

May 13, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10097

Saturday or Sunday will find this area crowded with people who have come to swim or boat or fish or picnic, or simply to walk about on its grassy and wooded slopes, or to view its buffalo or longhorns or elk or prairie dogs. Over the years, I have seen this use grow and swell as our population has grown and their leisure time has increased, conditions which have been duplicated in every area of this nation.

Theodore Roosevelt could well have been speaking of this very area, which he helped to establish, first as a national forest and then as a wildlife refuge, when he said in his first message to Congress in December 1901:

And hundreds of persons, especially from the immediate neighborhood, come back each year to enjoy the privilege of camping. Some, at least, of our forest reserves should afford perpetual protection to the native fauna and flora, safe havens of refuge for our rapidly diminishing wild animals of the large kind, and free camping grounds for the ever-increasing numbers of the men and women who have learned to find rest, health and recreation in the splendid forests and flower-clad meadows of our mountains. The forest reserves should be set apart forever for the use and benefit of our people as a whole.

I drive among those people enjoying the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, and I know many of them and their circumstances. I have seen families of Indians and Negroes and whites, who come from homes of such modest means that even the slightest charge for these wondrous facilities would remove them from their present enjoyment and use.

Are we to say to them, Mr. President, that we are going to spend millions of the taxpayers' money to take them out of the state of mind and financial condition called poverty, and say with another program under this act which I seek to amend, that we are going to charge them for the little free enjoyment nature now provides them? I hope we are not going to say that, and, if we pass this bill, we will not say that and we will have another opportunity to assure that it will not be said by any agency of the Federal Government.

There is another fine program which this administration is now sponsoring. It is called "See the U.S.A." It is a great program and one which I heartily endorse. That is the program under which the Secretary of Commerce recently said:

We are encouraging Americans to see the beauty and majesty of their own country.

He said further:

You can help by emphasizing the human values as well as the scenic wonders of traveling our great country.

He said:

It will benefit every citizen to journey forth into our land, see the vast outdoors and interesting cities of America, and visit our historic shrines.

He said:

We need to rediscover the spirit of America.

I submit that the "spirit of America," rediscovered, will once again be revealed as encouraging the full and free enjoyment of its natural beauties and wonders.

In furtherance of this program, "See

the U.S.A." Congress has passed House Joint Resolution 658, designating the years 1964 and 1965 to encourage "the American people to explore, use, and enjoy the scenic, historical, and recreational areas and facilities" throughout the country. Will they be met at the gate by the toll collector? When they "see the U.S.A.," will they have to drop some coins in the box every time they turn around?

The passage of the bill I introduce today will leave Congress the right to review the decision on those questions, and when and where fees will be collected, and whether they will be in keeping with the facilities provided, and whether the paying public will pay as much for collection of the fees as for the development of new and existing facilities.

This is not a partisan matter, but I call to memory the words contained in the Democratic platform in 1960, wherein it was stated:

The new Democratic administration will develop balanced land and forest policies suited to the needs of a growing America. This means intensive forest management, on a multiple-use and sustained yield basis, reforestation of burned-over lands, building public access roads, range reseeding and improvement, intensive work in watershed management, concern for small business operations, and insuring free public access to public lands for recreational purposes.

This was indeed a truly laudable statement of public policy. I hope it will be adopted again, not by political parties, but by Congress, by the passage of the bill which I have introduced.

Henry David Thoreau recognized the public philosophy involved in the full enjoyment of the great outdoors. He said:

I went to the woods because I wished to live deliberately, to front only the essential facts of life, and see if I could not learn what it had to teach, and not, when I came to die, discover that I had not lived.

Let us retain the public policy of this country, concerning its great natural beauties, wonders, and resources, in the firm grasp of the Congress of the United States, where it belongs.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. At the outset, I compliment the Senator on his excellent presentation, in which he has expressed strongly his point of view concerning charging the public for the use of Government-owned facilities. Does the Senator's bill in any manner provide funds from the trust fund?

Mr. HARRIS. No; the bill does not affect the trust fund itself. It is in two particulars: First, it adds the Monroney amendment of the last Congress, which provides that fees cannot be charged, not only for the use of waters, but also for access thereto; and second, no entrance or use fees can become effective until they have been filed with Congress, provided that during a period of 60 days neither House has passed a disapproving resolution. It eliminates some fees that now might be charged and which might affect the trust fund.

It does not affect the other portions of the law which have to do with the sale of surplus property and taxes on gasoline and other fuels.

Mr. McNAMARA. I do not have a very clear answer to that. I understood the last part of the remarks of the Senator, which dealt with reserving unto Congress the right to pass upon it.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McNAMARA. Now we get into a situation which might be a drain on the so-called trust fund. That already amounts to \$5 billion-plus, so far as the roadbuilding fund is concerned.

Mr. HARRIS. It does not involve the roadbuilding fund at all. There is a fund set up under the act, which is called the Water and Soil Conservation Act. This would affect the public law and affect the law to the extent that motorboat fuel and the taxes thereon would go into this fund.

Mr. McNAMARA. This would only affect the fund, because the increased motorboat traffic would be retained in the fund established last year.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator is correct. That is not affected by my amendment. That is contained in the present law.

