restoration of the Union without the abolition of slavery, "let him try me." The implication was that Lincoln might prove flexible on this point.

This vagueness pleased no one, but enabled the Greeley-Jaquess-Gilmore peace probes to be mounted without giving too much offense to either hawks or the doves.

CHANGED TACTICS

These probes served the purpose Lincoln had in mind: They proved that the main obstacle to peace lay in Richmond, not Washington. President Davis indicated that the war could only be ended by accepting post-war Confederate rule in the South.

Lincoln encouraged disappointed peace probes to share these results with the Northern voters before the November election.

When that election was won, Lincoln changed his tactics, but not his strategy. On Grant's urging, he accepted a Confederate invitation to talk peace at Hampton Roads with the Vice President of the Con-

federacy (an old friend) and two other Confederate Commissioners—without any prior indication of Confederate agreement to restore the Union. He wanted to discover whether the deteriorating Southern military situation was reflected in a changed Confederate negotiating position. It was not.

The meeting, the only "official" negotiation of the war, broke up after four hours. The Confederate representatives could not agree, to restore the Union, even though both Lincoln and Seward signalled some flexibility on abolition (at least in request of means and timing). Lincoln could not agree to an armistice without a political settlement; this would only give the Southern armies needed respite, and prolong the war.

3. Pacification. During this Conference the Southern Commissioners described Lincoln's demand that the South lay down its arms as a call for "unconditional submission." Seward replied that the people of the South would have the safeguards of the Constitution and the Courts, once the Union was restored.

Here was the essence of Lincoln's peace-making. Confederate leaders might not give up the goal of overthrowing Union rule, but Lincoln hoped that the Southern people would, if they were offered a prospect of fair treatment in the Union.

His plans for pacification—restoring self-government and Congressional representation in occupied areas of the South—were to him a more likely road to peace than negotiation. He looked to settling the great issues that were at stake, not by negotiating under the threat of armed duress, but by submitting them to the normal process of free election. He hoped to restore peace by treating not with the Confederacy but with its citizens.

INSURED FREE ELECTIONS

All this took concrete form in the first Southern areas to come under Union rule: Louisiana, Arkansas, and Tennessee. He sought quickly to restore state governments, and he instructed his military commanders to insure that there was a genuinely free vote. He did not want, he wrote one of them, "Northern men here (in the Congress) as representatives elected . . . at the point of the bayonet." Orderly elections were held as early as December 1862 in the First and Second Louisiana Congressional districts, which embraced New Orleans and outlying areas.

In December 1863 the President sought to dramatize what he was about. He announced that as soon as 10 percent of the registered voters in any state occupied by Union armies were ready to take the oath of allegiance to the Constitution, he would be prepared to restore state government. The people of that state could then decide for themselves, in free elections, by whom they wanted to be governed—locally and in the Congress. With this went a sweeping amnesty.

The "hawks" disapproved and passed the punitive Wade-Davis law as a substitute. Lincoln used the pocket veto to kill that law.

DISAPPOINTED CROWD

He hoped that as word of his pacification policy got about, the morale of the Confederate people and armies would be affected and the way opened for a lasting peace.

All this was at the heart of Lincoln's concerns in the final months of his life. When a large crowd came to cheer beneath the White House windows at the news of Lee's surrender, Lincoln disappointed it: In this, his last speech, he spoke not of military victory but of his plans for restoring self-government on generous terms in the South—and of the progress which these plans were making in Louisiana.

Thus, Lincoln's handling of "negotiations" largely in terms of Northern politics was balanced by his handling of "pacification" largely in terms of Southern needs. The

August 26, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19991

first he saw as a means of defusing peace sentiment in the North; the second was, in his view, the essence of peace-making in the South.

4. Making war. But none of this would avail, Lincoln believed, unless Union military successes convinced the Southern people that resistance was futile. "Peace" pressures on the President to relax the pace of military operations got short shrift.

This issue came to a head in the summer of 1864.

Grant's offensive against Richmond had bogged down in heavy casualties. A historian notes that "every day the North was sinking deeper in despair, as hopes of a speedy victory vanished." There were demands for firing "butcher" Grant and calling off his offensive.

AVOIDED SHERMAN

A stepped-up offensive would mean heavy losses and a new draft call, and would hurt Lincoln politically in the short run. On the other hand, if this offensive succeeded, fewer people would probably be killed in the long run, and the Northern peace party's position in the election would be weakened.

Some eminent Southerners were weighing the same factors. Gen. Stephen Ramsour of North Carolina wrote his wife: "If our armies can hold their own, suffer no crushing disaster before the next election, we may reasonably expect a termination of this war."

... McClellan will be elected and his election will bring peace. . . . Gen. Joseph Johnston, fighting ably in Georgia, sought to avoid pitched battle with Sherman—judging that a delaying defense was best calculated to enhance war weariness in the North. He and other Confederate Military leaders had long since ceased to think of victory; their only object was to keep the war going long enough to give peace sentiment in the North a chance to prevail.

Lincoln turned a deaf ear to pressures for "de-escalation." He called for another 500,000 men to be drafted (even though the draft was highly unpopular—witness the extensive draft riots in Ohio and New York the previous year.) He told the armies to press ahead, as hard as they could: "Hold on with a bulldog grip and chew and choke as much as possible."

STORM OF PROTEST

A storm of protest broke about his head, as he knew it would. His biographer records: "All the submerged discontent broke into open clamor. The awful losses of the last few weeks had horrified the nation. The thought of further bloodshed brought revulsion."

The language with which some Northern newspapers greeted his demand for "five hundred thousand more victims" probably did not surprise Lincoln. His election prospects seemed to dip further.

But Lincoln's other expectations were also borne out: As Sherman and Grant pressed forward, Northern peace sentiment receded, Southern peace sentiment mounted, and McClellan's fortunes declined. After the November election, the Northern peace movement never troubled Lincoln again.

Lincoln's responses to the peace movement were effective and mutually reinforcing, because they were grounded in the principle of self-determination.

BASED ON PRINCIPAL

Seeing the war largely as a means of preserving this principle, he was able to define its meaning eloquently and effectively.

Because he insisted that any peace negotiations be based on this principle, he was able to handle pressures for negotiation in a way that strengthened, rather than weakened, the war effort.

Because his pacification plans were directly related to this principle, they offered convincing hope for the future.

And because he perceived that this principle was at stake he was able—sensitive though he was to human suffering—to explain why pressures for abating a cruel war could not be accommodated.

AUTO INSURANCE PIRATES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to call my colleagues' attention to "Auto Insurance Pirates," from the August 14, 1966, issue of the interesting and informative Parade. This is a vivid description of the harm being done Americans by the failure of many high-risk auto insurance companies. Basis for much of the article is information developed by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] during and following hearings of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee. Certainly I, for one, am grateful to Senator Dodd for focusing the public spotlight on this serious problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

AUTO INSURANCE PIRATES: HOW THEY MENACE THE PUBLIC—AND REPUTABLE COMPANIES

(By Charles W. Stickle)

In Indiana, where high school basketball is "big league," 16-year-old Ronald Barricklow, leading rebounder on the Holton High School team, enjoyed near-celebrity status.

On the cold wet morning of Jan. 13, 1959, after boarding the schoolbus near his home, Ronald found himself the center of a lively discussion of his team's chances for victory in a forthcoming game.

Ronald Barricklow would not play in that game or any other basketball game from that morning on. Nor would he ever walk normally again. When the bus carrying Ronald and 30 other students stopped to pick up more passengers, it was rammed from the rear by a trailer truck.

Young Barricklow awoke the next day in a hospital, his right leg broken in three places, his left thigh fractured, his left hip dislocated. Eight operations and nine months later, Ronald was discharged from the hospital, his left leg three inches shorter than his right.

Medical and surgical expenses totaled \$19,340.53. Ronald's father, a construction worker, paid the bills by mortgaging the Barricklows' small farm.

The truck that crashed into the schoolbus was insured by an out-of-state firm, which did a multi-million dollar business in 43 states. It was found completely insolvent in 1962 and left the Barricklows and 8500 other claimants without payment.

The story of the Barricklows and their insolvent insurance firm is but a single episode in a sordid casebook of mismanagement, fraud, embezzlement and financial machinations by carpetbaggers and incompetents who have invaded the American auto insurance market.

The soaring highway accident rate and the resulting heavy insurance losses have caused established companies to exercise painstaking care in choosing whom to insure. The carebaggers, taking advantage of this climate, have moved into the so-called "high-risk" market that services motorists who have difficulty obtaining insurance coverage because of poor accident records, age, poor health or physical disability.

The result has been catastrophic.

States Dean E. Sharp, assistant counsel to the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and

Monopoly: "Passing virtually unnoticed has been the insolvency of 62 insurance firms in 21 states since 1960, including 33 in the last two years alone. These companies have left more than \$275 million in unpaid claims, filed by more than 175,000 persons, many of them badly injured, and more than one million individuals with worthless automobile insurance."

Subcommittee counsel Sharp describes the situation as "one of the greatest scandals ever to affect the insurance industry."

The scandals, of course, have been limited to a relatively small percentage of companies, while many of the nation's most reputable insurance firms also write high-risk automobile insurance and reliably meet their claims. (Of 900 firms in the auto casualty insurance field, 350 perform the essential function of underwriting insurance for risky motorists.) But the scandals threaten to give an economic black eye to all.

A "FESTERING SPLINTER"

Illinois State Insurance Department Director John F. Bolton Jr., who was appointed last year when the state literally was being blitzed by hit-and-run insurers, says: "We are dealing with a splinter—a painful, festering splinter, but still a splinter."

The "splinter" Director Bolton refers to has two jagged edges. One of them jeopardizes the financial security of the motorist insured by the shaky high-risk company every time he gets in his car.