I thank the Senator for his comments.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE ASSIGNMENT OF THE U.S. COAST GUARD TO ASSIST THE REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM IN OFFSHORE PATROLS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I welcome the assignment of the U.S. Coast Guard to assist the Republic of Vietnam in offshore patrols. This is work for which the Coast Guard is preeminently suited. Moreover, the assignment of white Coast Guard cutters to this kind of task emphasizes that the United States is concerned with bringing peace to this unhappy country; that this is a peace-keeping and law enforcement operation, too. As a Coast Guard officer, I welcome the fact that these vessels will continue proudly to fly the Coast Guard commission pennant.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that the attached article by Sevellon Brown of the Providence Journal of May 4, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal,
May 4, 1965]

TOPIC FOR TODAY: THE COAST GUARD GOES TO VIETNAM

(By Sevellon Brown)

Units of the U.S. Coast Guard, Washington has announced, are being sent to Vietnam with the specific mission of suppressing smuggling of arms and men to the Vietcong. Thus this ancient and honorable branch of the Government service returns simultaneously to the wars and to its pristine function.

Not many people nowadays, I imagine, think of the Coast Guard as an antimuggling force. Yet that is precisely how it all began.

In the years before the Revolution, smuggling contraband past the British authorities was not only highly profitable, but was considered an eminently patriotic endeavor. Once independence had been won, this aura of social respectability persisted. Men who had earned their living for years by smuggling kept right on with their trade, and the

general public tolerated and even applauded the practice.

To the infant American Government, however, smuggling now seemed anything but praiseworthy. Washington needed every cent of revenue it could lay its hands on, and the systematic evasion of tariffs represented a serious drain. The first Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton, was especially worried about the problem, and it was he who first proposed an armed force to combat it. This explains the fact, which many people find curious, that to this day, except in time of war, the Coast Guard is an arm of the Treasury Department.

What Hamilton asked for—and got in 1790—was "10 boats of from 36 to 40 feet keel * * * each armed with swivels"—guns that could be aimed in any direction—and carrying plenty of canvas for top speed. The Secretary estimated that "the cost of one of these boats may be computed at \$1,000 and assured Congress that they would more than pay for themselves in increased revenues. He proved to be right.

Hamilton apparently guessed, though, that the suppression of smuggling would not be a particularly popular business. He wrote further:

"The utility of an establishment of this nature must depend on the exertion, vigilance and fidelity of those to whom the charge of the boats shall be confided * * * To procure such * * * it will, in the opinion of the Secretary, be advisable that they be commissioned as officers of the Navy. This will not only induce fit men, the more readily to engage, but will attach them to their duty by a nicer sense of honor."

The first "revenue cutter," the *Massachusetts*, was launched at Newburyport in 1791. She measured 50 feet from the Indian figurehead at her prow to her square stern, had a beam of 17 feet, 8 inches, and a displacement of 17½ tons. Her armament consisted of six swivel guns. To sail her, President George Washington named as the first "master of a cutter in the service of the United States for the protection of the revenue" a New Hampshire man with the splendid Yankee name of Hopley Yeaton.

Captain Yeaton was paid \$30 a month, and his crew down to \$4. Each man's rations included "a half gill of rum, brandy, or whiskey." Though that pleasant perquisite has long since disappeared, other hallmarks of the early days have survived. The broad collar at the back of the modern sailor's blouse, for example, was designed originally to catch dripping from pigtailed tarred as protection against salt water, and the familiar bell bottom trousers were cut to roll up easily over boots in heavy weather. The 13 buttons that joined blouse and trousers were less utilitarian; they were intended to signalize, rather inconveniently, the number of the Thirteen Original States.

The Revenue Marine, as it was first called, turned out to be a smashing success. In a relatively few years, smuggling was virtually obliterated. The best evidence of the service's achievement was the fact that the usually penny-pinching Congress steadily raised its pay scales.

But much bigger things were in store. The Continental Navy had been blithely dissolved in 1785, and for 8 years until the U.S. Navy was founded in 1798, the Revenue Marine was all navy we had. Thus it was a matter of sheer necessity that Congress empowered the President to join the cutters to the Regular Navy whenever he considered that necessary. Under this authority, the Coast Guard has fought in every war the United States has ever fought at sea.

The record is a proud and varied one. Over the generations, the Coast Guard has chased French privateers, engaged the formidable British fleet in the War of 1812, participated in the first Union victory of the Civil War, helped blockade Cuba in the Spanish-American War, undertaken hazardous convoy and antisubmarine duty in

World War I, manned many a Pacific landing craft in World War II.

In between wars, the Coast Guard may justly claim to have been busier than any other services. It has harried pirates through the Caribbean, combatted the slave trade, performed miracles of rescue work in the Arctic, and fought the rumrunners of prohibition days—the last an activity no more popular than its original mission. It has been estimated that in the 70 years from 1871 to 1941, the Coast Guard saved more than 200,000 lives and close to \$2 billion worth of property; the figures today, of course, would be far higher.