According to Vincent A. Carroll, judge of the Court of Common Pleas in Philadelphia, "There are thousands of motorists who believe they have fulfilled their social duty by purchasing insurance when, in fact, for all practical purposes they are not really insured."

His assertion proved bitterly accurate for a young Maryland couple who lost their home when an accident victim obtained a \$12,000 judgment against them. They felt they were covered, but when the claim was filed, the insurance company was insolvent.

The other side of the "splinter" endangers the innocent motorist, when he is injured or his car is damaged by a high-risk driver, who carries a worthless auto liability policy.

How many Americans are affected by these failures is reflected by the following statistics.

In Illinois, 19 companies have failed in the last three years. Cosmopolitan Insurance Co. of Chicago left 22,000 persons holding claims totaling \$68 million. When examiners looked into the insolvency, they found assets of only \$2.5 million. The collapse left 130,000 individuals without insurance.

In Missouri, Guaranty Insurance Exchange, one of six high-risk companies that failed in that state, was found able to pay only four cents on every dollar of the total \$2 million in claims against it.

WHY THE SCANDALS?

What are the reasons for the recurring failures and the resulting losses to motorists?

The basic one is that most reputable insurance companies have sustained mounting losses in recent years because of soaring claims and high jury awards. Rates, usually regulated by state law, have not been allowed to keep pace.

Caught in this squeeze, the companies have been forced to pick and choose whom they insure, placing more and more motorists in the "high-risk" market. Such drivers then face the alternative either of obtaining insurance through "assigned-risk" pools (by which established companies agree to carry a percentage of less desirable risks) or of going to a company that offers its own plan.

For many drivers, the latter choice has been more inviting, because many assigned risk plans offer only minimum coverage and because few motorists wish to be labeled an "assigned risk."

19992

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 26, 1966

Elderly motorists, even with good driving records, can find themselves thrown into the high risk market if they have an accident. If a driver has epilepsy, he probably will find himself a high risk. Companies very carefully underwrite prospective policyholders with diabetes, heart disease, arthritis, total deafness or loss of sight in one eye.

Social factors also may count against a driver. The individual who cannot read or speak English can be marked "high risk." Ex-convicts or those on probation or parole are often in the same category.

But the high-risk market is by no means limited to the unhealthy or disadvantaged. Single men, 16 to 25, who own and drive their own cars probably comprise the largest single group of high risks. Of the nation's 2.5 million youthful drivers, nearly one-third buy insurance through assigned-risk pools. The remainder carry no insurance at all or are carried by high-risk companies or standard companies trying to accommodate parents already carrying insurance with their firm.

All these motorists have provided a happy hunting ground for hit-and-run insurance operators.

As Charles W. Gambrell, chief insurance commissioner of South Carolina, explained to this reporter: "When a large number of people find themselves unable to buy automobile liability insurance, and when they are under some form of real or quasi-compulsion by the state to buy insurance, the stage is set for the high-risk insurance pirate."

In many cases it is surprisingly simple for high-risk racketeers to get into the business. Thomas Finley, executive vice president to the Pennsylvania Federation of Mutual Insurance Companies, says that "charters of some small mutual companies are bought and sold like liquor club licenses. The going price may be from \$5000 to \$25,000."

After acquiring a company, unscrupulous promoters may wheel and deal to build an apparently legitimate corporate structure. But every move is calculated to enrich them. Such companies, Commissioner Gambrell asserts, are organized to "go broke."

A common practice of the insurance pirates is to resurrect a company and run its affairs through "management contracts," which permit them to exert unlimited control and milk the companies of assets.

The case of one Minnesota high-risk insurance company is classic. Minnesota Attorney General Robert Mattson, whose investigation led to indictments in the case, explains it:

In 1963, after acquiring the management contract to operate an insurance company, a group headed by an ex-bail bondsman formed a new company and immediately transferred \$100,000 in cash and government bonds to the new enterprise. Their next step was to arrange another management contract giving them power to run the second firm, charge it management fees and operate it with no question asked.

The promoters then began to raid the new company of every asset they could get their hands on.

They set up a so-called "investment" plan that permitted them to sell to their insurance company real estate of highly inflated value and dubious title. They received in return nearly half a million dollars. Within six months, they had obtained title to the company's "home office" building and had mortgaged it for \$250,000. This money later was deposited to the account of an insurance agency they owned.

The report by the Minnesota attorney general states that 25¢ of every dollar paid in premiums went to the promoters either through the investment plan or the management contract. As long as the premiums rolled in, the promoters lived off them. Out of policyholders' funds, they purchased three houses for themselves, a \$6000 motorboat, furnishings and clothing.

In about two years, according to Attorney General Mattson, more than \$3.5 million had been drained from the company, leaving it broke. The promoters now face federal charges.

Another device is to incorporate a high-risk company in the Bahamas, where there is little regulation and where a company can be chartered for \$14. British International Insurance Co. of Nassau, Bahamas, is an illustration.

Already under indictment in Illinois on charges of embezzling \$180,000, Charles Bray incorporated British International to sell more high-risk insurance to the U.S. But first he had to prove that his company was financially sound. Most states require that foreign insurance companies establish substantial trust funds to assure payment of claims should the company fail.

HOW TO START A BUSINESS

This proved no obstacle. Bray simply incorporated his own bank, the Market Insurance Bank and Trust Co., in Nassau. His next step was to present to a Kenosha, Wis., bank certificates of deposit, indicating that the funds in the name of British International were on deposit in the Nassau bank. A trust fund based on the worthless certificates was established and Bray was back in the insurance business.

Operating out of Kenosha, Bray's company took in more than a million dollars from policyholders throughout the U.S. But before too long post office inspectors, tipped off by Illinois insurance authorities, identified Bray with the earlier indictment. He was convicted of mail fraud and has received five years.

Even before high-risk companies fail, motorists are frustrated in attempts to recover losses. Some never receive acknowledgement of their claims until they hire an attorney. Others are bluffed and eventually shortchanged on claim settlements of "stalled" in efforts to obtain payments.

Still another trick is to twist policy provisions. A woman whose collision policy provided for \$100 deductible skidded, struck one car and then another and wound up against a fence. Instead of deducting \$100 from her claim, the company applied the deductible to each collision, two cars and the fence and would settle only if \$300 was deducted!

Reputable insurance companies set aside a cash reserve for unsettled claims, but many high-risk companies make a mockery of this practice. For example, when a claim for \$1,000 was presented to a Maryland insurer, its adjuster determined that it might be settled for \$600. The company reserved \$60.

Companies also capitalize on the heavy backlog in court calendars. In Philadelphia, where the delay in trial of auto negligence cases is nearly four years, Common Pleas Court Administrator Edward Blake states that four mutual casualty companies that failed had an accumulation of more than 1000 cases. He describes this backlog as grossly excessive and indicative of a reluctance to settle claims.

How do the reputable companies view the problem of insurance pirates? Many of them are concerned.

"Certainly there is a place in our mobile society for the specialized companies that insure high-risk motorists who have difficulty obtaining automobile coverage in the open market and prefer not to go in to the assigned-risk plans . . ." says Bowman Boss president of the Nationwide Mutual Insurance Co. "But there is no place for any insurance company—of any kind—that does not meet its obligations to the people whose premium payments it has accepted."

Adds Thomas C. Morrill, vice president, State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Companies: "Only the very worst drivers—'repeater drunks' for example—need to buy

high-risk insurance. Everybody else who can't get coverage from a regular company can always get liability insurance through the assigned-risk plans maintained by insurance companies in every state."

Clay Johnson, president of Royal Globe Insurance, declares: "The fact is that the price of insurance is not right. Failure to approve needed rate adjustments in full and long delays before any adjustments are made have resulted in serious rate inadequacies and consistent underwriting losses. As a result, responsible insurance companies have been forced to restrict their underwriting, making it more difficult for many persons to buy insurance. [And] when insurance is not available through established channels an economic vacuum develops that sucks in a black market, which does not serve the public interest."

Traditionally, insurance regulation has been left to the states. Some have faced up to their responsibility. At the same time, the high-risk scandals provide stark evidence that state regulation has been a sham in many places.

New York Superintendent of Insurance Henry Root Stern is on record as saying that "The adequacy of state regulation is not judged by the performance of states where it is strongest. . . . Regardless of the merits of state supervision, the least diligent states are used as the gauge of its effectiveness."

State insurance commissioners themselves admit that a lack of coordination and liaison has enabled high-risk predators forced out of one state to proceed to another and start all over again.

The Senate subcommittee is considering legislation to establish a regulatory agency similar to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. In this way at least some of the funds lost by claimants would be paid when an insurance company fails in the future.

The same legislation also would provide for federal insurance examiners.

Dean Sharp considers the failure to employ enough competent examiners as the "underlying weakness of state regulation." In at least six states, the job of standing watchdog over the industry has been left to fewer than four examiners. Nine states have no examiners.

The subcommittee's study also disclosed all too many instances of nonfeasance by state insurance departments. These included failure to:

Make annual audits to determine if companies are financially sound.

Examine the structure of newly formed companies.

Investigate out-of-state or foreign insurance companies.

Several states, rocked by insurance company collapses, are overhauling archaic insurance regulations.

A notable example is Maryland, where Insurance Commissioner Francis B. (Bill) Burch, who came to office only last July, has taken the lead. Prior to his taking office, Maryland had been shaken by the failures of three high-risk companies which had left 35,000 policyholders without coverage.

Burch has begun cleaning house through administrative and legislative programs. His legislative program has two objectives: (1) to extend additional protection to both policyholders and claimants and (2) to give his office additional weapons to drive undesirable and financially unsound companies from the state.

Major legislation enacted this year included laws to:

Increase the minimum capital surplus requirements of companies seeking to do business in the state by 50 percent.

Impose fines up to \$25,000 on companies that violate the state insurance code.