Now 17 modern, high-speed cutters are on their way to southeast Asia, once again on an antismuggling mission. It is smuggling of a very different kind, to be sure, but we may imagine that Alexander Hamilton would be proud.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the natural followup to the assignment of these Coast Guard cutters is that they should be replaced and for this reason I support the bill introduced by the senior Senator from Washington to this effect. It is a fair and just bill and will mean that the services that have and are being rendered by these Coast Guard cutters in the United States and its waters will continue to be maintained in the future on the same high plane they have always been.

THE PENDING VISIT OF PRESIDENT PARK, OF KOREA

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, Americans have a notoriously short memory—particularly in foreign affairs. In this connection, I have always viewed as unfortunate our diminishing interest in Korean affairs since the signing of the truce. But the arrival for a fortnight's visit of His Excellency Chung Hee Park, President of the Republic of Korea, provides us with an opportunity not only to welcome a steadfast ally, but also to examine the exciting economic and political progress made by his country in recent years.

Changing conditions always come in advance of awareness. Most Americans, when they think of Korea at all, think of a war-devastated landscape, a stagnant economy, a nation with staggering unemployment, vast food shortages, and a shortage of development capital. But the facts show a difference. The industrial production index has risen, in Korea, by 60 percent since 1960.

In 1959 and 1960, over a million dollar's worth of cement were annually imported. In 1965 the Republic of Korea, with five cement plants, was an exporter of cement.

Production of coal since 1960 has doubled.

Some \$10 million worth of plywood are exported a year.

Korea is the largest exporter of strategic tungsten in the free world.

Sewing machine production has risen from 22,000 to 150,000 units; bicycles from 38,000 to 155,000 units.

All in all, this significant expansion of the Korean economy has increased its annual export rate from \$30 million in 1960 to an estimated \$170 million in 1965.

So dramatic has been Korea's ability to create the sinews of a productive nation—electrical energy and coal and oil supplies, that it is now on the verge of a very real economic leap forward. And for this

alone, we should thank President Park, for as Korea's economy has expanded so has Korea's dependence on American economic aid decreased. There are to be sure remaining substantial problems of economic stabilization and balance of payments. But, the Republic of Korea stands as a model for all those Asian states which are striving to increase their standard of living while advancing the political freedom of their population. They have but to look.

I am sorry to point out, however, that we Americans had our attention drawn elsewhere while these developments were taking place in Korea, and while another development of momentous import was taking place there.

On April 3, a basic agreement between Japan and the Republic of Korea was initialled, paving the way for a peace treaty between those two countries at long last ending World War II. The agreements are of great importance to friends of both Japan and Korea. They settled the troublesome problem of fishing rights. They provide for a total of at least \$800 million in reparations, long-term, low-interest loans to Korea, and private loans.

And, of great interest to us in the West, they provide for a "liquidation of the unfortunate past." The agreements declare to be "null and void from the very beginning" all previous Korea-Japanese agreements including the annexation treaty of 1910. Article 3 states:

It is confirmed that the Government of the Republic of Korea is the only lawful government in Korea.

The agreements in many other areas go far to the creation of conditions that will bring vast economical benefit to both Korea and Japan.

This treaty was negotiated by the government of President Chung Hee Park, despite the disapproval of many Koreans in every walk of life whose memories of a generation of Japanese occupation have led many to oppose any agreement at all, and led others to demand what I believe to be excessively harsh reparations. Indeed, President Park may be said to have taken his political life in his hands by this act of statesmanship.

Finally, the Republic of Korea has been able to contribute over 2,000 troops to our effort to preserve freedom in Vietnam and has even offered to send more. We should not forget when we welcome President Park that Korea's recent economic progress has been made in an atmosphere of political freedom and with the burden of 650,000 men under arms, the fourth largest army in the world.

This is, all told, a proud record for a small nation so recently ravaged by war. America should welcome President Park with a real sense of pride and respect.

ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order previously entered, the Senate will stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, May 14, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

May 13, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

10119

drugs appears mostly in the basic work in the academic institution, through support of the individual scientist, provision of facilities and equipment, or perhaps overall general support of the institution. Not supported by Government in most instances is the capability to perform large-scale animal tests or molecular modification, production research and development, or a dozen other tasks necessary to the introduction of a new agent. In nearly every case, these tasks are performed at great private expense by the pharmaceutical industry and consume no public or academic funds.

Given this context for the development of drugs, and realizing the immense importance of these products to the public health, the question that must be raised is, What incentive is there to drug manufacturers if the patent is confiscated by the Government and emasculated by blind licensing that in truth amounts to burying the patent in Government largesse? Is no value to be placed on the \$4.3 million invested to bring a new drug to market by the drug industry?

The result of HEW policies is to discourage progress in pharmaceutical research. There is real and mounting discontent in universities, Government, and industry over the inhibition placed on collaborative efforts.

Dr. Kenneth M. Endicott, Director of the National Cancer Institute, found fault with the practice in 1962, writing of his deep concern over our present patent policy and operating trends:

One man conceives the idea, another synthesizes the chemical, another proves its structure, and still others prove its utility in the clinic, but the Surgeon General is expected to claim all rights even though Public Health Service support is negligible.