Require companies whose licenses are subject to revocation proceedings to prove in court that they were entitled to continue

August 26, 1966

More long-range problems should also be considered now, before public misunderstanding and suspicion seriously hinder and delay the real progress which can be achieved through controlled, responsible research in weather modification. Although the case law in this field is still relatively small, it is already clear that many complex legal questions will have to be faced. To quote the Report on Law, Controls, and Operations:

Since weather is "transient" and can not be bounded by political borders and since experimentation over broad areas is or may become necessary, the utility of uniform rules with respect to licenses, operations, liability, ownership, use and control of the elements, and the like seems beyond question. Reporting, both before the activity in order to prevent interference and contamination and afterwards to permit the collection and evaluation of scientific data, is crucial to progress. Uniform protection of the general public and of those with special concern in the weather against inexperienced and/or irresponsible persons engaged in weather activities and a sharing by all the public in the risks involved in careful, needed experimentation in this new field are also essential.

Mr. Speaker, legally and scientifically, we are just at the beginning of a long, long road. Last November, in a meeting I sponsored at Hagerstown, Dr. F. W. Reichelderfer, retired Chief of the Weather Bureau, discussed some of the complex variables which must be analyzed in each specific meteorological situation, before the results of experimentation could be accurately predicted. The list included temperature, humidity, the structure of wind, topology, the height of clouds, the turbulence within the clouds, and the synoptic situation. In my judgment, far more precise knowledge of all these factors should be secured before large-scale experimentation with the weather can be safely tried.

At the moment, it seems most important that we know exactly what is actually being done, by whom, and when and where. The bills which I have sponsored were directed toward this end, as are my recommendations today to the National Science Foundation.

In closing, I would like to note that the reports, however incomplete, which have been collected by the National Science Foundation indicate that no weather modification projects have been undertaken in Maryland this year, and only one research project in Pennsylvania and one commercial project in West Virginia. The grand jury convened in Washington County this month also found no hard evidence of violations of the Maryland moratorium on cloud-seeding. Yet the grand jury concluded by urging the Federal Government "to expedite their investigation and studies into this matter to that the matter can finally be resolved."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point the report of the Washington County grand jury, and the text of my letter to Dr. Haworth:

GRAND JURY ROOM,
COURTHOUSE,
HAGERSTOWN, Md.

To the Honorable, the Judges of the Circuit Court for Washington County:

The March Term 1966 Grand Jury for Washington County met in special session at

9:00 a.m. on August 17th, 1966, to consider possible violations of the cloud seeding laws. The following witnesses appeared: Captain W. E. O'Hara, Trooper First Class Cecil Bittinger, of the Maryland State Police, State Senator George Snyder, and Sheriff Charles Price. The Maryland State Police has received many complaints, all of which have been investigated, including areas in Pennsylvania and West Virginia, and in no case has cloud seeding been established. Senator Snyder, author of the bill for two year moratorium, also appeared and related his extensive investigation into this matter. All complaints received by him were referred to the Maryland State Police for investigation. Sheriff Price has also received many complaints and he also has not been able to establish any violations of this law.

It is the opinion of the Grand Jury that there has been no evidence produced to this date which would indicate a violation of this law. However, the Grand Jury strongly recommends that the police agencies of Washington County continue their investigations into all complaints to see that the law is enforced. The Grand Jury urges the public to consider the following facts:

(1) This geographical area is in the center of a large aerial traffic pattern along the eastern seaboard and extending in all directions which results in many planes moving through this area at all times.

(2) The type of plane capable of cloud seeding must be a particular type of plane capable of withstanding the turbulence of a storm cloud and not the ordinary small plane.

(3) It is a violation of the Federal law to engage in cloud seeding without approval of the Federal Aviation Agency, the local base being located in Martinsburg, West Virginia, and to date there have been no known violations.

(4) The Grand Jury being without funds and staff sufficient to make a thorough independent investigation urges the Federal Government to expedite their investigation and studies into this matter so that the matter can finally be resolved.

The Grand Jury requests all citizens to comply with the law and to report any and all violations to the proper authorities for investigation rather than to take any independent action.

Three other witnesses appeared before the Grand Jury this morning and one true bill of indictment was returned.

O. N. CARRYER,
Foreman.
JUANITA MAATTI,
Secretary.

AUGUST 17, 1966.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 26, 1966.

DR. LELAND J. HAWORTH,
Director, National Science Foundation,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. HAWORTH: Despite the two-year moratorium on cloud-seeding in Maryland under state law, doubts and suspicions about weather modifications activities in Western Maryland have persisted and actually increased this summer, to the point where a grand jury was actually convened in Washington County to investigate many allegations of weather modification actions in violation of the state law.

I feel that this episode dramatizes the need for far more vigorous enforcement of the reporting regulations which your agency promulgated last December. If NSF itself has no field office structure to expedite immediate, on-the-spot investigation of alleged unreported activities, I urge you either to develop a satisfactory nationwide operation, or greatly extend liaison with appropriate Federal and state offices. Flight plans maintained by the Federal Aviation Agency, for

example, can be of great value in helping to identify aircraft suspected of cloud-seeding operations.

In general, I feel that the present level of public misunderstanding and suspicion makes full reporting too important to be implemented simply by the goodwill of individual operators. I hope that you will take all possible steps to insure full compliance with your agency's regulations.

Very sincerely,

CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR.

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

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

PREMIER KY SPOKE IRRESPONSIBLY

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

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, reports have been published that leaders of the South Vietnamese Government advocate the invasion of North Vietnam.

Not long ago, President Ky demanded that American forces, in conjunction with his own armies, carry the ground war into North Vietnam. It is understandable that South Vietnamese soldiers who have watched cohorts be killed by the North Vietnamese should in turn wish to attack their antagonists at the source. But Mr. Speaker, as President Johnson so often has said, we do not seek and cannot support "any mindless escalation" of this war. He has pledged often that no attempt will be made to conquer North Vietnam.

In order that persons in other nations are not misled by these reports, I consider it important that we in Congress make clear our concurrence with the President in this matter.

In the August 9 issue of the Adrian Daily Telegram, a newspaper published in my district, the editor of the Telegram states, very effectively and very concisely, the importance of this question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD and I commend the editor's remarks to my colleagues.

[From the Adrian Daily Telegram,
Aug. 9, 1966]

PREMIER KY SPOKE IRRESPONSIBLY

South Viet Nam's Premier Nguyen Ky has created embarrassment for the United States by repeating his demand that American forces in conjunction with his armies carry the ground war into North Viet Nam. It's embarrassing because what he proposes is in the last analysis aggression. The United States is fighting in South Viet Nam against aggression from the north. American forces are there precisely to show that crossings of the 17th Parallel are immoral, unjustified and must not be permitted.

The United States' position is that South Viet Nam must have its freedom. President Johnson has pledged that no attempt would be made to conquer North Viet Nam nor force a change in its government. To be sure, the United States has directed air attacks at North Vietnamese oil bases, has bombed

August 26, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

20029

I have been studying the activities of the Defense Department, namely, defense procurement and supply as it affects our domestic economy—and I have been defending him—I am now about ready to conclude that the gentleman is unaware of the limitations of the power that rests in the executive branch and the Defense Department, if the news items describe correctly his plans to use the draft for something other than providing the military manpower that this society needs to defend itself.

This, too, bears upon the basic question.

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

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I commend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] for raising this issue, not that it is in any manner a new issue, because, as the gentleman well knows and as most Members of this body must know, this very issue is indeed a source of great concern and disturbance to a great number of citizens.

I am sure many Members of the House have, as I have, received letters from home, wherein our people indicate they are troubled by the fact that we are at war, and that the war has not been declared. There are all kinds of associated problems that go hand in hand with the dilemma in which we find ourselves, such as those relating to the questions of "war prisoners" as applied to the terms of the Geneva Treaty, and many other things.

I would hope that sometime we could perhaps have an even more extended discussion, so that we may have the necessary rules and guidelines by which to conduct ourselves under the situation which presently prevails.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I fully agree with him.

WEATHER MODIFICATION: THE FACTS, THE LAW, AND THE PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, about 2 years ago I first warned of the need for more and better public information about the important science of weather modification. Although some progress has been made since then, our continuing problems were dramatized on August 17, when a grand jury was convened in Washington County, Md., to investigate persistent charges that weather modification work was being carried on in western Maryland in violation of State law. This episode clearly illustrates the need to review the facts, the laws, and the problems in this entire field, so that we can insure that weather modification work will proceed along the lines dictated by the public interest.

THE FACTS

Weather modification, as a science, is about 20 years old. In fiscal 1965 the Federal investment in research and ex-

perimentation was almost \$5 million, broken down as follows:

Department of Agriculture-----	\$140,000
Department of Commerce-----	115,000
<hr/>	
Department of Defense:	
Army -----	254,500
Navy -----	999,408
Air Force -----	193,000
<hr/>	
Total Defense Department-----	1,446,908
Department of the Interior-----	1,262,268
National Science Foundation-----	2,007,386
<hr/>	
Total -----	4,971,652

Perhaps the most renowned federally sponsored projects have been attempts to moderate oceanborne storms, and to disperse fog at airports. Certainly the most controversial projects, public or private, have been in the field of cloud-seeding.

Despite extensive research and commercial activity in various forms of cloud-seeding, many basic questions in the field still have not been resolved. As noted in the 1965 annual report of the National Science Foundation:

At the present time, there is no analytical evidence from commercial operations that seeding will reduce natural rainfall, and there does appear to be some evidence that existing rainfall can be augmented by seeding. No one has yet devised a scheme for producing rainfall where natural moisture is lacking in the atmosphere, and it is unlikely that seeding can produce rainfall where drought conditions are produced by large-scale movements of dry air.

The same report also declared that drought alleviation is "a field of inquiry in which the path toward applications is sufficiently long, and the possibilities are so diffuse, that a decade or more may be required to determine whether or not much large-scale efforts are economically feasible."