Others note that in some Government departments the patent policies appear to be at odds with PHS: Dr. J. H. Burkhalter, of the American Chemical Society, observes "unwarranted distrust, misunderstanding, emotionalism, and an ingredient of politics have led the Government to favor defense industries over the pharmaceutical." Comments from other leaders in academic research centers call the PHS policy "too stringent." Says one:

The present policy, which supposedly is for the purpose of protecting the public welfare, will in the long run be detrimental to it.

White House Science and Technology Director Dr. Donald H. Hornig has recently written to Senator HILL pointing out:

To get industrial companies to commit their best skills and know-how, it may be necessary in some cases for the Government to offer patent incentives.

He has suggested a need for general legislation on Government patent policy, after appropriate consideration by the Congress, a suggestion worth remembering.

But implicit in his statement may be a feeling that special concessions are needed to obtain industrial interest in a given project. I hope that would be necessary in only the rarest cases. Surely, from the

public's point of view, it is more reasonable to allocate patent rights in an equitable fashion among those agencies and institutions responsible for the existence of the patented articles, and stop there. Included in such a solution should be just provision for exclusive licensing, in order to preserve the purposes of the patent even when title may be in the Government.

Industry should not ask for special consideration; it is not accustomed to it, and does not need it. It needs and deserves a just share of the rewards it earns through its own efforts, and nothing more.

Certainly the President's Commission can do a great public service by resolving this complex and vital matter and thus removing a wasteful and intolerable obstacle to progress. While it does its work, Congress need not complicate matters with ill-contrived and shortsighted attempts to take for the Government what belongs to others.

The President is to be congratulated for convening this body. Let us hope it fulfills the expectations set for it and thus enhances our patent system's effectiveness and its example for the rest of the world.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR SOUTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. VIVIAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, today, the President of the United States made before a national audience a most eloquent presentation of the economic development program which our country has supported in the war-torn land of South Vietnam. I commend the President for a splendid speech.

A week ago, in response to the request from the President for supplemental funds to support the military forces now in Vietnam, I voted, as did most others, to provide the funds requested. But several weeks hence, bills authorizing and appropriating funds for continuing the equally vital economic aid and development programs in Vietnam will also come before this House. In the past, such foreign aid legislation has not fared as well in the House as has military forces legislation. I hope the numerous Members of the House who stood ready to support the President last week, will in the same near-unanimous way vote also for the economic aid.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn now to a related question, the question of whether or not U.S. policies in Vietnam are and ought to be subject to unrestrained public discussion and debate.

Mr. Speaker, this coming Saturday, senior officers of the Government are expected to participate as the President's representatives in a public debate here in Washington on our policies and plans for Vietnam. The debate is part of a day-

long meeting, called a National Teach-In, sponsored by university professors from our various States. I call the attention of Members of this House to the event so that interested Members can attend. The meeting will be held at the Sheraton Park hotel, from 9 a.m. to 12 midnight. Participants from the very highest echelons of the administration, including the President's special assistant, Mr. McGeorge Bundy, will be there to present the current policies. I frankly doubt, however, that any one of them will be able to surpass, in clarity and eloquence, the President's own message this morning.

Many of the leaders who organized this and earlier similar discussions have come from the faculty of the University of Michigan in my district. These individuals state and I concur in this view, that they believe strongly that vital activities and policies of our democratic Government, such as those in Vietnam, should be thoroughly discussed in public. They are committed to the concept that the benefits of continuous public scrutiny of our policies on critical matters, far outweigh any possible risks. Quite evidently, the President concurs, for he is encouraging able participants from his administration to present his views. I hope the other participants present will recognize his deep commitment, by presenting constructive criticism or meaningful alternatives. Emotional outbursts based on hollow dialectic do not belong in the debate.

Now remarks have been made by some in the public media which would seem to question the essential concept of public scrutiny and also to question the right of individual citizens to dissent vocally from current national policies. I believe no Member of this House, conscious of our Nation's great democratic traditions, would deny this essential concept or this right.

Now, of course, my remarks here today may be construed by some as meaning that I implicitly support all arguments which may be advanced by any critics of the administration policy who may speak at this meeting, or that I am opposed to all aspects of the President's policy. Such most certainly is not the case. I believe strongly that many features of the President's policy today are patently wise and necessary, whether popular or not. But I do respectfully suggest that we Members of this House consider whether or not we ourselves have adequately discussed and reviewed these matters. As our colleague from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL], a member of the House Committee on Foreign Relations, has suggested several times, a full, reasoned and unemotional discussion of this policy, public or private, here in the House of Representatives, could provide each individual Member with the basis for a commitment, and should serve to strengthen our and our constituents resolve, to undergo the difficult sacrifices it may demand.

Mr. Speaker, I append herewith the text of the President's incisive and courageous remarks delivered this morning:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN EDITORIAL CARTOONISTS IN THE EAST ROOM, MAY 13, 1965

Good morning ladies and gentlemen, and my friends of the Association of American Editorial Cartoonists. I am very happy that you requested through the press office this opportunity for us to meet together, because after looking at some of the cartoons you have drawn, I thought I'd invite you over to see me in person. After all, I had nothing to lose.