From these statements I think it is clear that our present fund of "hard" fact about weather modification in general, and cloud-seeding in particular, is still very small despite the efforts made to date. Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that attempts to alter the weather have produced public uncertainties, misunderstandings, suspicions, and doubts.

THE LAW

At present several types of restrictions on weather modification activities are in force. My own State of Maryland is the only State in the Union which has enacted a flat moratorium on weather modification work, under a law passed last year and effective until September 1967. Twenty-one other States have imposed varying restrictions, ranging from carefully drafted provisions requiring strict licensing and notice before projects are undertaken, to general requirements for registration or licensing of operators. All of these State statutes are summarized in "Weather Modification Law, Controls, Operations," a report to the Special Commission on Weather Modification of the National Science Foundation, released earlier this year.

On the Federal level, two civilian agencies administer rules and regulations affecting weather modification projects. The Federal Aviation Agency, while en-

forcing no special rules specifically against operators in this field, does strictly enforce its flight plan and clearance requirements against all individuals seeking to fly planes in the clouds. Obviously these rules, prompted initially by air safety considerations, have a direct bearing on airborne cloud-seeding efforts. I might point out that the flight plans required by the FAA are held on file at the respective FAA field offices for up to 30 days after each flight, and are open for public inspection.

The most specific Federal regulations were imposed last winter by the National Science Foundation, and are generally in accord with recommendations which I have been offering since 1964. These regulations, printed in 30 Federal Register 16202-3, December 29, 1965, require 30 days' advance notice by anyone planning to engage in any type of weather modification activity, plus extensive reporting on actual experimentation and apparent results. There is a fine of up to \$500 for willful noncompliance.

THE PROBLEMS

Our most immediate challenge, in my judgment, is the strict enforcement of these existing laws. Given the uneven nature of regulation by various States, it is essential that Federal requirements for reporting all weather modification work be completely complied with by all researchers and commercial operators.

In the legislation I introduced in the 88th Congress in 1964, and again in the 89th Congress in 1965, I provided that the Department of Commerce, and specifically the Environmental Science Services Administration—Weather Bureau—be assigned authority to publish and enforce reporting regulations. This task was assigned to the Department of Commerce because I felt that the large number of Weather Bureau field offices, and the detailed, up-to-date meteorological data collected and maintained by those offices, provided an appropriate framework for the efficient administration and enforcement of such regulations. As I have noted, however, regulations similar to those I proposed were promulgated last winter not by the Commerce Department, but by the National Science Foundation, acting under its general mandate in the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I feel strongly that now that the National Science Foundation has assumed this responsibility, it is up to the NSF to carry it through. Yet the agency has a very small staff in this area, and lacks the full field structure equipped and manned for on-the-spot investigations. Consequently I have written today to Dr. Leland J. Haworth, Director of the National Science Foundation, urging him to strengthen and expand his enforcement staff, so that the rules can be more vigorously enforced, rather than relying on the good will of individual operators for compliance. I have also urged that, where possible violations of Federal or State law by cloudseeding from planes have been alleged, every effort should be made, through searches of FAA records and other means, to determine the accuracy of these allegations without delay.

August 26, 1966

20031

bridges and supply routes. But this is done to shut off the flow of gasoline and other materials to the North Vietnamese forces fighting in South Viet Nam. Communist propaganda holds differently, and Ky's demand provides some fuel for the Red propaganda mills.

The Ky demand to which was coupled a remark that a battlefield confrontation with Communist China is eventually inevitable was irresponsible and harmful. His statements tend to confirm the world's suspicion that his wisdom and judgment are not of the highest. They are like statements made in recent years by President Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa and the former president of South Korea, Syngman Rhee. Chiang expressed the wish to invade mainland China. He had to be persuaded to be quiet. President Rhee wanted American backing for a military campaign to reunite North and South Korea. The United States had to make it clear that neither Chiang nor Rhee would be allowed to embark on such a perilous course.

Similar pressures have to be applied to Premier Ky's ambitions. Every effort must be made to limit the Vietnamese war to the legitimate aim of assuring South Viet Nam's independence. When Premier Ky speaks of invading the North, he has to have the American purpose in South Viet Nam made crystal clear.

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

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

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

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

TAX DEDUCTION FOR EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES OF TEACHERS

(Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD (at the request of Mr. WALDIE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today I am cosponsoring a bill, originally introduced by my distinguished friend and colleague, CECIL R. KING, ranking member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

This legislation follows in the footsteps of the July 28 House concurrent resolution, which I cosponsored, dealing with the proposed regulations, 26 CFR 1, as carried in the Federal Register for July 7, 1966. These regulations would prevent teachers from deducting educational expenses from their personal income tax. It was the purpose of the concurrent resolution to deter the Internal Revenue Service from enforcing this regulation until Congress authorized it.

Now I am following up this resolution with a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income, the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education, and including travel.

It is my sincere hope that the House of Representatives will act on it as soon as possible.

RIOTERS, MARCHERS, AND DEMONSTRATORS

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, an article appears in the current August 22 issue of U.S. News & World Report, which manages to cut through all the verbiage, all the excuses, all the explanations, and all the apologies that we have all heard on behalf of the rioters and demonstrators who have made the streets of the Nation unsafe at any hour. This article was not written by a constituent of mine, though she is from my State of Louisiana.

Because it is so crystal clear in its logic and because it presents an undeniable and irrefutable argument against the rioters, marchers, and demonstrators, I commend it to everyone's attention. I know that no one will have the nerve to deny the points made in Mrs. Irene Palmer's letter, but it would be very amusing reading if someone would attempt it. Therefore, I unqualifiedly issue a challenge to all the so-called spokesmen of all the rioting groups to come forth with a response to what is printed below.

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Aug. 22, 1966]

A DOWN-TO-EARTH LOOK AT A GROWING PROBLEM

(A plain-spoken woman has written a letter to the editor that is attracting widespread attention.

(In this letter Mrs. Irene Palmer of De Quincy, La., challenges the theory—often stated by top officials—that hardships and poor living conditions explain riots, crime, and growing dependence on government doles. To Mrs. Palmer, this is nonsense.

(Crippled, forced to leave school at 17, Mrs. Palmer has worked hard, without luxuries, but: "You will never see us in a marching demonstration line wanting something for nothing. We're too proud for that.")

Following are excerpts from a letter to the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise from Mrs. Irene Palmer of De Quincy, La., and published in the Enterprise on August 3, 1966:

"These marches, demonstrations, riotings, looting, police slayings and the such makes me literally sick, especially the reasons our Government officials are trying to cram down our throats as causes of these law-breaking episodes.

"Sir, I know what hard work, hardship, pain and suffering is. I had polio at age 5 months which left my left leg one and one-half inches shorter than my right and about one third the size.

"My father died at 6 p.m. Sunday in 1935, was buried Monday on my seventeenth birthday. My brother died at 5 a.m. Tuesday and was buried Wednesday, leaving me with two small sisters and my mother to support.

"At 17 I was not a drop-out in school. With no education—not enough, anyway—no experience and with only one good leg. I quit school and went to work to support a family. I didn't have a teen-age life because my working hours were always from 10 to 20 hours a day. In 1948, I got my right hand—my working hand; I'm right-handed—in an electric ice shaver and mangled it. It was doubtful whether I'd ever be able to use it

again, but after much pain and suffering I learned to use what I had left of a hand. This left me with one good leg and one good hand, but I didn't give up.

"FOLLOW ME JUST ONE DAY—

"I would like for Earl Warren, President Johnson, H. H. HUMPREY, Martin Luther King, and all the hell-raising juveniles to come to my home and follow me just one day. I can guarantee that they wouldn't have enough pep left to go on a demonstration, marching or rock-throwing party.

"My day begins at 4 a.m. and ends about 8 or 9 p.m., when my health permits. I do my own housework, cooking, washing, ironing, sewing, raising flowers and a garden. In fact, for the past three weeks I have been standing in a hot kitchen, over a hot stove, canning my vegetables. Have an air conditioner? Are you kidding? Neither do I run up town when I get hot and turn on the water hydrants, nor start rioting and looting stores. Do you see any civil-rights workers doing this kind of work, trying to add to their income? If you do, show me.

"I have two wonderful children who were reared most of their lives in hot, crowded apartments. They know what it is to do without a lot of the better things of life. If we could have afforded just one vacation for them, it would have been a luxury, yet neither are rioters, rock-throwers, nor law-breakers.

"I would like to show some of the officials in Washington, the marchers, rioters, and all those who have their hand stretched out for a handout, some of the handicapped people who are making it on their own and not asking Mr. Nobody for anything....

"EXCUSES FOR RIOTS ARE TOMMYROT

"Sir, can our President, Vice President, any civil-rights worker, agitator, or whomever they may be, stand up and look us hand-caps, whose very life itself has been a struggle for most of us, in the eye and try to cram down our throats an idea as idiotic as hot weather, crowded living quarters, low income, hard working conditions and all the other excuses they try to pass on to the people as being reasons for these riots we are having? I for one cannot nor will I swallow such tommyrot.

"You may see us handicaps become furious when we see a gang of able-bodied men and women, whether they are black, white, purple or spotted, running up and down our nation saying I want this, gimme that, without lifting a finger to earn it, but you will never see us in a marching demonstration line wanting something for nothing. We're too proud for that.

"I believe a great lesson could be learned from the handicaps. First, faith; then, courage, patience, love, kindness, long suffering, pride, competence and all the things that make life worthwhile.

"Sir, I didn't intend to write a newspaper when I started, but I have watched so much of these disgraceful crime waves, which are so useless, on television, and read so much about it in the papers, until I just had to say my piece.

"So I will close and leave an open invitation for the President, H. H. H., Martin Luther King and his followers, the agitators or whoever it may be who thinks it takes a crime wave to make a living in this old world, to come and follow in my footsteps just one day and I'll show them what can be done if anyone has the get-up about them to try."