I know that I am talking to the most influential journalists in America. Reporters may write and politicians may talk but what you draw remains in the public memory long after these other words are forgotten. That is why, after I learned that you would be here and we would meet together that I put together some notes to discuss with you while you were in Washington, a very little known side of our activity in one of the most vital places in the world—South Vietnam.

The war in Vietnam has many faces.

There is the face of armed conflict—of terror and gunfire—of bomb-heavy planes and campaign-weary soldiers. In this conflict our only object is to prove that force will meet force, that armed conquest is futile, and that aggression is not only wrong, but it just will not work.

And the Communists in Vietnam are slowly beginning to realize what they once scorned to believe: that we combine unlimited patience with unlimited resources in pursuit of an unwavering purpose.

We will not abandon our commitment to South Vietnam.

The second face of war in Vietnam is the quest for a political solution—the face of diplomacy and politics—of the ambitions and the interests of other nations. We know, as our adversaries should also know, that there is no purely military solution in sight for either side. We are ready for unconditional discussions. Most of the non-Communist nations of the world favor such unconditional discussions. And it would clearly be in the interest of North Vietnam to now come to the conference table. For them the continuation of war, without talks, means only damage without conquest. Communist China apparently desires the war to continue whatever the cost to their allies. Their target is not merely South Vietnam, it is Asia. Their objective is not the fulfillment of Vietnamese nationalism. It is to erode and to discredit America's ability to help prevent Chinese domination over all of Asia.

In this domination they shall never succeed. And I am continuing and I am increasing the search for every possible path to peace.

The third face of war in Vietnam is, at once, the most tragic and most hopeful. It is the face of human need. It is the untended sick, the hungry family and the illiterate child. It is men and women, many without shelter, with rags for clothing, struggling for survival in a very rich and a very fertile land.

It is the most important battle of all in which we are engaged. For a nation cannot be built by armed power or by political agreement. It will rest on the expectation by individual men and women that their future will be better than their past.

It is not enough to just fight against something. People must fight for something, and the people of South Vietnam must know that after the long, brutal journey through the dark tunnel of conflict there breaks the light of a happier day. And only if this is so, can they be expected to sustain the enduring will for continued strife. Only in this way can long-run stability and peace come to their land.

And there is another, more profound reason. In Vietnam communism seeks to really impose its will by force of arms. But we

would be deeply mistaken to think that this was the only weapon. Here, as other places in the world, they speak to restless people—people rising to shatter the old ways which have imprisoned hope—people fiercely and justly reaching for the material fruits from the tree of modern knowledge.

It is this desire, and not simply lust for conquest, which moves many of the individual fighting men that we must now, sadly, call the enemy.

It is, therefore, our task to show that freedom from the control of other nations offers the surest road to progress, that history and experience testify to this truth. But it is not enough to call upon reason or point to examples. We must show it through action and we must show it through accomplishment, and even were there no war—either hot or cold—we would always be active in humanity's search for progress. This task is commanded to us by the moral values of our civilization, and it rests on the inescapable nature of the world that we have now entered. For in that world, as long as we can foresee, every threat to man's welfare will be a threat to the welfare of our own people. Those who live in the emerging community of nations will ignore the perils of their neighbors at the risk of their own prospects.

This is true not only for Vietnam but for every part of the developing world. This is why, on your behalf, I recently proposed a massive, cooperative development effort for all of southeast Asia. I named the respected leader, Eugene Black, as my personal representative to inaugurate our participation in these programs.

Since that time rapid progress has been made, I am glad to report. Mr. Black has met with the top officials of the United Nations on several occasions. He has talked to other interested parties. He has found increasing enthusiasm. The United Nations is already setting up new mechanisms to help carry forward the work of development.

In addition, the United States is now prepared to participate in, and to support, an Asian development bank, to carry out and help finance the economic progress in that area of the world, and the development that we desire to see in that area of the world.

So this morning I call on every other industrialized nation, including the Soviet Union, to help create a better life for all of the people of southeast Asia. Surely, surely, the works of peace can bring men together in a common effort to abandon forever the works of war.

But, as South Vietnam is the central place of conflict, it is also a principal focus of our work to increase the well-being of people. It is in that effort in South Vietnam which I think we are too little informed and which I want to relate to you this morning.

We began in 1954 when Vietnam became independent, before the war between the north and the south. Since that time we have spent more than \$2 billion in economic help for the 16 million people of South Vietnam. And despite the ravages of war we have made steady continuing gains. We have concentrated on food, and health, and education, and housing, and industry.

Like most developing countries, South Vietnam's economy rests on agriculture. Unlike many, it has large uncrowded areas of very rich, and very fertile land. Because of this, it is one of the great rice bowls of the entire world. With our help, since 1954, South Vietnam has already doubled its rice production, providing food for the people, as well as providing a vital export for that nation.

We have put our American farm know-how to work on other crops. This year, for instance, several hundred million cuttings of a new variety of sweet potato, that promises a sixfold increase in yield, will be distributed to these Vietnamese farmers. Corn output should rise from 25,000 tons in 1962 to 100,

000 tons by 1966. Pig production has more than doubled since 1955. Many animal diseases have been eliminated entirely.