FANNIE MAE RULINGS

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

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of expansion of the purchasing authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association so that it will be the dynamic institution Congress originally intended it to be. I think the bill being considered today is very important because it will make money available to help the people and building industry in California and the rest of the United States. The additional purchasing power that is given to the FNMA will provide a degree of liquidity for mortgage improvements. It will allow the corporation to function with the needed flexibility and dynamism so necessary to a healthy economy and a productive institution.

I therefore support the bill but I want to make one point quite clear. Earlier this year, FNMA, in an effort to reduce the heavy flow of FHA and GI loans being offered for purchase, issued a ruling which made any mortgage with an original principal amount of \$15,000 or higher ineligible for purchase by FNMA. I view this administrative ruling as arbitrary and capricious. It completely ignores the wide differential in construction costs which exists between different parts of the country. For instance, in California, recent estimates indicate that approximately 90 percent of new residential mortgages are in excess of \$15,000.

The average FHA-VA mortgage is approximately \$20,000; \$5,000 more than the FNMA maximum. I also think this arbitrary ceiling discriminates against larger families whose need for additional bedrooms naturally requires them to purchase a higher priced home than a young couple just beginning family life.

With the very large addition to FNMA's mortgage purchase authority provided by the conference substitute, I would like to see the \$15,000 ruling completely abolished—within the limits of FHA insurance or VA guarantee—but in any event, I expect FNMA, if it insists on some ceilings, to revise the maximum substantially upward on both old and new homes. It should be at least \$25,000.

CHARLES RIVER BASIN STUDY

(Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. WALDIE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Eighth District of Massachusetts are proud of many things in their area. One of the things of which they have been most proud in the past is the potentially beautiful and often regaled Charles River.

The Charles River and the basin of which it is a part is one of the most historic areas in the United States. Only a little while after the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth, our forefathers were wending their way through the area now known as the Charles River Basin.

When this country was young, the waters of the Charles were pure and crystal clear. The basin itself was virtually untouched. The beauty of the area could not have been described in too glowing terms.

Then the area gradually became industrialized. Industrialization made ours one of the most wealthy, the most powerful, and the greatest countries in the world. But in our zeal to grow, too often we were indifferent to the effects of industrialization on some of our most precious resources.

One of these natural resources was our clean water. In the Charles River Basin, the beauty of the water and the beauty of the landscape go hand in hand. One cannot exist without the other.

The days when the Charles wound through the rolling hills of eastern Massachusetts, undisturbed and untouched, are gone now. The purity of the water has also gone. Now the river has become a discolored blight on the landscape, running afoul to the sea. Many areas of the Charles are not fit for swimming, water sports, or recreation. Sections of our once pure river have been condemned by the health authorities.

The Charles has been regaled in song and poetry for more than 200 years. But now a popular song currently leading the lists mentions the Charles not as a thing of beauty, but as "dirty water."

Those of you who have seen the Charles will remember the beauty of its tree lined banks and the grace of its bridge-arched flow. But it is useless for anyone, even the college students who walk along the banks of the river in the spring, to turn to anything beautiful if he is in the path of a strong breeze from the Charles. Conditions along many parts of the river have deteriorated to the point where fishing is a tragedy instead of a sport, beaches have been condemned because they are unsafe for bathers, and water sports are unthought of by people who enjoy the outdoors.

We must do something about the Charles. We must act now to clean up its waters and to preserve the serenity of its banks, the stillness of its quiet coves, and its dignity as it winds from wooded hills to the center of a major city.

The Charles and its tributaries are precious assets. They have been placed in this generation's care, and it is our duty to leave for posterity a thing of beauty, cleanliness, and scenic and natural wealth.

We cannot allow the basin to continue deteriorating. We cannot fail in our task of preserving and restoring our Nation's natural resources.

I do not mean to sound like an alarmist. We can act now to clean up this basin, but we are fast reaching the critical point. Unless we act soon, we may never be able to restore the beauty of one of our most prized river basins.

Before we can act, however, we must know what the causes of this decline are and what must be done to reverse the trend of continuing decay. The sad truth is that we do not know all the causes of pollution in the Charles. We do not know what measures must be taken if we are to save this river basin. But we must find out, and soon.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I introduce today, for appropriate reference, a bill which will enable us to find out what must be done.

My bill provides that the Secretary of the Department of the Interior shall conduct a study of the Charles River Basin to determine what its problems are. On the basis of this study the Secretary shall make recommendations and suggestions to the President concerning what needs to be done.

The study by the Secretary is intended to be a comprehensive one, reaching into all areas of water pollution, beautification, and planning activities. While conducting the study the Secretary will cooperate with all appropriate State and local agencies, commissions, and authorities relating to the Charles River Basin. This is not intended to be simply a Federal study. It will involve all interested State and local bodies. By coordinating the findings, recommendations, and views of all interested agencies, the study should embody their best efforts.

The Secretary's study shall cover three major fields.

First, he shall conduct research with respect to the quality of the waters of the basin. This is intended to reveal possible contaminants of the water, other foreign matter in the water, and the overall quality of the water at the present time. In addition, the Secretary shall make an analysis of the present and projected future water quality of the basin under varying conditions of waste treatment and disposal. He shall evaluate the future water quality needs of the basin, and shall evaluate the municipal, industrial, and vessel treatment and disposal practices with respect to such waters. He shall also consider any alternative methods of solving water pollution problems, including additional waste treatment measures, with respect to the waters of the basin.

Second, the Secretary shall consider, among other things, all the resource and scenic values of the basin, its economic and recreational potential, and its ecology. He shall consider the present urban and industrial uses of the waters of the basin, and how the waters can be used most effectively for future urban and industrial needs. He will explore the most appropriate means or methods of preserving or protecting the recreational, historic, and fish and wildlife values of the basin. This does not necessarily involve any Federal land acquisition of Federal administration, but the Secretary, after consulting with State and local authorities, may recommend Federal land acquisition of Federal administration.

Third, the Secretary shall coordinate his study with applicable highway plans and other planning activities relating to the basin, including plans completed or in preparation pursuant to the act of May 28, 1963, the Water Resources Planning Act, and the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965.

During the course of this study the Secretary of the Interior shall hold hearings to obtain views and recommendations from interested parties, public or private. Such hearings shall be held when the Governor of the State of Massachusetts so requests.

Within 3 years after the Secretary is authorized to begin his study, he shall submit to the President a complete re-

August 26, 1966

A4554

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

HIGH "WASHOUT" RATE

The pressure on Federal Aviation Agency controllers in the O'Hare tower is great. As at other busy airports they man critical positions only for an hour at a time before taking breathers doing less demanding tasks. The "washout" rate for controllers is astronomical; in one period 77.8% of all the men who tried to transfer to O'Hare from other FAA facilities outside Chicago failed to make the grade. This may not be surprising considering the demands placed on controllers here, where roughly half of all the pure jet aircraft operated by the nation's airlines touch down at least once a day.

O'Hare's ground control radio frequency is sometimes overwhelmed by the traffic load. At 6 p.m., for example, no less than 20 flights are scheduled to leave their gates simultaneously and each pilot is trying to get the tower's ear. "It's frustrating. Pretty soon you get two or three guys keying the mike and you can't get a chance to talk and you can't understand anything. You just have to lay down your mike and walk away," says Donald R. Kemmerling, a supervisor.

Such congestion at many airports has led to continuing "inflation" or "padding" of scheduled flight times, as airlines seek to allow for delays. Capt. J. D. Smith, director of flight safety for United Air Lines says, "It's a helluva big cushion. We put buffer on buffer as experience dictates."

In fact, says Capt. Smith, fully 26% to 28% of the average United flight schedule is padding. United is the unhappy carrier with the snail's pace jet flights from New York to Philadelphia.

Even these big chunks of padding have failed to reduce delays extending well beyond scheduled flight times. The longest of these appear to be at Kennedy and O'Hare, where two and three-hour waits are not rarities. Newark Airport, however, wins the dubious honor of having the highest incidence of delay in proportion to flights handled. According to the FAA, a whopping 42.7% of all incoming flights were delayed last year at the Newark end of the line. The figure does not include those planes which had no trouble getting into Newark but were delayed at another airport.

The FAA estimates that delays last year at the 292 U.S. airports with air traffic control centers cost civil and military carriers \$63.6 million in direct operating costs. More than 35% of the total delay costs were incurred at nine airports, among them the biggest and busiest in the nation.

Delays at Kennedy cost users \$6.8 million, and at O'Hare the figure was \$6.5 million. Delays at seven other airports cost carriers more than \$1 million each. They are, in order, Newark, Love Field (Dallas), La Guardia (New York), Atlanta, Lambert Field (St. Louis), Los Angeles International and National (Washington, D.C.).

LIMIT ON AVIATION GROWTH?

The airlines fret over the inconvenience to their passengers as well as the rising costs. Carl A. Benscoter, executive vice president of Mohawk Airlines, recently issued a public warning that "the situation is becoming intolerable" at Kennedy. On April 28, four of Mohawk's seven flights out of Kennedy sat on the runway for more than an hour apiece awaiting takeoff clearance. George Keck, president of United, recently told stockholders the airline faces "a critical situation" in 20 major cities and warned that if uncorrected, congestion could "be a limiting factor in the growth potential we know to be present."

The carriers are deeply concerned that airport congestion will undermine advances in aircraft technology. Mohawk, for example, has had a particularly frustrating experience with its fleet of speedy BAC 111 two-engine jets. The BAC 111 is one of several new types of jets designed to operate profitably on short-haul trips.

The BAC 111 has a cruising speed of 550 m.p.h., but in the first quarter this year Mohawk's fleet of five, hampered by delays, averaged only 231 m.p.h. from gate to gate. The 5:15 p.m. flight from Kennedy to Syracuse, N.Y., averaged 198 m.p.h.—only 36% of its cruising speed. "This calls for special action, pronto, if the true potential of these small jets is to be realized," comments Air Transport World, a trade magazine.

This problem may grow more acute as the airlines continue to turn in their remaining propeller aircraft for more jets. And the airliners can only cringe at the vision of a supersonic transport of the 70s crossing the continent in less than two hours—and then circling its destination for another hour or so, waiting to land.

ON A TIGHTROPE

Some business and commercial pilots, concerned about the increasing congestion, have sounded safety alarms. Leonard Kmiecik, secretary of the 40-member Chicago Area Pilots Association, believes that the volume of aircraft handled at O'Hare is so great that there is little margin for human or mechanical error. "Though most airline, city and FAA officials argue that O'Hare is completely safe," he says, "it reminds me of a man on a crowded tightrope saying that it is safe because nobody has fallen off—so far."

Elsewhere business pilots have had some close calls, often because they cannot carry enough fuel to enable them to circle landing fields during long delays.

Business and Commercial Aviation, another trade publication, said recently that "long delays are growing common" and claimed that "more than a few of the fuel-limited business jets are calling in for priority (one step below declaring an emergency) to avoid holding or to expedite the approach." The magazine says one of its readers, waiting 45 minutes to take off at Newark, witnessed the landing of a JetStar without enough fuel left to taxi to the ramp, the landing of a Sabreliner with only 200 pounds of fuel remaining and the departure of a Lear Jet from the takeoff line for refueling.

Doesn't all this add up to a threat to air safety? Says Archie League, director of the FAA's air traffic service: "The more airplanes in a given amount of air space the greater the congestion and also the greater the possibility of collision. But that is what air traffic control is all about."

FLOW CONTROL HELPS

Mr. League notes that the FAA's control centers delay, hold, or impose "flow control" to prevent dangerous oversaturation of traffic in a given area. This, of course, often requires the FAA to sacrifice on-time arrivals and departures in order to further safety.

As for O'Hare, officials maintain there is no danger even when scores of planes, separated by 1,000 feet of altitude, are circling in the "stacks" in the sky. Carl Eck, air safety specialist with the Air Line Pilots Association, says O'Hare's procedures are "adequate and safe."

All agree, however, that O'Hare is crowded, to say the least. J. P. (Pat) Dunne, airport manager, says its traffic load is running five to ten years ahead of predictions by "the so-called experts." This has led to congestion not only on the runways and in the air around O'Hare and other major hubs, but in the airline terminals themselves.

It takes a lot of doing to crowd O'Hare's huge, sprawling terminal complex. It is so big that a passenger getting off a flight at one end of the terminal's long fingerlike extensions may have to walk up to three-quarters of a mile along its "bunions boulevards" (the main through corridors) to board another flight at the tip of another distant "finger." Trudging along a bunion boulevard, a footsore Gorgie Jessel quips: "Coming

into O'Hare is like landing in Cincinnati and walking to Chicago."

The terminal is a city in its own right. About 12,000 people are employed in the complex, including one man who does nothing but replace an average of 875 telephone directories a week. Six restaurants and cafeterias, three cocktail lounges, seven stand-up liquor bars and six stand-up snack bars can serve 2,400 people at a sitting—or standing, as the case may be.

THEY NEVER SEE TOWN

O'Hare is so self-contained that many businessmen fly in, conduct deals over a drink or dinner, and fly out again without ever going into Chicago. Or they stay in one of the motels that have sprung up around the airport and conduct business there.

Despite the size of the complex, O'Hare's terminal facilities are taxed "everywhere, from the rest rooms to the bars," says Herbert H. Howell, planning chief for Chicago's aviation department. Sample: A monumental traffic jam the Sunday after Thanksgiving, when cars backed up 5½ miles trying to get into the airport.

There are many partial remedies offered to ease the congestion that afflicts O'Hare and other major air transport centers: The development of high-speed rail transportation to carry short-haul passengers (already planned in the Northeast); more non-stop flights to medium-sized cities, removing some of the traffic from the bigger airports; and separate airports for business and private planes, a proposal which evokes considerable opposition from non-airline flying interests.

But any real solution, according to most experts, must include an immediate program to expand some existing airports and build others. According to the Airport Operators Council, the American Association of Airport Executives and the National Association of State Aviation Officials, some \$2 billion will have to be spent over the next 4 years if this is to be done.

These groups have been hoping to get about 30% of this total, or roughly \$600 million, from the Federal Government. They seem doomed to disappointment; bills currently in Congress call for Federal aid to airports totaling less than \$300 million over the next 4 years—and it's not a certainty that Congress will appropriate that much. Also, the Administration is inclined more to cut back on airport aid programs than to expand them.

VN Vietnam Gets the Goods: An Exclusive Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, amidst the criticisms of weapon and supply shortages in Vietnam, I wish to take note of one segment of the military effort which has gone well beyond the call of duty. Those responsible for the movement of supplies and equipment to this distant land—the Defense Department and the transportation industry—certainly have not waived in "delivering the goods."

During my recent inspection of logistical management in Vietnam during the month of July, I saw first hand the value of this accomplishment at ports, airfields, and supply lines.

August 26, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4553

grams. Some projects will have full-time guidance counselors to visit the schools sending students to the program. They will work on college planning and "reentry" into their regular school routine.

FREE-WHEELING APPROACH

In spite of the hectic and free-wheeling approach to packing as much into the summer's luggage as possible, teachers are deeply impressed by the quality of the learning going on.

Some of the students will be entering white schools for the first time. Counselors are attempting to help students prepare for this change.

As Upward Bound director, Dr. Ruth Bradford of Grambling College (Louisiana) put it: "There is all the difference in the world between desegregation and integration, and we are asking some of these students to shoulder an enormous burden. I am deeply touched by their willingness to do so."

Although all the projects were to be integrated, seven of the eight visited in the South were all-Negro. For the first time the majority of students encountered white teachers and tutors.

The director of the Talladega College project commented: "During the first three weeks the white tutors had to convince the students that they would not do them any harm. Now our job in the remaining weeks is to prove to these students that they can be confident in the help offered them."

At Tougaloo College several girls were a week late entering the program because they were hospitalized from the gassing in Canton during the Meredith march. It did not take them long to catch up. The Upward Bound dropout rate is remarkably low (less than 5 percent) in spite of the fact that most students have never been away from home.

One girl who went home wrote back to her counselor: "Just a few lines to let you know that every word you said was true. And I am truly sorry I didn't come back. . . . I wish I could. Has my space been filled yet? I know now that I made the biggest mistake of my life.

"You never realize you've made a mistake until after it's too late. I know there's not a possible chance I could come back—is there? I just needed some time to think things over, but it's too late now?"

The girl has been readmitted.

As one young man stated: "I didn't know I was capable of so much, and there is so much out there for me if I can only make up for the bad years."

If the programs in the Deep South are typical the Office of Economic Opportunity may have begun a small revolution in secondary education.

Managing the Public Business

SPEECH
OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1966

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have joined in sponsoring the legislation to enlist the genius of private industry in the solution of great public questions. I want to pay tribute to the leadership of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] in taking the initiative in getting this proposal organized, shaped into a bill, and introduced.

With this legislation, we lay to rest once more the false charge that ours is merely a party of opposition and that it

does nothing constructive. This is a Republican bill, both imaginative and realistic, and I am proud to support it as a Republican.

The approach we have taken in this legislation is more than a Republican approach; it is an American approach. It calls upon the private sector to help Government and provides a convenient means through which this can be done. It is based on the traditional Republican belief—and the traditional American belief—that the Government is the servant, not the master of our society. It also recognizes that every element of the society has an obligation to every other element to contribute to the general welfare its talents and resources. Above all, this legislation is realistic and forward looking. By drawing on the systems analysis techniques developed by our sophisticated industries, it proposes a constructive method that, in my opinion, is capable of coping successfully with some of the vast and complex problems that face the country.

I urge its prompt consideration by the House.

Airport Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1966

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the aviation industry is currently facing the biggest threat to its growth in its entire history. Both commercial and general aviation must contend with crowded airports, runway shortages, and general air and ground congestion.

Lately, this problem has become of such an emergency nature that I feel it is time Congress should take up this matter immediately.

To give you a clear idea of the situation that is before us, I am offering for the RECORD an article written by Mr. Philip M. Boffey that appeared in the August 22 issue of the Wall Street Journal.

This article is well documented, concise, and presents a frightening picture.

The article is as follows:

CLOGGED AIRPORTS: CONGESTION AT BIG HUBS NOW LOOMS AS THREAT TO GROWTH OF AVIATION—AIRLINES PAD SCHEDULES, LOSE MILLIONS AS DELAYS INCREASE—SAFETY QUESTIONS POP UP—CROWDS ON BUNION BOULEVARD

(By Philip M. Boffey)

CHICAGO.—All the airplanes are flying again—right into another thunderhead.

This is not the sudden turbulence of a labor dispute, but a storm of major proportions that has been building up for years. Its effects already are being felt by airports, airlines and passengers, and the worst is yet to come.

The trouble is severe congestion at the nation's big air transport hubs. Airports at many of the nation's principal cities, some of them built or expanded only recently, are strangling in traffic undreamed of when the jet age began. "Every major airport in the United States will run out of runway capacity in the foreseeable future unless they do

something about it," says E. Thomas Burnard, executive vice president of the Airport Operators Council.

The airlines have been forced to lengthen their scheduled flight times repeatedly to allow for weaving in and out of clogged traffic on the ground and in the air. In 1940 a passenger could board a 185-m.p.h. DC-3 at La Guardia Airport in New York and expect to reach Philadelphia in 46 minutes. Today, on at least two flights, the same nonstop trip from Kennedy International Airport (which is closer to Philadelphia than La Guardia) is scheduled at 53 minutes—on a 550 m.p.h. DC-8 fan jet. Congestion is one reason for the stretchout.