Disease and epidemic brood over every Vietnamese village. In a country of more than 16 million people with a life expectancy of only 35 years, there are only 200 civilian doctors. If the Vietnamese had doctors in the same ratio as the United States has doctors, they would have not the 200 that they do have but they would have more than 5,000 doctors.

We have helped vaccinate, already, over 7 million people against cholera, and millions more against other diseases. Hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese can now receive treatment in the more than 12,000 hamlet health stations that America has built and has stocked. New clinics and surgical suites are scattered throughout that entire country; and the medical school that we are now helping to build will graduate as many doctors in a single year as now serve the entire population of South Vietnam.

Education is the keystone of future development in Vietnam. It takes a trained people to man the factories, to conduct the administration, and to form the human foundation for an advancing nation. More than a quarter million young Vietnamese can now learn in more than 4,000 classrooms that America has helped to build in the last 2 years; and 2,000 more schools are going to be built by us in the next 12 months. The number of students in vocational schools has gone up four times. Enrollment was 300,000 in 1955, when we first entered there and started helping with our program. Today it is more than 1,500,000. The 8 million textbooks that we have supplied to Vietnamese children will rise to more than 15 million by 1967.

Agriculture is the foundation. Health, education, and housing are the urgent human needs. But industrial development is the great pathway to their future.

When Vietnam was divided, most of the industry was in the north. The south was barren of manufacturing and the foundations for industry. Today, more than 700 new or rehabilitated factories—textile mills and cement plants, electronics and plastics—are changing the entire face of that nation. New roads and communications, railroad equipment, and electric generators, are a spreading base on which this new industry can, and is, growing. All this progress goes on, and it is going to continue to go on, under circumstances of staggering adversity.

Communist terrorists have made aid programs that we administer a very special target of their attack. They fear them. They know they must fear them because agricultural stations are being destroyed and medical centers are being burned. More than 100 Vietnamese malaria fighters are dead. Our own AID officials have been wounded and kidnapped. These are not just the accidents of war. They are a part of a deliberate campaign, in the words of the Communists, "to cut the fingers off the hands of the government." We intend to continue, and we intend to increase our help to Vietnam.

Nor can anyone doubt the determination of the South Vietnamese themselves. They have lost more than 12,000 of their men since I became your President a little over a year ago.

But progress does not come from investment alone, or plans on a desk, or even the directives and the orders that we approve here in Washington. It takes men. Men must take the seed to the farmer. Men must teach the use of fertilizer. Men must help in harvest. Men must build the schools, and men must instruct the students. Men must carry medicine into the jungle and treat the sick, and shelter the homeless. And men—brave, tireless, filled with love for their fellows—are doing this today. They are doing it through the long, hot, danger-filled Vietnamese days and the sultry nights.

The fullest glory must go, also, to those South Vietnamese that are laboring and dying for their own people and their own nation. In hospitals and schools, along the rice fields and the roads, they continue to labor, never knowing when death or terror may strike.

How incredible it is that there are a few who still say that the South Vietnamese do not want to continue the struggle. They are sacrificing and they are dying by the thousands. Their patient valor in the heavy presence of personal, physical danger should be a helpful lesson to those of us who, here in America, only have to read about it, or hear about it on the television or radio.

We have our own heroes who labor at the works of peace in the midst of war. They toll unarmed and out of uniform. They know the humanity of their concern does not exempt them from the horrors of conflict, yet they go on from day to day. They bring food to the hungry over there. They supply the sick with necessary medicine. They help the farmer with his crops, families to find clean water, villages to receive the healing miracles of electricity. These are Americans who have joined our AID program, and we welcome others to their ranks.

For most Americans this is an easy war. Men fight and men suffer and men die, as they always do in war. But the lives of most of us, at least those of us in this room and those listening to me this morning, are untroubled. Prosperity rises, abundance increases, the Nation flourishes.

I will report to the Cabinet when I leave this room that we are in the 51st month of continued prosperity, the longest peacetime prosperity for America since our country was founded. Yet our entire future is at stake.

What a difference it would make if we could only call upon a small fraction of our unmatched private resources—businesses and unions, agricultural groups and builders—if we could call them to the task of peaceful progress in Vietnam. With such a spirit of patriotic sacrifice we might well strike an irresistible blow for freedom there and for freedom throughout the world.

I, therefore, hope that every person within the sound of my voice in this county this morning will look for ways—and those citizens of other nations who believe in humanity as we do, I hope that they will find ways to help progress in South Vietnam.

This, then, is the third face of our struggle in Vietnam. It was there—the illiterate, the hungry, the sick—before this war began. It will be there when peace comes to us—and so will we. Not with soldiers and planes, not with bombs and bullets, but with all the wondrous weapons of peace in the 20th century.

And then, perhaps, together, all of the people of the world can share that gracious task with all the people of Vietnam, north and south alike.

Thank you for coming this morning. Good morning.

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

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

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

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

COMBATING PORNOGRAPHY

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

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, last month I introduced a bill to establish a Presidential Commission to study ways of combating pornography on all levels of government.

The response to my bill has been very heartening. I have received mail from all parts of the Nation supporting the legislation which I have introduced.

H.R. 7465 is, in my opinion, a bill which every Member should support. Civic leaders and educators from coast to coast are now urging action against the increasing availability of hard core pornography.

In the May 10 edition of the Jersey Journal, a paper with great influence in New Jersey, there is a story about a very distinguished citizen of Jersey City who is vitally concerned with curbing the traffic in smut.

George E. Davis is a Knight of St. Gregory, a high papal honor, and is president of the Newark Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Men. He has served the United States with distinction in World War II and is a successful businessman. He is, in my opinion, typical of the good citizen who wants to see something done about pornography.

I think all Members of this House will find this story about Mr. Davis interesting. He is no little old lady in tennis shoes or puritan fanatic. He is an American father who is concerned with the effect of smut on our youngsters. Furthermore, he is doing something about it.

The article follows:

HE'S THE NEWS—VETERAN FIGHTER TAKES ON SMUT

George E. Davis, Knights of St. Gregory and president of the Newark Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Men has four sons (another died in infancy), "and I intend to see to it that they are not exposed to the filth so easily purchased on too many of our newsstands."

While soft-spoken, Davis, who lives at 630 Bergen Avenue, Jersey City, with his wife, Catherine Walter Davis, and their offspring has a military background which attests to his tough masculinity.

He spent 5 years in the Navy in World War II, 1 year on destroyers, the other 4 in submarines. He saw duty in four theaters ranging from the Atlantic and Mediterranean to the Pacific.

It takes prodding to get him to discuss his decorations but they are worth mentioning: The Silver Star, Bronze Star, personal Presidential Citation; three commendations from Adm. William Halsey, and a personal citation from the late Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal.

Now vice president of Scott Printing Co., Jersey City, Davis has launched a consistent attack on the easy distribution of indecent literature.

"It's bad enough that adults can buy this scum, but irreparable damage can result when teenagers are exposed to it."

He is a much-sought speaker on this subject, his most recent appearance at the annual communion breakfast of the St. Joseph's Holy Name Society.

In his lapel he wears the rosette of a Knight of St. Gregory. He was recommended

for this honor by Archbishop Thomas A. Boland and named by the late Pope John XXIII in 1962.

Elected president of the ACCM on April 3, his first function was to represent the archdiocese at the convention of the National Council of Catholic Men in Dallas.

While there a particular experience was meeting Very Rev. Oscar Huber, C.M., who administered the last rites to the assassinated President John F. Kennedy.

"Father Huber," he recalls, "was watching the motorcade on television when the fatal shot was fired. He raced to the hospital where he is chaplain, arriving moments after the President was brought in."

Davis' honors are not the sudden type. He has held a variety of high offices in the Council of Catholic Men, the Knights of Columbus, Holy Name Society, and St. Vincent de Paul Society.

In all of these posts, he has been a working, shirt-sleeve type officer. He has not neglected civic affairs either. Since November 1962 he has been chairman of the Hudson County Planning Board, having served with the board since its inception the previous year.

His education is all local, St. Aloysius Parochial School, St. Peter's Prep, and St. Peter's College where he received his degree in 1939.

FINANCING FOR YOUTH OPPORTUNITY CENTERS

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

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, no phase of the Employment Service is more intensified than the expanding youth program, parts of which are already operational and others still in the planning stages. The problems of unemployed youth and particularly those youth from impoverished families, in a time of the highest overall employment in our Nation's history, has prompted the establishment of youth opportunity centers in metropolitan areas throughout the Nation.

It has been recognized that the Employment Service cannot create jobs and that there is a need for additional public expenditure to meet the chronic needs of large numbers of youthful applicants who are not fully employable at this time in the private sector of our economy. Manpower Development and Training Act amendments have already furnished a valuable number of new opportunities for the development of greater employability among youth. The antipoverty bill with its work-training, work-study, and job corps provisions offers important new resources for the preparation of youth for regular employment. The youth opportunity center staff will work closely with these programs in an effort to insure that as many needy youth as possible will be recipients of the benefits of these new programs.

To better cope with the complex problems of youth and especially disadvantaged youth, the centers' staff must be highly skilled and trained. They must be qualified to decide at what point the youth is ready for placement either on a job or in one of the many Federal or State training programs. Special training is required for all persons

whether professional counselors, interviewers, youth advisers who are not college trained, or volunteers who offer their services to the center to help youth. The training and development is a continuing process and requires the use of technical consultants in a variety of fields such as psychiatry, psychology, medicine, and social work to keep the center staff current in their knowledge of services which might be of benefit to the applicant.

In addition, the counselor may have to seek technical assistance and advice concerning the youth applicant who presents special problems. Such consultations are costly but often quite essential in order to develop the youth's maximum employability.

Salaries for skilled counseling staff must be competitive in a market in which the supply will probably never meet the demand. In addition to demands for counselors by our growing number of schools, many more public and private agencies and organizations are also in search of qualified counselors. Although the supply of counselors is increasing it cannot keep pace with the growing demand.

Research shows that counseling service when effective, is often lengthy and time consuming. This would be particularly true in the center where intensive counseling interviews cannot be limited in number or length without a reluctant loss of "rapport" or contact with the counselee. The use of a variety of techniques can be more effective with hard-to-reach applicants and the use of such equipment such as motion pictures and other visual aids is vital to the overall effectiveness of the program.