FRAZZLED NERVES

And flights may take a lot longer than even the lengthened schedules show. Delays far in excess of scheduled flight times, are growing commonplace, costing the airlines tens of millions of dollars in extra operating expense, robbing new high-speed jets of their efficiency and frizzling the nerves of countless passengers. The increasing congestion also is breeding new air safety worries in some quarters.

The problem is people. Since the dawn of the jet age, commercial air travel has drawn more customers than most experts ever dreamed it would. In 1965, U.S. scheduled airlines flew 51.6 billion revenue passenger miles (one paying passenger flown one mile) over domestic routes compared with 43.9 billion in 1964 and only 19.7 billion in 1955, before jets were used. It is predicted that the 1965 total may be doubled by 1970. What's more, the boom in air cargo, private and business flying is expected to continue, too.

After 1970 the crush may grow worse. Around then airlines will be operating supersonic jet transports and "jumbo" carriers capable of hauling 500 passengers at drastically reduced rates. While this greater capacity might seem likely to trim the number of flights, these new aircraft are expected to give another mighty boost to air travel, just as today's conventional jets did after they were introduced in the late 1950s.

Some of the nation's large metropolitan airports are barely able to cope with today's traffic, much less the crowds of the future. The predicament of many is exemplified by one—O'Hare International Airport, the world's busiest terminal since 1962, when a massive expansion program was completed.

THE COMPLETE AIRPORT

O'Hare, Chicago's principal terminal, has a reputation as one of the best-equipped and best-run airports, as well as the busiest. It is blessed with relatively unencumbered approaches, has more runways equipped for instrument landings than any other, and is the only airport that can bring in two planes simultaneously on instrument landings.

But despite its vaunted efficiency, O'Hare is slowly choking on its mounting traffic load. It logged nearly 520,000 landings and takeoffs last year, a world record, 24% more than in 1962. Some 21 million passengers passed through its terminal, up 56% from 1962. In good weather, the airport must strain to the utmost to handle takeoffs and landings occurring once every 20 seconds in peak periods. In bad weather, jam-ups become hopeless.

On one particularly foul day last winter, 88 incoming planes were backed up in four "stacks" in the sky, according to James R. Rugg, a veteran supervisor in the O'Hare control tower. On another occasion it took the pilot of an empty passenger plane 3 hours and 55 minutes just to taxi across the airport after a snowstorm. So many planes were waiting to land and take off that harried controllers couldn't let the taxiing pilot waste precious seconds crossing the runways.

August 26, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4555

In this connection I wish to call to your attention an article in *Traffic Management*, a Cahners publication, which deals thoroughly and completely with the huge task of getting material from the manufacturer to the fighting men in Vietnam.

Harry Tennant, author of the article, has documented the subject well, as I learned on my recent trip. The Cahners people are to be congratulated for pointing out that this massive job has not only been well done but has been accomplished without the administration having to impose any stiff transportation regulations. As Vincent F. Caputo, Defense Department transport head says, we have made a heavy buildup on a crash basis without imposing emergency controls.

The article follows:

From oxen to computer, the transport complexities that have been overcome in fighting this nation's greatest single long-distance war are phenomenal. For the logistics system employed in moving men and goods in the Vietnam conflict is altogether as sophisticated as the weapons it moves. Among other things, it keeps air transports carrying men and materiel flying six minutes apart across the Pacific while making full use of more than 370 Military Sea Transport Service vessels. And it would take an army of statisticians to determine how many tons are moving hourly in this country by train, truck, domestic water carrier and pipeline.

There have been only two major hitches thus far. One is the port congestion at the Vietnam end where there is a shortage of harbor and berthing space, inadequate port facilities, and often not enough stevedores to unload the cargo. (Defense transportation people think it unfair that they should be criticized for this set of circumstances so inherent to an underdeveloped country after they have "delivered the goods.") The other problem is that distribution of supplies has been disrupted, requiring diversion and re-routing, as a result of the recent anti-Saigon government demonstrations in the military headquarters city of Danang.

Outlines for this country's huge transport effort have long been set. Out of bitter lessons learned in other conflicts has come a system which thoroughly integrates the functions of the three services and those of their civilian counterparts in one of the most efficient operations of the Vietnam conflict.

Defense Secretary Robert McNamara is understandably proud of this feature of the war effort and has repeatedly defended it against censure, both through the public press and in Congress, with the counter-charge that any talk of a shipping shortage is "absurd." For one thing, he need not do any prodding in this area because there have been few bottlenecks on the transportation side. Problems are ironed out before they reach the worrisome stage.

Mr. McNamara's chief troubleshooter, DOD's Director for Transportation and Warehousing Policy Vincent F. Caputo, at the first sign of any disorder contacts the service and joint staff transportation representative and the single managers. Foreseeing trouble, such as the possibility of a ship walk-out, he carefully lays plans—in this case for the best use of maritime labor who have continued to load Vietnam supplies in spite of picket lines.

As the world's largest corporate organization, the Defense Department naturally has one of the largest transportation budgets. And it is on the three freight-moving agencies covered by that budget—the Military Airlift Command, the Military Sea Transportation Service, and the year-old Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service—that Mr. McNamara, Mr. Caputo and close to 300,000 fighting men must depend.

These agencies function in vastly different manner in fulfilling their duties. MAC is made up of 100,000 men. After a long post-World War II history highlighted by the spectacular Berlin Airlift, this unit (then known as the Military Air Transport Service) has moved with such success that its C-141 Starlifter, the first military jet designed solely for troop and cargo transport operations, has moved to the glamour pages.

Another cargo workhorse, the C-135, which has moved heavy loads of cargo from inland points to Vietnam, is now being phased out of service and it is the C-141, which joined the MAC fleet less than a year ago, that is the backbone of what MAC calls its "Red Ball Express," which hauls Army cargo. Patterned after the logistics supply line of World War II, when virtually needed supplies were trucked across the continent on an around-the-clock basis, the "Express" has updated its operation to carry out its Vietnam role.

John M. Malloy, Deputy Assistant Defense Secretary for Procurement, has dusted off the old World War II plan, substituting planes for trucks, and has some impressive results to show. Twenty-four hour use of construction and materials hauling equipment with little or no time for preventive maintenance has multiplied the need for spare parts. The same holds true for aircraft and automotive parts and the Express handles components for fighter aircraft, helicopters, tanks, bulldozers and trucks as well as materials-hauling equipment.

"Spare parts, in most instances," Mr. Malloy said, "were available but getting them to the man who needed them was the big problem. To cope with this emergency the jet-age 'Red Ball Express' was organized with a fleet of jet transports carrying priority spare parts and equipment, all marked with the Red Ball."

The idea behind this World War II scheme (when the trucks were given a priority rating and identified by a red ball marking on the bumper) was to have the needed parts in the needed place within 168 hours or seven days. Malloy points out that defense contract awards for Vietnam during the first half of fiscal 1966 totaled \$15.57 billion, of which the most essential items were sent via the Red Ball Express.

The C-141s now carry supplies to Southeast Asia from two Air Force bases on the East Coast, at Dover, Del., and Charleston, S.C., as well as two in California: Travis near San Francisco, and Norton, near San Bernardino. Norton only recently began airlift operations to the war front when 43,000 pounds of cargo departed on a 24-hour flight to Saigon.

With its 160-foot wing span and 143-foot long fuselage, the C-141 can haul more than 30 tons nearly 4,000 miles. Equally important is its ability to load or unload its cargo in 15 minutes.

Still to come is the giant C-5A transport which Gen. Howell M. Estes, Jr., MAC commander, hopes to have in operation by 1969. To be built by Lockheed in Marietta, Ga., the C-5A will be capable of carrying upwards of a quarter million pounds more than 3,000 miles nonstop. With lesser loads its range can be extended to more than 5,000 miles.

Considering its tremendous cargo capacity, military planners expect C-5A operational costs to average about four cents less than the corresponding figure for the C-141, 11 cents less than the C-135 and about 18 cents lower than the much slower propeller-driven C-124 Globemaster, also being phased out of MAC service.

The C-5A is a genuine breakthrough in terms of bulk cargo loads. According to Gen. Estes, MAC moved 15,500 troops from Texas to Germany during "Operation Big Lift" in October, 1963. "We used 204 aircraft, flying 234 missions, and completed the lift in 63

hours. By way of comparison, 42 C-5As could have done the same job in 13 hours."

MAC's commander believes that the proper mixing of C-141 and C-5A aircraft would meet the most exacting transportation requirement the military can anticipate—the airlifting of large combat forces and equipment to Europe or the Far East, or in both directions, at the same time.

Meanwhile, Robert H. Charles, Assistant AF Secretary for Installations and Logistics, today terms Saigon's Tan Son Nhut the busiest airfield in the world. He said AF pilots have carried more than 667,000 troops and delivered over 265,000 tons of cargo. "Each day approximately 225 MAC transports are in the air over routes connecting the U.S. and several Pacific locations and every six minutes, somewhere along the immense span of the Pacific, an AF transport touches down."

Charles says the need for airlifting high priority cargo "rose sharply" in 1965 and that by December more than 12,000 tons per month were required. Last year's Pacific airlift totaled more than 96,500 tons of cargo and more than 275,000 passengers. By comparison, 80,000 tons of cargo and 215,000 passengers were airlifted during the three years of the Korean conflict.

Supplementing the use of Government-owned aircraft are flights operated by commercial airlines under contract with MAC. Pan American, Flying Tiger, Seaboard World and Continental Airlines have been among the most active participants in the military airlift, and Trans World will begin flying 22 roundtrips a month between the U.S. and Saigon in July. Although MAC pays the airlines less than their rates for commercial service, they realize a profit because of the high utilization of their aircraft.