The minimum requirements for the network of youth opportunity centers now being established must be met in order to provide our needy youth with the skills and tools which are now required and will continue to be required by employers today and in the future.

It should be the policy of this Government to give firm support and endorsement to the purpose and operation of these centers. They are proving to be a unique venture into our expanding efforts to relieve the economic plight of our unemployed youth.

In making this assertion, I speak from firsthand knowledge; for one of these youth opportunity centers will open in my district in the very near future. I can assure you that it will fill a real and immediate need.

I would like to propose that the Congress follow the recommendation of the House Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, and speedily enact legislation so that available funds can be utilized.

Unless this problem of financing is met and solved, then the entire program of the youth opportunity centers is in grave danger. But even more important, we will have turned an indifferent ear to the hopes of thousands of young Americans who are asking for the chance to prove that they can assume a respected place in our society.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

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

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the resolutions which were adopted by the 75th Congress of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution.

Here is an organization of responsible citizens, men who are the direct descendants of those courageous men and women who founded our Nation and its Government. Its members are dedicated to upholding those fundamental principles from which our constitutional Government developed. I would urge my colleagues to read carefully the official expressions of the Sons of the American Revolution, which follow, and to note those matters which are of concern to them, because they are of concern to many Americans today:

RESOLUTION 1

Resolution to declare the political and economic rights which protect the dignity and freedom of the individual, and what is deemed necessary to implement such rights

Whereas the great message of the American Revolutionists of 1776 to the world was that the state exists for the people, not the people for the state; that the human dignity of the individual means something and always must be fiercely protected by courts and juries from governmental oppression, and from every form of tyranny over the mind of man; and

Whereas to understand and maintain this American way of life, by exemplary conduct, and to pass it intact to succeeding generations, is the responsibility of every true American; and

Whereas the political and economic rights which protect the dignity and freedom of the individual include:

The right to worship God in one's own way;

The right to free speech and press;
The right to petition for redress of grievances;

The right to privacy in our homes;
The right of habeas corpus, and no excessive bail;

The right to trial by jury under the doctrine that everyone is innocent until proven guilty;

The right to move about freely and safely at home and abroad;

The right of all citizens to keep and bear arms;

The right to own private property;
The right to free elections and personal secret ballot;

The right to work in callings and localities of our choice;

The right to bargain with our employers and employees;

The right to go into business to compete and make a profit;

The right to contract about our affairs;
The right to the service of government as a protector and referee; and

The right to freedom from arbitrary government regulation and control; and

Whereas there is in this declaration of rights, for which our ancestors struggled, the greatness of truth; and

Whereas in recent times there has crept

in amongst us reactionary medieval ideologies from communistic and other totalitarian states, utterly inconsistent with the political philosophy of our Founding Fathers: Be it, therefore,

Resolved, That we, the members of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, in congress assembled, do hereby reaffirm the declarations of the first American revolutionists, and swear eternal hostility against all forms of governmental oppression, and against every form of tyranny over the mind of man, and to further implement these rights and declarations, we unequivocally support:

1. The voluntary reading of the Holy Bible and the voluntary offering of prayers in our schools;

2. The rights of the States, in the exercise of their sovereign powers not specifically granted to the Federal Government;

3. A strict separation of powers amongst the legislative, judicial and executive branches of the Federal Government, as set out in the Constitution;

4. Adherence to the Monroe Doctrine, in the right and duty of the United States to protect itself, its people, and this hemisphere from invasion, infiltration, and subversion by foreign forces;

5. Endorsement of the admonitions of George Washington, contained in his farewell address to the American peoples; and

6. Appropriate action toward the freeing of American prisoners who are held in Communist jails.

We view with alarm and oppose:

1. The growing dictatorship of the executive branch of the Government, which, to use the words of the Declaration of Independence, is constantly erecting a multitude of new offices and sending out swarms of officers to harass our people and to eat out their sustenance;

2. Any limitation upon man's economic freedom by unwarranted and excessive taxation;

3. Actions of those who would surrender any part of the Government of the United States to any association of governments or to any international government;

4. Proposed legislation on immigration which, if adopted, will destroy the safeguards now provided by the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, and will increase immigration into the United States, thereby aggravating unemployment and welfare problems now existing;

5. The rapidly mounting increase in crime throughout the United States in all areas under Federal control, including the District of Columbia, which endanger the personal safety of the individual citizen; and we support those who are petitioning the Federal Government to reestablish protective measures to insure the personal safety of the individual citizen in all areas under Federal control, even including the District of Columbia; and

6. The repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

RESOLUTION 2

Resolution to authorize the president-general, in his discretion, to appoint a special committee to investigate the eligibility of the proposed Hall of Fame for Patriots of the Revolution at Edenton, N.C., for endorsement by the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution

Whereas there has been inaugurated a movement which has as its purpose the establishment, in or near Edenton, N.C., of a nonprofit enterprise to be known as the "Hall of Fame for Patriots of the Revolution"; and

Whereas the said project has been unanimously endorsed at a recent annual meet-