But, while air travel to Vietnam is fast and sometimes glamorous, it nonetheless is still expensive, restricted to the relatively small size of the airplane and limited to the number of airfields available.

Currently with thousands of plants and factories across the U.S. again geared to the war effort, more than half a million tons of supplies flow out each month to the battle area. Except for high-priority items which can travel by air, most cargo must go by ship.

In fact, every day about 170 ships belonging to or chartered by the Military Sea Transportation Service are on their way to or coming back from Vietnam. In their holds they carry virtually everything imaginable—boots and beer, toilet paper and tanks, helicopters and helmets. And they carry the troops that will use the equipment. Best estimates now are that nearly 98 percent of all supplies and two out of three soldiers destined for the Far East travel by ship.

The vast job of controlling these vessels belongs to MSTs, the Navy's "single manager" for providing sea transportation for all the armed services. Commanded by Vice Admiral Glynn R. Donaho, MSTs currently has control or operation of 413 vessels, a large portion being commercial ships under government contract. Unfortunately, many of these have been sailing on a stormy sea of discontent.

Normally, the task of delivering military goods falls on U.S.-flag lines and they do, in fact, carry most of the tonnage. For the aging fleet of tramp steamers, which are available for special charter, additional military volume is a welcome find. The same, however, is not the case with the 14 subsidized steamship companies and their 340 liners. Since most of them operate regular trade routes on tight schedules, they have had to forego more lucrative commercial contracts in order to carry defense cargo. Foreign flag lines, in turn, are picking up the commercial contracts, and U.S.

carriers make no secret of their fear that when the crisis in Vietnam is ended the business will be hard to get back.

According to best estimates, transpacific shipments on U.S. ships have recently been averaging close to 60 percent war goods, an increase of from 20 to 30 percent over a year ago. Like the airlines, the ship operators say the Government pays much less than commercial shippers for their service. And in a further cost-cutting step, MSTs beginning July 1 will purchase ship space through competitive bidding between individual lines, instead of negotiating rates with carrier conferences. DOD officials expect a 25% saving as a result of this change.

The ship lines, of course, are not legally obligated to accept any set amount of government business although commercial ships could be "drafted" into service under MSTs control. This is considered highly unlikely, especially now that more than 75 World War II freighters have been reactivated from the reserve mothball fleet and another 25 are due in service by late spring.

There is widespread concern among steamship experts that a disaster could befall the transportation industry if more attention is not given to the merchant fleet in the current struggle. This fear is based on the fact that no additional ships are being built. No one is bold enough to believe the giant airlift could do the task alone.

Figures show that to keep the nearly 300,000 Vietnam fighting men (plus another 100,000 men in other sections of Southeast Asia) in material and equipment, MSTs has enlarged its fleet through charters and vessels from the mothball fleet to more than 400 ships. But shipping men compare this to the Korean conflict. They say the vessels taken out of mothballs are now years older than when they entered the Korean War, and supply lines are much longer.

Falling somewhere in the middle between (1) MAC-MSTs operations and (2) coordination, direction and management of the flow of men and materiel to the proper destination, is the newest of the three "single managers" for military transportation—the Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service.

Historically, this command came into being a year ago when Secretary McNamara, employing the foresight he is sometimes criticized for possessing, instructed Army Maj. Gen. John J. Lane to consolidate the management and operation of military traffic, land transportation and common-user terminals within the continental United States.

The charter handed to Gen. Lane gave him broad powers. In essence, it directs him to control and supervise all functions pertaining to the procurement and use of freight and passenger transportation service within the continental 48 states. This includes negotiations with commercial for-hire companies, including rail, highway, air, inland waterways, coastwise and intercoastal carriers.

Also, he controls the movement of cargo and passengers into appropriate air and ocean terminals in order to meet the availability of air and sea lift. Previously, this had been an area of divided authority with unclear lines of responsibility resulting in duplication and overlap. What is important here is that MTMTS now has control over military traffic into air terminals and into and through ocean ports.

The last of the continental U.S. (CONUS) functions is direction of the Defense Rail Interchange Fleet operation. DRIF, as it is called, is composed of military-owned rolling stock registered for interchange service operations. Although the fleet is comprised of both passenger and freight equipment, freight cars make up the largest segment and thereby require the greatest effort to control.

The latest tally shows there are 5,276 cars

in the Interchange fleet including 2,590 general purpose tank cars, 756 special purpose tank cars, 931 heavy duty flat cars, 896 defense freight box cars, 95 other box cars and eight gondola cars. All are strongly geared to the Vietnam war.

Understandably MTMTS does not publicize shipments for Vietnam and other areas where supplies are needed to maintain troops. But some figures showing the magnitude of its operations in the first year may throw a little light on the big job in Asia. For instance, the Command:

(1) Contracted for the movement of 1.3 million passengers traveling in groups of 15 or more. (Smaller groups or individuals are still handled by their respective services.)

(2) Directed the movement of close to 10 million tons of cargo through ocean, Gulf and Great Lakes ports.

(3) Monitored key ocean terminals on the east, west and Gulf coasts in addition to supervising more than \$50 million in stevedoring contracts and related activities.

(4) Managed the movement of \$350 million worth of household goods throughout the world for DOD personnel.

What this amounts to in dollars and cents is that MTMTS during its first year of operation was responsible for the expenditure of \$1.3 billion of the Defense transportation budget, a significant portion going toward the supply and re-supply of U.S. forces in Vietnam.

Considering that the total DOD transportation appropriation runs between \$2 billion and \$3 billion, this means that MTMTS, the newest of the three transportation agencies, is responsible for managing the largest chunk. It means, too, that this Command has had to take over some of the responsibilities of MAC and MSTs, a fact that at times has been difficult for either to accept.

This, then, is one of the big problems facing Vincent Caputo. As a major point of contact between the three agencies and Defense Secretary McNamara on transportation matters, it is his lot to see that neither MAC, MSTs nor MTMTS becomes short-sighted in its operations. Each, of course, thinks in terms of its own Command and wants to show the respective service Secretary that its responsibility is the most important of the three.

The size of the job in Vietnam can be seen from an assortment of reports produced by the Defense Department. In the final five months of last year a total of 3,200,360 tons of war goods was shipped by water from Atlantic, Gulf and Pacific Coast ports destined for Southeast Asia. The shipments were divided about like this: Atlantic ports, 15.8% or 504,882 tons; Gulf, 14.1% or 450,085 tons; and Pacific, 70.1% or 2,245,393 tons. (To Vietnam directly, 355,875 tons went from Atlantic ports, 342,802 from Gulf ports, and 1,307,577 from Pacific ports, with lesser amounts from each range sent to Thailand, Subic Bay in the Philippines, Guam, Okinawa, Japan, and Korea.)

Some DOD officials, basing their estimates on what is assumed to be a projected ten-year period (military transport people never plan on a short, Hitler-type blitzkrieg), have estimated railroad car requirements for defense needs for the first six months of this year. They estimate a total of 51,690 rail cars needed from January to June—considerably higher than the 36,481 actually used in the same period last year. These figures apply to all railroads, although the western carriers are used the most extensively since the bulk of the shipments are consigned through West Coast ports.

Defense officials have carefully avoided any part in the Capitol Hill battle over freight car shortages. This is because the arrangement between DOD and the carriers through the Association of American Railroads has given the military adequate hauling space. While Brig. Gen. Raymond C. Conroy, com-

mander of the western area for MTMTS, has shown concern over the commercial car shortage, Gen. Lane agreed some months ago that, although the number of cars available will continue to decrease, "the fact that the new replacement cars are of greater carrying capacity" will do the job. Piggyback and containerization will also aid in relieving the situation, he said.

"Since a limited engagement, such as prompted the present build-up, does not require any significant diversion of certain types of shipping," Gen. Lane said, "the Defense Freight Railway Interchange Fleet could be augmented to meet the increase in car requirements and at the same time permit control of their movement and supply. This increase in the fleet could be brought about by leasing cars from the carriers, the mobilization of service-owned, intraplant equipment into the interchange fleet, or limited purchase of selected types of equipment."

The trucking industry, like the railroads, has not blown its horn over its Vietnam role. But DOD figures are impressive for this mode. In the third quarter of fiscal 1966 trucks transported 187,679 less-truckload shipments valued at nearly \$11 million and 49,728 truckloads valued at \$23,700,000. The shipments have included such commodities as airplanes and airplane parts, iron and steel items, ammunition and explosives, petroleum products, auto and machinery parts, motor vehicles, electrical equipment, printed matter, furniture, containers, chemicals, and ordnance materiel.

With regard to the Saigon port congestion—which worsened with the increase of military shipments to a point where at one time last November 122 ships were unloading or standing idle in Vietnam ports or holding areas—the situation is now improving.

According to Lt. Gen. William F. Cassidy, the Army's Chief of Engineers, the port bottleneck has been broken, with monthly military tonnage unloaded from ships in Vietnam presently in excess of that shipped from the U.S. to Korea at the peak of that war. In the third week of April, some 36 ships were waiting for berthing space, usually four to five days. Previously delays extended as long as 30 days before a ship could find space to unload its cargo.

Defense officials also are working on plans to bring about better cargo control, whereby supply items will be identified in each shipment to permit priority handling. Recently a fleet of barges and some floating piers, 80 by 300 feet, were in operation. And there are plans to use containership to facilitate faster unloading and turnaround at the ports. As in previous wars, many of the innovations developed to expedite the movement of supplies to the front will likely find commercial applications in the future.

The latest estimate is that supplies are now arriving at Saigon at the rate of about 700,000 tons a month. Mr. Caputo sums up the performance thus far in a single sentence: "We have made a heavy build-up on a crash basis of troops and materials in an underdeveloped country 7,000 miles from our West Coast, and our emergency governmental powers are still in reserve."

Marine Reserve Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to call attention to the 50th anniversary of the Marine Corps